

Submission in Response to the Tasmanian Law Reform Commission Issues Paper : *Conversion Practices Law Reform Options for Tasmania*

Submission by Peacock Public Policy Training

Totalitarianism is the Absence of Nuance – Anon

Introduction

My name is Erik Peacock. I have followed the progress of the LGBT campaign for 20 years and done my own research on that issue. I have worked in law reform and public policy for much the same period of time. I was highly instrumental in bringing about Tasmania's Elder Abuse Strategy, have worked extensively in residential tenancy law reform, and as a senior policy analyst with the State Government, was at one time privy to current Cabinet papers. I have studied public policy to Masters level (Flinders); her Excellency Governor Kate Warner is my former law lecturer. My commitment to good public policy led me to develop an on-line training course in civics www.3ptraining.com.au

As a lay preacher and life group leader I have been personally involved at the coal face of human struggle and dysfunction; I have lived with and discipled both a recovering schizophrenic (who recovered) and a recovering alcoholic (who didn't and died). This year I completed a Graduate Diploma in Ministry through Christian Heritage College. My family attends a small church in that Northern suburbs of Hobart, an area of social disadvantage. We meet at the Montrose Bay High School and support both the school and the wider community. As such I am personally invested in this proposal to the extent that the more extreme suggestions, if adopted, would likely see me in prison.

Key Points

The Proposal is Based on False Assertions

The paper is essentially an advocacy piece for the LGBT based on three known untruths:

1. Homosexuality is not a medical, psychiatric or psychological condition
2. Sexuality is fixed and binary – gay or straight
3. Sexuality cannot be changed

That is a gross oversimplification of reality.

A 'condition' is what a given professional associates decides is a condition at any given point in time. That decision may or may not have a scientific or medical basis. In the USSR belief in God was considered a psychiatric disorder and people of faith were 'treated' in psychiatric institutions. Today in China they are kept in concentration camps and their organs are harvested. In the case of homosexuality the decision to remove it from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of psychiatry was a values based decision following an internal political

campaign led by the pro-homosexual faction. In the US at least, it was a coup-de-ta. In other words, it was a political decision not a medical one. The argument is/was that social stigma associated with the orientation resulted in negative mental health outcomes. That is true, but it is not a medical argument. It is also true that exactly the same argument can be made, and will be made, for every other sexual orientation. It can also be made for every psychiatric condition. Taken to its logical conclusion, this argument would be the end of psychiatry itself.

For most people sexuality is fixed and binary. They are gay or straight and that's that. That is not everyone's truth. It is certainly not the truth of my lesbian gay rights activist (then) neighbour who cheerfully told me that "I chose to become a lesbian because there were no good men in Melbourne or Germany" or the 'Lesbian Avengers' whose slogan is "ten per cent is not enough, recruit!" or countless other individuals who have left or joined the gay lifestyle. I agree with the TLRC observation that peer reviewed studies do not necessarily capture everything due to reporting biases, reporting barriers and other factors, and less academic sources are still useful. I would add that the take-over of the social sciences by the radical Left makes it unlikely that contrary narratives will ever be properly assessed. In that context I note that the TLRC made passing reference to the North Institute. I have read their material in depth and it deserves more than passing mention. The TLRC could also have referred to the book *'My Genes Made my Do It'* published by the Institute.

The Institute surveyed studies of success rates among homosexual people undertaking mainstream secular psychological treatment to change their sexuality prior to removal of homosexuality as a condition from the DSM. It found that substantial changes in orientation occurred in over fifty per cent of patients. That compares favourably with many other disorders such as alcoholism and depression.

In more recent studies, sexual orientation among study participants was found to vary on a spectrum with many self-identifying heterosexuals reporting feelings of same sex attraction of varying intensity. This included people in heterosexual marriages. Likewise, self-identifying homosexuals also reported varying degrees of opposite sexual attraction. These were found to change over time and in response to diverse factors. This is congruent with recent research into brain plasticity which has found that for many people sexuality is not fixed and can be altered, particularly during adolescence. Importantly the Institute found that many adolescents who were firmly convinced that they were homosexual were equally convinced that they were heterosexual by the end of high school. Unsurprisingly the LGBT seeks to promptly recruit any adolescent who reports homosexual feelings into the gay lifestyle and opposes a balanced approach to counselling under the guise of banning 'harmful practices'.

Even a publication as biased as this TLRC report noted at foot note 53 on page 18 that in a review of 202 people who had undergone gay conversion therapy, 13 per cent found it helpful. Clearly, some therapies, some forms of socialisation and social support, some early direction in life, can change some people's homosexual orientation.

Contrary to the assertions in this paper and elsewhere, the LGBT does not want to criminalise gay conversion therapy because it does not work. They want to criminalise it

precisely because (for some people) it does work. This can only be understood in light of the overall LGBT strategy (see further <http://thesaker.is/the-truth-behind-the-lgbt-global-revolution/>). It is essential to believe that homosexuality is fixed in order to make it accepted as a civil rights issue. The fact that some people leave the gay lifestyle and some people cease being homosexual is kryptonite to the LGBT campaign. Therefore this truth must be suppressed and all attempts at helping people to leave the LGBT must be outlawed. (See further: <https://insightpolicy.blogspot.com/2016/05/anti-homophobia-day-downunder.html>).

If gay conversion practices never helped anyone there would be no market for them. The fact that there is, belies the assertion that they are wholly harmful and without merit. If gay conversion practices never help anyone then those practices will die a natural death. If they help some people then they should not be banned. Either way there is no role for Government in restricting choice.

Why criminalise something that some people want, seek out, and find helpful?

Proposal Is Unbalanced

Having established that some people can be recruited into the homosexual lifestyle and some people can reduce or remove their homosexual orientation, let's pan back. The LGBT is a recruiting proselytising movement through a variety of forums. That is at least partly the purpose of the purpose of the 'Safe (sic) Schools Program'. Why else force pre-pubescent and teenage children to fantasise about homosexual relationships? Co-author of the program in Australia, Roz Ward, is on record as saying that the program "Is not about bullying".

According to the LGBT, and the social left, recruiting a young person into homosexuality is just fine. Helping them leave should be a criminal offence. Given the poorer average life outcomes and public health issues associated with homosexuality, that is highly irresponsible.

Interferes with the Basic Rights of LGBT People to Determine their Own Life Choices

I supported the decriminalisation of homosexual conduct in Tasmania because it was then promoted as a civil liberties issue. The claim made by Rodney Croome and others was that "what happens between consenting adults in their own bedroom is none of the Government's business". I agree. Equally, what happens between consenting adults in churches, counselling offices, support groups, or the wider community is also none of the Government's business. It is not the role of Government to deny homosexual people the right to seek out whatever intervention they believe may be helpful to them in any aspect of their lives, including their sexuality. To say otherwise is to classify LGBT people as a class of people who are not fully adult and cannot be trusted to make their own life choices. There is broad support for 'right to die' legislation. If people have a right to choose to die, then by any logic, they must also have the right to choose to change their sexuality.

It is not acceptable to refer to adult people of colour as 'b[redacted]' or 'n[redacted]'. That is essentially what this proposal does to homosexual people who do not conform to the LGBT ideology.

Definition of 'Harm' Absurdly Broad

This paper takes as its starting point the proposition that if something in society is deemed harmful the law should intervene. That is an unsustainable proposition, practically, morally, and socially.

This paper defines 'harm' in the context of gay conversion practices as essentially anything that makes someone feel bad about themselves, their life, or life in general.

Oh please?!

By this logic and definition we must criminalise adultery. Adultery and separation certainly causes trauma and poorer life outcomes. What about abortion? Dare we admit the psychological repercussions of widespread abortion among (primarily) women? Should abortion therefore be banned based on the TLRC logic? What about feminism? Female fertility halves by 35 years of age, the age at which feminists suggest maybe trying to start a family now that a career is established. Dare we admit to the grief of women made childless by this ideology, or to a generation of spinsters who were lied to that promiscuity would be a path to relational fulfillment? Should we ban 'Cosmo' and 'Cleo' for encouraging promiscuity without stepping out the health dangers? Communism is a thoroughly debunked ideology that has caused perhaps 100 million deaths and unimaginable suffering but continues to be taught in universities. Should this be a criminal offence?

According to the New Atheists religion is a poison that harms society and causes psychological harm. For some people, that is true. For others, religious faith has not only saved their souls but their very lives. I have no doubt that some people have been and will be harmed by some gay conversion practices. Undoubtedly, others will be helped. At one time in my life I was part of a legalistic religious group. The discipline was hugely beneficial to people with otherwise out of control dysfunctional lives, but it was simplistic. The teaching around human sexuality was narrow and condemning. I can to some extent relate to the sentiment of a life un-lived. Was I harmed? Perhaps. I was also helped. In the end it was up to me to grow up and embrace life's complexity and uncertainty. That is a matter for personal responsibility, not for the law. These are the stories we need to share; to be present to one another's truth. That is how healthy societies, over time, sort what is useful from what is harmful. It is messy and sometimes painful, but we have been doing it quite successfully for 2000 years.

The alternative is some version of fascism. In Plato's classical formulation of fascism 'the wisest and best' should rule. Those who are not in the elite group of enlightened ones get no say. Clearly the LGBT and the radical left believe that they are 'the wisest and best' and they have a right to exercise total control over speech, thought, belief, and action, because they are the only and ultimate arbiters of truth. Therefore anything that does not align with their ideology must be punished, including gay conversion practices. This basic approach to public life is what exists in common between the torture chambers of the inquisition, the soviet gulags, the killing fields of Cambodia, the public beheadings in Saudi, the 'perfect

Islamic State' in Iran, and the proceedings of various 'human rights' and 'equal opportunity' tribunals around the Western World. Let us not forget that the worst atrocities of the last 100 years have been committed by idealists in the name of equality. We have been down this road. We know where it ends.

Continues the Cycle of Abuse

The gay liberation movement began in response to legal harassment, abuse and marginalisation. Since then all legal discriminations have been removed and consenting homosexual acts legalised and the promotion of homosexual life styles accepted. That should be enough for anyone actually motivated by compassion or fairness. It is clear that the LGBT now wish to use their social and political leverage to get revenge through legal harassment, abuse and marginalisation of anyone who stands in their way, and specifically the church. Systemic and predictable behaviours, observed world-wide, towards their perceived enemies, now include:

- Threats of rape and murder of individuals, their partners, and children
- Destruction of property
- Physical intimidation including blockades of meetings, vehicles, and speakers
- Threats against venue owners, publishers, employers, and sponsors
- Lawfare against individuals and organisations
- Harassment on social media of individuals, extending to family members and employers
- Termination of employment
- Social shaming
- Forced social indoctrination at work places and in schools

These are modernised versions of tactics used by the Red Brigades, and the Hitler Youth. These may be the acts of a few but they are predictable, systemic, organised, and pass without censure by the liberal left. During the debate over the redefinition of marriage one gay rights activist remarked that he wanted to "hate fuck the homophobia out of [politicians objecting to same sex marriage]". This passed without censure from the liberal left including the ABC. Silence is violence. He kept his twitter account and his seventy thousand twitter followers, and his publications were not withdrawn. Imagine the (quite proper) outrage if a cleric had suggesting raping the homosexuality out of lesbians. The LGBT is thus fascist not only in its over-arching ideology but also in its modus operandi.

The TLRC needs to understand that these are not all nice people who just want a fair and caring society. Some are. However homo-fascism is real and needs to be acknowledged for what it is in the public square. To what extent the LGBT as a political force represent same sex oriented people is also a moot point. In my experience of knowing and working with same sex oriented people I have found them to be mostly decent people who are happy for others to make their own life choices. My impression of the LGBT from the outside is that it is largely composed of far Left heterosexuals who have not dealt with their Daddy issues and are using issues around sexual orientation as a means of expressing their rage and hatred of normal society. They do not deserve public attention.

In promoting lawfare against people and institutions that are trying to assist people out of the LGBT via the TLRC is enabling homo-fascism.

Opens the Door to Paedophilia

The 'working definition' of gay conversion practice proposed by the TLC would make illegal any form of therapy/counselling to change a person's orientation towards paedophilia. This would make unlawful the moderately successful program run by the Department of Justice for convicted child molesters prior to release. After all, paedophilia is merely another sexual orientation that society does not accept. Human sexual orientation includes sex with:

- Close relatives
- Animals
- Objects
- Robots
- Children
- Dead people
- Dead animals
- Unconsenting people (rape)
- Sex involving various violent and degrading acts

...and whatever else people dream up from an alleged 60 different genders. (I am guessing sex with cacti is off the menu but I could be wrong). Roz Ward has stated that many forms of sexual orientation can be expected to 'flower' as a result of teaching children to reject 'heteronormativity' though the 'Safe (sic) Schools Program'.

To my knowledge (and I have looked) the LGBT has not anywhere ever publicly stated what sexual orientations/practices are off limits. If the rainbow flag does not mean that all colours/orientations should be accepted, which ones are excluded? What is clear, is that there exists a global pro paedophile movement. If there did not, a film like 'Cuties' could never have been produced, much less promoted on Netflix. (See further:

<https://www.rt.com/news/492170-berlin-pedophiles-foster-children/?fbclid=IwAR2vmOot2wQmjX2nsM5XGoolO2arhRvRRwk1uAvgYsgDVzv2u1e1IgliGTU>)

It is not a 'given' that society would reject any of these practices. Paedophilia, incest and bestiality were perfectly acceptable in the first century AD. It was only Christianity with its rigid insistence that sex was something exclusive to a heterosexual marriage, and that heterosexual marriages should be exclusive, that made these practices unacceptable. Small wonder then, that those who want to return the Western World to the moral mores of the first century, oppose Christian 'bigotry'.

In that context, a proposal that says to society that no one should help anyone change their sexual orientation must be understood as a conscious attempt to return society to the moral mores of the first century. Anyone who thinks this is progress or 'progressive' needs to get a handle on just how horrible the ancient world was for women, children, and the poor.

Answers to Questions

Question 1

After considering the background and working definition (see [1.3.23] on page 13), in your opinion, what are and are not ‘sexual orientation and gender identity conversion practices’?

Answer: The TLRC working definition adequately captures the concept. The Safe Schools Program is a sexual orientation and gender identity conversion program to convert vulnerable children and teens into the homosexual lifestyle.

Question 2

Should people be allowed to consent to SOGI conversion practices? If so, at what age and under what conditions?

Answer: Yes, under any conditions either as adults or with parental consent.

Question 3

Have you been involved in or offered, or are you aware of, any forms of SOGI conversion practices in Tasmania? If so, what were the effects on you, or the person exposed to them?

Answer: No, but if someone asked my help to overcome unwanted same sex attraction I would walk with them on that journey without presuming the outcome.

Question 4

Do you think that Tasmanian law should be changed to address SOGI conversion practices? If so, should this be through comprehensive reform, amendment or both (a hybrid)?

Answer: Tasmanian law should not in any way address SOGI conversion practices. These are a matter of individual conscience and personal responsibility and are not properly the domain of government.

Question 5

Should some or all forms of SOGI conversion practices be criminalised in Tasmania? If so, which, if any, should be dealt with as serious (indictable) crimes and which, if any, should be dealt with as less serious (summary) offences?

Answer: Tasmanian law should not in any way address SOGI conversion practices. These are a matter of individual conscience and personal responsibility and are not properly the domain of government.

Question 6

Should some or all forms of SOGI conversion practices be made civil wrongs in Tasmania? If so, what sort of practices should people be liable for and how should those subject to such practices be compensated?

Answer: Tasmanian law should not in any way address SOGI conversion practices. These are a matter of individual conscience and personal responsibility and are not properly the domain of government.

Question 7

Should any existing Tasmanian laws (besides criminal laws or the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (Tas)) be amended to cover SOGI conversion practices? If so, which ones and in what way?

Answer: Tasmanian law should not in any way address SOGI conversion practices. These are a matter of individual conscience and personal responsibility and are not properly the domain of government.

Question 8

Are there any other models or approaches that are preferable to, or should complement, changing the law?

Answer: Tasmanian law should not in any way address SOGI conversion practices. These are a matter of individual conscience and personal responsibility and are not properly the domain of government.

Question 9

Are there any other matters that you consider relevant to this Inquiry and would like to raise?

Answer: Yes. This is an extremely dangerous, poorly thought out and ill-advised proposal for the reasons given above. It enables homo-fascism and establishes a precedent for Government to meddle in any and every aspect of civil and personal life on the basis that what someone says, does or thinks, might hurt someone's feelings. It is reflective of a conviction that society can be perfected by banning everything that's bad. If that were true society would have been made perfect long ago. We have tried clericalism, communism, socialism, liberalism, capitalism, Wokeism and now homosexuality. When the church was the major social force we also spent a lot of time trying to perfect society by outlawing sin. In the United States we even banned liquor. It didn't work. It will never work. On moral issues it is much better to accept the grace that is given and allow people to live by the lights they have. That is 'tolerance'.