

The Biggest 360° Degree Quest For LGBT Equality

By Jonathan J Joslin [Director of B-F-P Research] www.b-f-p.org.uk

[The Condensed Version]

The Biggest 360° Degree Quest For LGBT Equality

By Jonathan J Joslin [Director of an LGBT research group, B-F-P]

Are LGBT lobby groups fighting for equal rights, by aspiring to obtain the highest moral goals, or for un-equivalent partiality in special rights at half measures? Just like Section 28, the law that lobby groups laboured fifteen years to abolish, The Civil Partnership Act lawfully construes same sex relationships "As Pretend".

For decades, lobby groups and activists have been condemning governments and religions, for restricting or disallowing all vital and fundamental rights of a community and minority, from a social prejudice of the dehumanising ideals of self-superiority, based on sexuality. The Civil Partnership Act is the first ideal answer to immediate legal support for same sex couples, who dream of joint insurances and inheritance safety nets throughout life, should one of them die. But these couples are having every standard, principle and human dignity taken away from them by LGBT civil rights groups, who believe immediate political and equating partiality for booby-trapped special rights, to be a fundamentally more important answer, than equal rights.

Are LGBT lobby groups and activists really fighting for equality, to support a minority suffering oppression based on the non-existence to equal treatment over difference? Or are they just snatching at everything the government is offering them, and turning a blind eye to the acceptance of inequality on difference over treatment, in an attempt to obtain the highest believable "victory points" in winning over the LGBT populous and politicians. By making statutory commercialised political statements, that these are the things which brings equality forward, without revealing the race to gain poll position in a coalition to a monopolised LGBT hierarchy of political status, with a purpose of hope, those who support them, would resolve the group's desperate need for funding.

The Civil Partnership Act will be in force later this year, but what exactly is the Civil Partnership Act, and do the LGBT public have any idea what this new law construes their relationships as. Lobby groups have been promoting Civil Partnerships as the biggest victory point, and a step closer to equality. But this new law is not an equal right, because it certainly not any form of marriage. Lobby groups have been promoting the Civil Partnership Act as a law that gives next of kin status. This law does allow Civil Partners to gain over a third of all the same entitlements as a married couple, in relation to being next of kin. But regardless of all the entitlements, the main basis of this law under the interpretations and amendment section's, in its legal writing, Civil partners are not next of kin by the lawfully expressed grounds of a relationship.

The interpretation and amendments sections of any legislation should be the first part of any written law that one should read, because it is those sections, that lay down an underline premise for the entire legislation, to update old Acts and bring them forward to the new. And yet, not only has no lobby group or activist made any comments on these sections throughout the entire consultation period, they have completely ignored every person and politician that stated; "this does not give next of kin status". When any words, terms, labels, or classifications are used in the writing of law, they will only be construed through law in relation to their official statutory vocabulary meaning, and not by what people believe they would, could, should, or might mean. For example there are many sections like the: Minor & Consequential amendments Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages (Special Provisions) Act 1957 (c. 58) 21 In section 1 (records of deaths, births and marriages among armed forces and service civilians and their families overseas), in subsection (1), for "and marriages solemnised," substitute- "marriages solemnised", and "civil partnerships formed,".

The statutory Meaning of Solemnised is: A duly serious and dignified ceremony to an eternal loving oath between two people. The meaning of Marriage: An established ceremony of an intimate eternally loving union between two people, for the purpose living together, and often to have children.{the marriage of true minds}

Any legislation, or Act when using the term "or", is a terminology of segregation, to give one defined option or the other. This law when it states the additional amendments to past laws, like "add or Civil Partnership", it is stating there is another form of expression of a "legally" binding relationship. When a legislation gives "new" terminology in the writing of law, whether it is for a new law, or additions to past Acts, it is a protocol with legal definition to explain the expression of the new terminology, because without further expression, it leaves the lawful writing of legislation to be ambiguous. For example, above, it states: in subsection (1), for "and marriages solemnised," substitute "marriages solemnised, and civil partnerships formed."

By protocol in the construction of any legislation, it is statutory to give reason by definition as to "why" only marriage is solemnised, and "Why" civil partnerships are formed. "what is the difference between the two"? These are terms used to define the personal relationships of the couples taking up either marriage or a partnership. When it comes to the legislation, lawful writing will not give two completely different classifications to mean exactly the same thing. It is statutory to remove ambiguity, by explaining that difference in any new sections, amendments, or clauses. So where is the expression by definition to explain why they are formed, not solemnised to lay down the premise of a couples relationship who are taking up this so-called partnership. One example is in Chapter 6 Miscellaneous And Interpretation; The amendment to the Registered Births Deaths and Marriage Act 1965; Section 136 [Interpretations] In Section 56(1) the expression "Relative" in the 1965 Act, In section 56(1) of the 1965 Act (interpretation), in the definition of relative, at the end, insert "A Civil Partner and "anyone" related to the civil partner of the person as regards whom the expression is being construed.

Meaning of a Relative: Considered of having significance in relation to something else; but not absolute {they live in relative comfort} Why bring "the definition of a Civil Partnership" forward with amendments to the definition and expression of a family's "relatives", and not in an amendment to sections explaining marriage, to add additional expression of solemnised commitment. What should have brought it forward in line with past Act's, is in the Section of interpretations to add an extra expression to the definition of "marriage" not "relatives". The following that should have been added to any past Registrations of Death Birth and Marriage Acts, was, in addition to the expression of "solemnised marriage" and at the end of paragraph 1(a) add, "or a Civil Partnership." This is not about what Civil Partners are entitled too, it's about they are construed as. Every Heterosexual marriage law directly states, explains, construes, marriage between to people "is a life long committed solemnised relationship" which is based on eternal marital monogamous LOVE. Which this law gives nothing of the kind, and defines the entire basis of a same sex relationship between two people, within a civil partnership to be nothing more or less, **"than a summarily significant status, but non-absolute relevance to each other"**. Which is exactly what any relatives legal position and defined status is [Brother or Sister in-law] to any family. This is not a lawful status, "legally defined" as a solemnised committed relationship of eternal marital love. Marriage has around 4500 co-habitation, joint pensions, insurances, inheritances, benefits and rights, which have grown over the past 50 years, Civil Partnership have only a third of those entitlements.

This is all demonstrated in plethora of amendments were it states:- after "is married **to**" insert ", or a civil partner **of**". And:- in relation to parties "**to**" a marriage, or to two people who are civil partners "**of**" each other. It is exactly the same premise as the Local government Act 1988, containing Section 28, that lobby groups exhausted 15 years to abolish 2a 1(b) of Section 28 that classed same sex relationships as pretend. Unfortunately, through years of experience in research on activists, lobby groups, and going to LGBT conferences, I've found that lobby groups still have absolutely no idea what Michael Howard meant when he wrote "pretend family relationships" into Section 28. Instead they have been pursuing the expression "pretend" in relation to a lobby groups belief, that the oppression is a sexual apartheid. A theoretical premise designed by Bisexual activists, that Heterosexuality is as much of a choice, and that the world's population is born Bisexual, and that sexuality as whole, is a preference. Don't take my word for it, one only needs to look up LGBT group websites, and read their literature on sexuality. However, believe it or not, many gay men and women not only disapprove, but disbelieve without question in such a premise that Heterosexuality is an unchangeable inherent nature only towards the opposite sex from birth. Heterosexuals believe in that premise for a very good reason, but prejudice or not, Heterosexuals believe the planets population is a totally Heterosexual race, with an inherently nature "only" to the opposite sex. Which means rights groups don't realise the largest percent of Heterosexual society believes Homosexuality is solely based on sexual induction, and has absolutely nothing to do with a natural feeling to be eternally monogamously involved or in love with the same sex. Even when prejudice politicians endlessly and directly state: "Homosexuality is wrong abnormal, unnatural, and there is no moral equivalence between Homosexuality & Heterosexuality". Do you know what would make moral equivalence? I truly believe Michael Howard should spell it out to LGBT rights groups "what exactly pretend meant", because I know his expression of "pretend" meant he believed there was as much between two people in a same sex relationship, as there is between a shopkeeper and a customer.

Even though the Partnership Bill explains the legal status of civil partnerships between two people, is the same as "Relatives", is does allow the partner to inherit his or her partner's estate, as a married couple do. But, in simple English; civil partnerships are neither husband's, wives, or next of kin regardless of sexuality and entitlements. Which is something they would need to be, if they were to be defined in this law, or any law, as anything even remotely equivalent to a solemnised Relationship. There are dozens of amendments where old acts state husband or wife or spouse, to add at the end of the clauses, either "or a Civil Partner, or 'A's' and 'B's'". It was these interpretations and the last amendment sections, that allowed MP's in early 2004, to trash the whole Bill with provisions for Heterosexuals in forms of relationships that are not based on eternal marital love like a brother looking after a father, and not one rights group figured it out, and if any have figured it out, they haven't told anyone. It is equally the same as Section 28's 2a 1(b), that classed Homosexual relationships as a pretend family relationship. And if you are confused to what exactly that means the answer to any confusion is in the self-evident answer to the following question: "**what makes a genuine family relationship, in relation to a pretend family relationship?** Clue: the answer begins with the letter "L".

Is this just supposition & paranoia? I'm not the only person who made this claim, politicians proved this premise to rights groups, when they trashed the Civil Partnership Bill in early 2004. The Civil Partnership Act doesn't need to state the term pretend, to construe the exactly same meaning, and Civil Partnerships are not even construed as a solemnised commitment, let alone state it. Regardless of its legal benefits, with or without the name marriage, or added amendments to bring the old inline with the new, politicians have never stopped being "misogamist's"-[*Hatred of marriage*] to same sex relationships, and never ever wanted Civil Partnerships in the first place.

Well, until the end of 2003, when voting on Civil Partnerships completely changed, when they realised same sex civil partnerships would be "immune" to inheritance tax. Then, the whole prospect of Partnerships became so inviting they helped LGBT lobby groups over promoted it. "**IF** Civil Partnerships are cohabiting relatives", then this would be a perfect engine for Heterosexuals in "any form of relationship whatsoever" to avoid inheritance tax... Why should a politician's son or daughter who live away from their widowed parent, pay immeasurable thousands with an inheritance tax of 40% on any estate over £263,000 after the death of the parent. Inheritance tax is an Inland Revenue constitutional catch 22 of having to be paid, before any estate can be sold off. For example if an estate is worth around £400,000, the inheritance tax rate would be around £58,000, which must be paid, before the estate can be sold, so if your broke, its a nightmare nobody wants to contemplate. Unless your civil partners living together, then you won't need to pay a penny, let alone loose 40% over £263,000 on your kid's inheritance... What holds the best personal advantages to prejudice politicians: Misogamy to same sex relationships, or push Civil Partnerships? "Who's your daddy?"

The LGBT community are no longer fighting an oppression based the non-existence to equal treatment over difference, they're now bowing down to deifying difference over treatment, as rights groups devalue every ounce of human dignity of the LGBT community. Unfortunately the true voices of the LGBT community who would rather slit their wrist's than take up a civil partnership, are being silenced by lobby group agendas of the civil rights system and coalition. Who shout "victory point" to every snatch and grab on anything microscopically equivalent to the basic human rights they've been denied, and shout "diversity hero's" to politicians who are pressed to offer a tiny piece of inviting hypocrisy. When in reality, it's a financial race of catch 22, between the groups who monopolies the civil rights system, to gain poll position in an LGBT hierarchy of political status to the commercial investors they open their arms to. Who, with a generous wallet, in giving the highest financial results to the group's desperate need for funding, are then given a seat of power in setting the lobby groups political agenda. While members of the LGBT public, with blind faith in lobby groups, who hope to take up a civil partnership, are completely unaware what this law defines their relationships as.

LGBT lobby groups have now, with the help of the powers that be, set themselves up in the worst possible position, by allowing themselves to be dealt the dangerously unplayable card in the biggest discrimination game of the new millennium. Without realising the facts of reality, that neither side of "any debate" is infallible. Because now, once again, they have had their relationships defined as "PRETEND", but this time, lobby groups have indorsed the government's actions to establish it, over a commercialised mercenary belief that civil partnerships would be the political bridge to gay marriage, without even taking into consideration, they will never again, be able to convincingly demand "EQUALITY".

When did fighting for the highest fundamental moral goals become a misnomer to the need to accept special rights. I believe the aspiration in all people to obtain the highest moral goals, is what achieves "equality". Not half measures on equating the ambiguity of concealing the truth in legislative partiality, that is not even remotely equivalent.

Along time ago, I believe that it was one of the worlds greatest activists '**Martin Luther King**' who said; "*The right time to push for equality is always now, today, regardless of the stones in our way, because the perfect time never comes. There will always be those with everything, telling those without, to hold off, wait, take your time, don't rock the boat, here take this crumb, and come back next year, when we will, for sure, be willing to give you another... perhaps.*"