No, 1) Civil partnerships were designed to provide state affirmation of a particular type of relationship, namely a same-sex sexual relationship. The appropriate relationship for sexual activity is an exclusive, life-long heterosexual one. It is not possible, therefore, to hold a religious "blessing" for sexual activity that takes place outside of such a relationship, whether the relationship is heterosexual or homosexual. Therefore a religious ceremony would be inappropriate. 2) In today"s climate there is a likelihood that religious bodies who refuse to register civil partnerships would stand accused of discrimination on the false assertion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: Do you agree that legislation should be changed so that civil partnerships could be registered through religious ceremonies?</th>
<th>that all types of sexual activity should be treated alike. This is a matter government should take very seriously, and shows that its present approach is flawed. 3) The Gay movement has not hesitated to bring unacceptable pressure to bear on people who hinder its agenda, and it has been highly successful. It is certain that Gay activists would use a change in the law to create major problems for individuals or bodies who chose not to register civil partnership by a religious ceremony. It could become impossible for a religious body (or celebrant within it) to continue to function, either through personal pressure or legal harassment. Governments have consistently failed to take this into account when legislating on equality matters, and are becoming guilty of institutional discrimination by neglect.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Do you think that the proposals in England and Wales on registration of civil partnerships in religious premises would be appropriate for Scotland?</td>
<td>Don't Know,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: Do you agree with allowing religious celebrants to register civil partnerships in religious premises?</td>
<td>No, The reasons are the same as for question 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: Do you agree with allowing religious celebrants to register civil partnerships in other places agreed between the celebrant and the couple?</td>
<td>No, See answer to questions 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: Do you agree that religious bodies should not be required to register civil partnerships?</td>
<td>Yes, It is a matter for concern that such a question would be asked, as it has implications for civil liberties. It suggests Government might compel a religious body to act in a way that is contrary to their conscience and fundamental values. This is a human rights issue - and it is impossible to believe the state would treat any other type of organisation or community in this way. We note that in its application of an EU Directive on equality and discrimination the previous Westminster government attempted to make it difficult for faith groups to act in a manner consistent with their beliefs, while ensuring that political organisations were allowed to practise freely. Yes, 1) From our observation, religious celebrants are among the trustees of their community”s beliefs and practices. Provided that is the case, and provided the refusal to register civil partnerships is for reasons of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Question 6: Do you consider that religious celebrants should not be allowed to register civil partnerships if their religious body has decided against registering civil partnerships?

Yes, There is a difference between the situations envisaged in questions 6 and 7. Question 6 deals with a body ensuring that its trustees fulfil the trust committed to them. Their body is simply requiring that they take no action - this is not a conscience issue for them. If a celebrant disagreed with the body’s fundamental beliefs he or she has a right to resign their position as trustee, and has no ground for complaint as trusteeship is not a human right. Question 7 deals with an individual’s conscience. Neither the state nor any religious body has a right to compel someone to act against their conscience.

### Question 7: Do you agree that individual religious celebrants should not be required to register civil partnerships?

Conscience the celebrant would be bound to uphold that. 2) It is not a matter for the state to consider whether or not individuals in a religious or other body should be allowed to register a civil partnership. That would be going beyond the authority of the state. 3) If the state were to legislate in a way that encouraged disagreement between a religious body and one of its trustees there is a strong probability that a "test case" would be raised. Gay or secular activists would be likely to use such an opportunity to create difficulties for a body that does not affirm their aims. This would be an unintended and unacceptable consequence of legislative change.

### Question 8: Which of the options do you favour to ensure that religious bodies and celebrants do not have to register civil partnerships against their will?

Option 2, In today’s climate, Option 1 would have the effect of encouraging and facilitating attacks on a body that does not support the Gay agenda. Option 2 provides an opportunity for a religious body to register civil partnerships if they so wish. Nevertheless, the mere fact of being allowed by law to register civil partnerships would expose bodies that did not do so to unwarranted charges of discrimination (see answer to question 1).

### Question 9: Religious bodies may not wish their premises to be used to register civil partnerships. Do you agree that no legislative provision is required to ensure religious premises cannot be used against the wishes of the relevant religious body?

Don't Know, Legislation may be needed to ensure that activists do not attack bodies that do not wish their premises to be used in this way; equality legislation can be used as a means to create problems for people who hold views different to one’s own, whether these are religious bodies, parents, or others. There is evidence from a number of countries that individuals in the Gay movement have "manufactured" situations that would produce conflict with people who did not support their agenda. We would expect this to happen here,
and that low-level harassment would take place over use of premises, including for publicity purposes, and to disrupt decision-making.

No, 1. Rationale. 1.1 The Introduction to the Consultation gives reasons for considering this issue. These are stated as: the equality agenda, and changing social attitudes. It fails to mention a third and significant reason - pressure from the Gay movement and its allies.

1.2 The rationale may be assessed as follows. 1.2.1 The idea that this is an equality issue is false. That view rests on the notion that a heterosexual marriage and a public declaration of same-sex relationship are identical. That is manifestly not the case, and the differences are far greater than the similarities. The term "same sex marriage" is an oxymoron. Arguments on grounds of rights and equality can only be valid where there are identical situations, which is not the case here. Equality bodies are misusing the word "marriage" and are therefore mistaken when they speak in terms of "rights" in this context.

1.2.2 The arguments used in favour are lacking in rigour. As an example - the Social Attitudes Survey 2010 shows surprising inconsistency in dealing with gender issues. It uses a definition of a discriminatory attitude as "one that directly or indirectly suggests that some social groups may not be entitled to engage in the full panoply of social, economic and political activities that are thought to be the norm for most citizens." Yet it goes on in chapter 7.3 to imply that believing same sex sexual relations to be "wrong" is a discriminatory attitude, though it has nothing to do with depriving a person of "the full panoply". Many who promote same sex "marriage" make the same mistake. Opposition to "same sex marriage" is not a discriminatory attitude, since a same sex relationship is by definition different from a heterosexual one, and disapproval is not exclusion.

1.2.3 There are no practical benefits to be gained by introducing same sex marriage. It does not confer anything that is not already available through civil partnerships. Its only significance is symbolic. That raises the question of why government is giving such attention to symbolism? The only change is in the usage of the word "marriage". It is not a function of government to change the usage of words, and it is presently wasting its time on an exercise in semantics. 1.2.4 Since the term is a
Question 10: Do you agree that the law in Scotland should be changed to allow same sex marriage?

contradiction, and existing present legislation is not discriminatory, a further reason for the proposal must be sought. It lies in the Gay movement's campaign to win "official" affirmation for same sex practices, and to change public opinion. The state is not conscience; it certainly is not God, (the existence of the International Court of Justice is a reminder of that). Government should not give way to such pressure, for it is not a legitimate function of the state to confer moral approval or its equivalent. This is positive discrimination gone mad. 1,2,5 It would be manifestly unjust for a very small minority to enforce its will on the rest of society in a matter of such magnitude. The Survey's finding that attitudes to same sex activity are changing cannot be used to infer that those respondents want the usage of the word "marriage" to be officially altered - that would be absurd, yet it is an argument at the heart of this Consultation.

2. Arguments from the context of this proposal. It cannot be considered adequately in isolation.

2.1 Equality has been mainstreamed in government. But its intended beneficiaries are specific groups (mentioned in the Social Attitudes Survey). This proposal is an example of positive discrimination for one of those groups. Any group outside the favoured few is liable to be treated unequally. 2.2 There has been a great deal of woolly thinking and misleading comment. The common term "anti-gay" is an example. It is used to imply hostility towards gay people (which would be reprehensible), but the reality is that it normally refers to disapproval of gay conduct (which is a legitimate moral stance). Another example is the refusal to distinguish between equal treatment of individuals (which we support) and affirmation of aspects of their conduct (which is plain daft). Such confusion has hindered the current debate. 2.3 The Gay movement has undergone transformation, from a campaign to correct abuses to a force that had the ability to destroy the Bank of Scotland when it intended merging with a company associated with disapproval of Gay conduct. It has succeeded in having Gay conduct ring-fenced from criticism - a privileged position. It has shown an extraordinary intolerance of criticism - the near-hysterical reaction to John Mason MSP's plea that Registrars should have their conscience respected is an example of that. The demand for redefinition of marriage is
in keeping with that. 3. The social context must be considered. 3.1 Marriage is an age-old institution, recognised in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The idea that a tiny group in a tiny country can redefine marriage is laughable. Attempts in the United States to do so have been rejected by the public, and it is generally rejected in the rest of the world (today as well as in all ages). 3.2 Marriage is known to provide the best environment for bringing up children. To change it would be perverse. 3.3 In the Introduction to the Consultation opposition to the proposal is portrayed as being faith-based. That is seriously misleading, and should not have come from a senior politician. There is no demand for the proposal, and most of those who disagree with it are people of no obvious faith. Marriage is not a religious phenomenon; it is a universal human institution. 4. Expected results of this proposal 4.1 The combination of demanding equal affirmation for all sorts of conduct, the failure to make vital distinctions, and the atmosphere in which criticism of Gay conduct is treated as almost criminal will inevitably lead to serious harassment by the state of people who refuse to support the Gay agenda. The proposal for Gay "marriage" must be seen as a step down that road. 4.2 This does not only affect religious bodies. It affects non-religious people even more. This process has already deprived a Registrar of employment. It will affect teachers, who are already under pressure to teach children that homosexual activity is on the same level, morally, as heterosexual. A few years ago an attempt was made in Wales to have that made a condition of employment for teachers. The most sinister outcome is that parents would put themselves on the wrong side of equality law (in spirit at least) for teaching their own children as they see fit. A foster couple in England have already been struck off after their local authority demanded they teach their charges that homosexual conduct is "right". Such things will be the unintended consequences of pursuing the current proposal, rather than resisting the movements' unreasonable demands. 4.3 The tendency to dismiss anything that arises from a religious worldview is unfortunate as it ignores the fact that many religious views are evidence-based. We would argue (on the basis of evidence) that the way society treats marriage is a moral matter that has lasting consequences.
God cares enough about the people he made to judge us for how we treat them. As things stand there is a clear line between sexual relationships that are acceptable and others that are not. If government were to redefine marriage it would remove the only reference point for discussion of such matters. Evidence for that is the reported start of a campaign in California to permit polygamy. It may be no coincidence that governments ready to consider Gay "marriage" have also been very slow to deal with worse forms of sexual aberration such as people trafficking. Behind this proposal is a free-for-all that is based on the maxim "What-is-is-right". That cannot make for good government.

**Question 11: Do you agree that religious bodies and celebrants should not be required to solemnise same sex marriage?**

Yes, Such a requirement would be more than "inappropriate", as the Consultation document describes it. It would be an act of tyranny.

**Question 12: Do you agree with the introduction of same-sex civil marriage only?**

Don't Know. 1) There is no substantive difference between civil and religious same-sex "marriage". This question could be answered only if the answer to question 10 was "Yes". 2) There is no substantive difference between civil and religious "marriage". The distinction is an artificial one, as marriage is a universal human institution, and any religious element is appended to it rather then being of its essence.

**Question 13: Do you agree with the introduction of same-sex marriage, both religious and civil?**

No, See answer to question 10.

**Question 14: Do you agree that religious bodies should not be required to solemnise same sex marriage?**

Yes, To require any person or body to act contrary to their conscience is outwith the authority of the state. It would be tyrannical, on a par with the old Soviet Union in its treatment of religious and other groups.

**Question 15: Do you consider that religious celebrants should not be allowed to solemnise same sex marriages if their religious body has decided against solemnising same sex marriage?**

Yes, 1) From our observation, religious celebrants are included among the trustees of their community"s beliefs and practices. Provided that is the case, and provided the refusal to solemnise same sex marriage is for reasons of conscience, the celebrant would be bound to uphold that. 2) It is not within the authority of the state to decide whether or not individuals in any organisation should be allowed to register a same sex marriage. 3) Furthermore, if it were to legislate in a way that allowed disagreement between a religious body and one of its trustees or employees there is a strong probability that a "test case" would be
raised. Gay or secular activists would be likely
to use such an opportunity to create difficulties
for a body that does not affirm their aims. That
would be an unintended and unacceptable
consequence of allowing religious celebrants to
solemnise same sex marriages if their religious
body has decided against doing so.

**Question 16:** Do you agree that individual
religious celebrants should not be required to
solemnise same sex marriage?

Yes, Neither the state nor any religious or other
body has a right to compel someone to act
against their conscience.

**Question 17:** Which of the options do you
favour to ensure that religious bodies and
celebrants do not have to solemnise same sex
marriage against their will?

Option 2, In today"s climate, Option 1 would
have the effect of encouraging and facilitating
attacks on a religious body that does not affirm
the Gay agenda. Option 2 provides an
opportunity for a religious body to register
same sex marriage if they so wish.
Nevertheless, the mere fact of being allowed by
law to register same sex marriage would
expose bodies that did not do so to unwarranted
charges of discrimination (see answer to
question 1). The preferred answer is "Neither",
for the question assumes same sex marriage,
which is unacceptable.

**Question 18:** Religious bodies may not wish
their premises to be used to solemnise same
sex marriage. Do you agree that no legislative
provision is required to ensure religious
premises cannot be used against the wishes of
the relevant religious body?

Don"t Know, Legislation may be needed to
ensure that activists do not attack bodies that do
not wish their premises to be used in this way;
equality legislation is being used as a means to
create problems for people who hold views
different to one"s own, whether these are
religious bodies, parents, or others. There is
evidence from a number of countries that Gay
activists have "manufactured" situations that
would produce conflict with people who did
not support their agenda. We would expect this
to happen here, and that low-level harassment
would take place over use of premises,
including for publicity purposes.

**Question 19:** If Scotland should introduce
same-sex marriage, do you consider that civil
partnerships should remain available?

Don"t Know,

Yes, We note with a degree of satisfaction that
Government has acknowledged the role of
conscience and of religious bodies in marriage
arrangements (2,25; 2.36; 3.10; 3.23). This
should be non-negotiable. If Government"s
approach were to change it would
fundamentally alter the historic commitment
Scotland has made to human freedom. There
are serious flaws in the Government"s
approach. The fact that the proposal on
"marriage" has been made is evidence of an unhealthy dependence on the gay movement. It is so artificial as to appear quite bizarre. It is part of a process that has already led to discrimination against people who do not subscribe to that agenda, and it has distorted the application of the equality principle. We expect a step-change in discrimination (especially anti-Christian) as a result of this. We remain concerned at the failure to grasp some of the main issues in this debate, such as the misuse of language to "load the dice", and the erroneous use of the equality argument. The proposal represents excessive individualism. The approach that has given rise to it asserts self at the expense of others and tries to overturn the most fundamental aspect of social life. We note that Government misrepresents the situation in implying that opposition to the proposal is uniquely a faith matter. It is not, and in today's climate such a suggestion is liable to create prejudice and distort the debate. We welcome the Government's attempt to deal with the question of forced marriage. It is a great evil. This is a tricky issue and we applaud the fact that it being handled with firmness and sensitivity.

Question 20: Do you have any other comments?
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