

Male Speaker: From the Australian Christian lobby, the Political Spot.

Lyle Shelton: Welcome to the Political Spot. I'm Lyle Shelton. It's great to be with you again in 2016 at the start of this New Year, thanks for joining me. Ever since the Greens member from Melbourne Adam Bandt stood up in the Federal Parliament in December 2010 and moved a motion that MPs consult with their constituents about changing the definition of marriage. The so called gay marriage debate has been on in earnest. It's been five long years as a small minority of activist urged by a willing media have kept this issue alive in the public square and in politics, despite opinion polls seemingly showing majority support for the idea of changing the definition of marriage. The polls also show it's a very low order issue with voters. It is well down the list of people's priorities that they think politician should be focusing on. As we head into a six consecutive year of campaigning to retain the definition of marriage, a settlement is in sight. Our new Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull has promised to uphold the Abbott government's decision to hold the people's vote or plebiscite after the next Federal Election. Now there's speculation that an election could be held early in March of this year but Mr. Turnbull has indicated the government is most likely to go full term. That means an election wouldn't be held until the latter part of this year, perhaps between August and October but its politics no one really knows for sure but what we do now is to plebiscite on marriage will be held after the election. For those of as such as the Australian Christian Lobby and others who have been in this fight to preserve marriage, it has been a long and tough fight. The same sex political juggernaut has seemingly been unstoppable and certainly has the support of most of the mainstream media who continually give the impression that same sex marriage is a no brainer and politician should just get on with it. But last week in London the same sex political agenda suffered a significant setback. Anglican Primemates from around the globe met to consider the issue because leaders of their church in the United States and Canada have accepted same sex marriage in defiance of the bible's teaching. Instead of endorsing the North American's capitulation to the culture, the 27 of the 36 voting Primemates voted to actually censure the North American Church for straying from Christian teaching on marriage. This is very, very significant. It just goes to show that with courage and conviction this agenda can be turned. One man who has been showing great courage for many years in this battle is Toowoomba GP and president of the Australian Marriage Forum Doctor David Van Gend. Last year Dr. Van Gend had his doctor surgery spray painted with the word bigot and television advertisements that he produced refused broadcast by the tax payer funded SBS. Dr. Van Gend joins me on the line now, welcome to the program David.

Doctor David Van Gend: Thanks Lyle, you must be the former Towoomba City councilor?  
[indiscernible 0:02:59].

Lyle Shelton: There's something's from our former life but yes we've been friend for many years and it's great to have you joining us with this first program in 2016, David.

Doctor David Van Gend: Thank you Lyle. Great to be here.

Lyle Shelton: David, this meeting of Anglican Primemates. I made much of that in that in the introduction because I do think it's significant that when people stand up, this agenda can be resisted and can be turned around and that's something you've been doing in your work and private capacity as president of the Australian Marriage Forum.

Doctor David Van Gend: I think so because a lot of people understand that there's something enormous at stake with marriage. It's not a religious issue so much with Anglican or with people have every right to weigh in on this. It's about the truth of nature that marriage is a man, woman thing in our culture because it's a male, female thing in nature. It only exists doesn't it because male, female relations typically have been momentous consequence of creating children and children need the love and protection of a mother and father. They need the identity and the belonging that goes with being bound to their real mum and dad. That is what marriage achieves. For every child marriage gives them a mum and dad and so called homosexual marriage makes that impossible. Impossible and that's the injustice mate.

Lyle Shelton: Yeah.

Doctor David Van Gend: That's the injustice that we all care about.

Lyle Shelton: Now. This is about being anti any people you just very eloquently said what marriage is and why it's a justice issue for children but you're a doctor and you see people from all walks of life including same sex attracted people and your advocacy for marriage is not in any way motivated by any animus towards people. Just as the Anglicans isn't all, the Australian Christian Lobby isn't. Tell us about this people as people.

Doctor David Van Gend: I don't think it's possible, yeah, I don't think it's possible to know especially young gay people but older ones too, I don't think it's possible to know them and not just wants to put your arm around them and say, "Look, it's going to be okay, it's going to be

okay.” Something’s happened, something’s happened to put you in a position of, all right to these patients I see of considerable suffering in anguish. They don’t know where this attraction came from. They don’t know why they go it, they don’t know what to do with it and a number of them have a conflict between those feelings and their own convictions about what marriage and parenting and family is. This is sets up a terrible tension and I think that tension can be resolved. I think we need to get to a very clear position in Australia. Where gay couples have all the liberties and all the equality of any other couple, any other couples married or defacto that as you know Lyle, they already have all that liberty and called.

Lyle Shelton: That’s right 85 laws where changed in 2008 and state governments have allowed relationship registers. There is no discrimination in Australian law against same sex couples.

Doctor David Van Gend: Perfect. That’s it, they have full relationship equality and that is what a liberal society should achieve. That’s where we’re at but you’ve got to also let children have the one institution in society that exists for them. Marriage exist for children, they’ve build around mother and child. The very word matrimony is broken into two words, mother and the state of. It’s the state of motherhood is matrimony and marriage exist to serve the interest of mother and child. It serves to bind men, feral by nature men to their mate so that both of them can be bound to their child. That’s the whole purpose of it and gay people get this. You’re going to listen to Christopher Pearson used to write about marriage needing to be a to man, woman thing, or Dolce & Gabbana, the great fashion gays what they said about it or Doug Mannering, all these other serious principal gay guys who say we got what we want. We got the liberty and benefits that we want. Don’t take marriage away from children, it’s their only structural institutional possession and that’s where we’re at Lyle. We can all get to this point of saying, yes, yes our fellow citizen who are same sex attracted must have all the liberty and equality of any of us, and they do. Now that is enough do not let them usurp the one child sense of institution that there is and remake it in their own adult centered image. That is an injustice against child and that’s where we draw the line.

Male Speaker: The political Spot at [www.acl.org.au](http://www.acl.org.au).

Lyle Shelton: Now, we never hear about this in the mainstream media. We’re told continually by some politicians and certainly by the media that same sex marriage doesn’t affect anyone else’s marriage. It has no consequences for anyone else but you’re saying it breaks this bond of matrimony. I’ve never thought of that the word matrimony as having to do with mother and child but this is just never discussed in the mainstreams press.

Doctor David Van Gend: It breaks all marriages because I was sitting in America couple of months after their definition of marriage was changed. I looked around this restaurant. None of those married men and women, none of them have the same marriage they used to have because marriage has now become purely an adult romantic affair. A relationship between any two adults of any sex was no further meaning than that. What they signed up to is marriage being the vocation of a man and woman given by nature itself to undertake the great task of creating a home, a new family and new generation. That great vocation, that great honorable life task has been degraded into a mere romantic association between any two people. So that's gone but more importantly Lyle, the relationship between all parents and all children is redefined when you change marriage as the great lawyer Margaret Somerville pointed out when Canada brought in gay marriage. They changed all of the legal reference to natural parents and made it legal parents. Now, a natural parent is a fundamental, natural relationship which government has to respect, has to stand back and let natural parenthood prevail but once you abolish natural parents because you got rid of natural marriage. All parents and all children are related by a government definition which the government can damn well change whenever it likes. It's a legal fiction and no parents and children any longer have a natural relationship. They have a legal fiction for a relationship. Be like profound, you're playing into the hands of big government. People have no idea ...

Lyle Shelton: Absolutely. This is a huge change, it's a social injustice to children as you've eloquently said but the other big consequence is something you have felt the full force of personally and this is the consequence to free speech and free argument. You've actually been taken off to an Anti Discrimination Tribunal Commission in Queensland for something you wrote about the rights of the child. Can you just tell us about that experience?

Doctor David Van Gend: Sure. It was an article in Courier Mail and they had for and against forum. I was asked to write the case against gay marriage and someone else wrote the other one. In it, I pointed out that yes, this were the exact words that got metaken to the court or at the commission which was a great experience for me, I enjoyed it because it gave me a chance to teach this gay activists a lesson in how men conduct their debate on matters of public concern. They don't set lawyers onto your opponent like he did. You just argue your case. By the end of it, he conceded and he ran away and he pushed through his stupid complaint but on the way, this is what I'd said, I'd said, yes, yes, it is discrimination to prohibit the marriage of two men but it is a far worse case of discrimination to allow this and thereby abolish a mother from the life of any child created within that marriage or words that effect." I haven't quoted it quite right. But I've said, "Of course we discriminate against two men by saying they can't marry because they can't. It's not possible because marriage is by definition a natural institution of male and female but more importantly they can't because that would impose a far worse injustice on children who

will be created by surrogacy or adoption or whatever under this new institution not by tragic circumstance law but this kids won't miss out on their mum because their mum's died or there's a divorce. These kids in the future will miss out on their mother because an act of parliament today decreed that they will miss out.

Lyle Shelton: For saying these things you had to front up to a tribunal. We all know in Tasmania the Archbishop Julian Porteous is also before the state anti discrimination commission for saying similar things, beautifully expressed not discriminatory, not bigoted or hatred against any person but just upholding this beautiful definition marriage and the importance for children. These two examples I guess the sort of things you and I talking about now are the sort of things that can trigger the state based antidiscrimination laws. That's a real problem and what is going to happen if the federal definition of marriage has changed. That will just I think turbo charge the state antidiscrimination laws and make it very difficult for these discussions to occur in the future.

Doctor David Van Gend: Actually Lyle, from a wide reading into the activist literature on gay marriage and gay issue. That's actually the main objective. Gay thinkers, gay activist don't really care about gay marriage, they actually despise it. They always have despised marriage. It's a bourgeois, hetero normative, slightly religious patriarchal repressive thing that cramps your gay style. They despise it, they always have but in the mid '90s, they realize that there's this new thing in town called antidiscrimination law and if you normalize homosexual marriage in law, you have normalize homosexual behavior in all its manifestations with the force of the law and that gives you two things. It gives you control of the curriculum so that all children with gay marriage bought in. All children must be taught the homosexual behavior is no different to the relationship of their mum and dad. That it is normal and natural and right and if parents disagree to bad it's the law of the land. You've missed your chance, it's gone and the second thing is they the big stick of antidiscrimination law to beat the churches and other conscientious objectors into submission and that is what they are trying to do now but we can resist it now. We will not be able to resist it when gay marriage is the law of the land and they know that and this is why they want it.

Lyle Shelton: David, look our time has ran unfortunately and there's much more we could say on this but I think you've given three very clear reasons. The rights of the child to their mother and father, the freedom of speeches issues not to be dragged off to a tribunal and of course what is taught to our kids in schools and that we've talked previously about this so called safe school's curriculum which is already in Australian schools. 2016 is going to be another big year for marriage. It's going to be another year where we're all going to need to resist and to stand up and to be engaged in this plebiscite discussion whenever it comes after the next election. David,

thanks for being on the front line. We looked forward to hearing more from you and the Australian Marriage Forum.

Doctor David Van Gend: Lyle, thanks to you because we all owe you a debt of gratitude for having taken the burden of this for many years. Thanks you so much.

Male Speaker: The Political Spot from the Australian Christian Lobby at [www.acl.org.au](http://www.acl.org.au).