

## Marriage

Do we Believe in Marriage – or just “Marriage”?

“Marriage” Anyone?

The recent decision by the Republic of Ireland to change its Constitution to allow marriage between people of the same sex raises, like all such decisions by states and governments, the question of what definition of the word they are using. Probably they mean simply the legally-recognised union of two people; of course, this is not at all the same as the definition of marriage that has obtained in human society everywhere, for many millennia.

Britain took a similar decision some while ago, of course, though with nothing like the level of democratic consultation enjoyed by the people of Ireland (indeed, none at all). At no time, to my knowledge, did the promoter of the fundamental change, David Cameron, explain precisely his definition of marriage, as it was now to be in the new world of same-sex ... er, whatever, and he and many others seemed deaf to the argument (coming from many, including gays) that the new same-sex marriage would add no legal protections, rights, or privileges, to same-sex couples, as was currently enjoyed by those in civil partnerships).

If the introduction of same-sex “marriages”, therefore, is simply a case of a ... something involving recognition by the State, or the law, created merely by a human committee of some sort (for that is all Parliament is, at least today) then the same committee can create anything to be anything, can bring in the machinery to re-define as it will, to call anything by any word it chooses, rather like Humpty Dumpty (or is it the White Queen? - I never can quite remember. On reflection, David Cameron *does* somewhat resemble Humpty as seen in the famous Tenniel illustration). A word can mean whatever the people in power tell us it means, and if anyone fails to realise that demagogues and tyrants (even aspiring ones) choose as their first target the language, (re-creating the real meanings of words) they need to read George Orwell again, and no doubt various other writers; such peoples’ knowledge of recent political history is very inadequate.

Such is the (much-abused) word “equality”, which is used not only in connection with same-sex “marriage”, but also with many other things that the rulership and their supporters wish to re-make. These days, we’re told, all kinds of people and things can demand, and achieve, “equality”, totally denying, or failing to realise, the fact that there can never be any real or true *equality* between people or things which are fundamentally different; trying to deny that men and women are different could be said to be the premier project, the cause *par excellence*, of the politically-correct age we live in, that on which many things, and maybe all such causes, ultimately rest.

Some people – perhaps many – naively believe that the achievement of same-sex “marriage” laws constitute the end of a process; in fact, of course, they mark just the beginning, and the push for polyamorous, or many-partnered, “marriage” is not far behind. It will surely come into being, unless our societies experience a major, sudden change (I can think of one scenario) in a decade or so. There is some glimmering sign that many people are beginning to realise this, the fact that when a state has once relinquished adherence to real, time-honoured concepts of marriage (or the place of sex in human society) then it has no logical, rational, or realistic means to prohibit anything (those

arguing for the acceptance of paedophilia are gaining respectability; such people use very much the same arguments that gay liberationists used thirty years' ago). Marry your dog? Of course such a thing seems absurd – now; man marrying men would have seemed *very* absurd in, say, 1950. But then, we live in a time when madness and badness – lies – rule.

May 2015