Almost everyone believes that the modern Gay Rights Movement began on Saturday, 28th June, 1969, the night of the Stonewall Riot in Manhattan’s Greenwhich Village which, so the urban myth continues, was the night they buried Frances Ethel Gumm, better known as Judy Garland. The urban myth is wrong on all counts. Judy Garland died on 22nd June and her funeral was held on Friday, 27th June. It is true Judy was a “gay icon” and that thousands of people had attended her funeral. It is also true that the following night, Saturday 28th, was one of those intolerably hot Manhattan nights. And it is true that the police raided the Stonewall Bar, as was their custom, and were arresting drag queens when some of the “girls” refused to go quietly and fought back, a riot ensued, gay men heard about the riot and rushed out of other neighbouring bars to join the fray…. In its way, it was a bit of a storm in a teacup, magnified by the media and now, by popular history.

Karl-Heinrich Ulrichs

The Stonewall Riot was not the beginning, by a long chalk, of the modern gay rights movement, but it has proved a convenient punctuation-point in the long history of the discrimination against homosexuals and the civil rights movement which probably can more rightfully be said to have started in Germany where the word “homosexual” was invented. Much of what we now take as read about homosexuality was the result of the pioneering work of men like Karl-Heinrich Ulrichs and Magnus Hirschfeld, even our old friend, Kertbeny, the Hungarian nobleman who invented “homosexuality” a century before Judy died.
Magnus Hirschfeld in Nazi anti-Jewish propaganda poster.

Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld was one of the pioneers of sexology. He founded the Institut für Sexualwissenschaft (Institute for Sexual Research) in Berlin in 1919. This not only provided medical services but perhaps more importantly, housed an immense library and a museum devoted to the study of human sexuality. Christopher Isherwood, in his book *Christopher and his Kind*, records the visit he and the homosexual poet, WH Auden paid, as did thousands of others anxious to understand their sexuality. However, one of the first things the Nazis did when they came to power was to destroy the Institute and burn the library (the newsreel footage generally seen of Nazi bookburning is of this incident). Fortunately, Hirschfeld was in Nice at the time where he died of a heart attack in 1935.

As it happened, Hirschfeld was born the week after Kertbeny coined the word “homosexual, although Herschfeld himself always believed homosexuals were a “third” or “intermediate sex”.

**Gay Liberation in America**

While recognizing that there were important contributions to the Gay Rights Movement in other countries, undoubtedly the most important impetus came from the United States. Before Stonewall there were many “homophile” organizations, the first of which was *The Society for Human Rights*, founded by Henry Gerber in Chicago in 1925. Writing in 1962, not long after the Illinois became the first US state to de-criminalized homosexual acts, Gerber¹ himself said:

> The joyful news that the State of Illinois had recently, to some extent at least, given up its persecution of homosexuals was appreciatively received by all of us concerned. Just 37 years ago, in 1925, a few of my friends and myself were dragged off to jail in Chicago causing our own efforts to ameliorate the plight of homosexuals to come to an early end.

---

Gerber was born in Bavaria as Joseph Henry Dittmar in 1892. In 1913 his family emigrated to America and went to live in Chicago. Henry himself was interned as an alien at the outbreak of The Great War but, from 1920 to 1923 he served in Germany as part of the American Army of Occupation. During those years he was in contact with Herschfeld and other pioneers of the German homophile movement.

The task confronting his new organization was immense: unlike Germany where the anti-homosexual laws were national, in America this was the province of individual states. “To go before each State legislature and argue the real nature of homosexuality would be plainly a job too costly to be considered”, he recalled in his 1962 article. But significantly, he added that another huge hurdle confronting any attempt to reform the law was “The conduct of many homosexuals in their unpardonable public behavior…” which, he wrote, “clearly led to public protest against all homosexuals.” He continued, complaining that:

> Many homosexuals told me that their search for forbidden fruit was the real spice of life. With this argument they rejected our aims. We wondered how we could accomplish anything with such resistance from our own people.²

Even today, it is clear many men — the majority of whom are most accurately described as primarily heterosexual — who frequent public toilets when on their way to or from work are looking more for the “adrenalin rush” than for sexual relief. “Bog”, “tea-room” or “cottage” behaviour is more closely related to gambling than to sexual desire.

In the years following the Second World War, gay organizations in America fell into three different categories, according to Michael LaRegina³ in his exemplary 1997 essay The Struggle for Gay Rights in America:

> The first are those who view the struggle as a liberal individualist one. The second are those who feel that homosexuals are an ethnic group, and as such suffer as an oppressed minority. The third are those dedicated to a complete transformation of modern society and thought itself. This group seeks to prove that homosexual “deviancy” is a myth, and that current society is that which is flawed and in need of reform. The ultimate success of what is

² One of the barriers to safe sex education after the onset of the HIV crisis was a similar attitude: “We have always lived dangerously”, many gay men explained, “risking a life in jail just for having sex…..”

³ LaRegina, M: The Struggle for Gay Rights in America, at http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/laregina-gayrights.doc
Examples of these three types of gay rights organizations are, the Mattachine Society, the Gay Activists Alliance (GAA), and the Gay Liberation Front (GLF). Of these, the Mattachine Society typified the Type I organisation. It was founded by Harry Hay in Los Angeles in 1950 with the primary aim of promoting public acceptance of homosexuals. According to their manifesto, they wanted to ensure that homosexuals:

"physiological and psychological handicaps need be no deterrent in integrating 10 percent of the world's population towards the constructive social progress of mankind."

With this more passive, apologetic attitude — more politely called an “accommodationist approach” — the Mattachine Society lost power to the more militant groups which emerged after the Stonewall Riots in 1969 and is now little more than a counseling centre. Even so, it is respected as the origin of many important features of the American Gay Civil Rights movement.

The other types of groups carried their Gay Pride banners much more aggressively, inspired and to a degree supported by the other two great Civil Rights movements of the day, the Black Rights and the Feminist Movements. The GAA, which represented the Type II organizations, considered gays as an oppressed minority group and so became a political pressure group:

\[\text{It strove to be an active force in politics, worked for tax benefits and fair employment, urged gays to vote, and publicized political candidates’ stances on homosexuals, and even sought to improve the public opinion of gays in the media.}^{4}\]

GAA was also concerned that so many gay men and lesbians were afraid to have their sexuality known (“in the closet”) that the size and potentially, the power of the community was virtually invisible. Hence, much of their work was designed to bring people out of the closet and stand up and be counted. However, many people thought that GAA’s agenda of obtaining civil rights was too narrow, that it was “...... part of the liberal syndrome of reform and compromise that always lets us half solve our problem and then ends up frustrating us to the point of apathy.”^{5}

On the other hand, GLF, a type III organization, saw society as its adversary, oppressing homosexuals from infancy through the imposition of sex roles and stereotypes. Their objective, like so many of the many Rights Movements of the time, was to bring about a total overhaul of society. In other words, the

---

^{4} ibid.

^{5} The quote is from Murphy, J: *Homosexual Liberation*, Praeger, 1971, p. 146
Sexual Revolution! As one writer expressed it, the revolution is “part of the unfinished business of modern democracy.”

Gay Rights in Australia
The first homophile organization in Australia was the Homosexual Law Reform Society founded in Canberra in July 1969 (less than a month after Stonewall), followed by an organization of the same name in Sydney in October. Far more important and with a much higher political profile was the Campaign Against Moral Persecution, or CAMP as it was universally known. The actual date of its inaugural meeting in Balmain is unknown but it was definitely sometime in July 1970.

CAMP was — as I remember it — most probably best described as a Type II organisation, that is, predominantly a political lobby group but many of its members and some of its functions favoured a much more revolutionary approach. Indeed, a great deal of time, money and effort was wasted in the internal squabbling of these two factions. Initially, CAMP was intended to be an open organisation which welcomed everyone irrespective of sexuality although there were never many “straight” members. It was also intended to be an umbrella organisation which would sponsor and coordinate regional groups. For the most part, this failed and the Sydney group became an organisation responsible only for itself no matter that often the administration presumed a national mantle. CAMP was also intended to be an organisation which would combine all “homosexuals” — i.e., gay men and lesbians — in a non-sexist community. Again, this was pretty much a failure: after huge fights about the sexist behaviour of the men, the women walked out leaving only a small and rather token female presence.

Central to CAMP were, first, a national magazine called “CAMP INK”, which for several years was published to provide an out-reach to gay men and lesbians around Australia; and most importantly, “Phone-a-Friend”, a telephone counselling line which still exists as the Gay and Lesbian Counselling Service of NSW, the first registered gay and lesbian charity in Australia. The arrests and subsequent legal battles following the 1978 Sydney Gay Mardi Gras, led to a quantum leap in the politicisation of the gay community in NSW and this, in its turn, tore CAMP apart, some members wanting to take a more aggressive political role, others wanting to protect the core role of the counselling service. Eventually, the membership split and the political faction broke away to form a

---

7These dates are taken from Wotherspoon, G. (Ed): Being Different, Hale and Ironmonger, Sydney 1986, p. 20. While the Canberra –based HLRS is generally regarded as the first in Australia, some claim the Melbourne-based Daughters of Bilitis, a Lesbian organization modelled on a similar American group, might have been earlier but it seems to have begun only in 1970.
new organisation called “Gay Solidarity Group”. In 1980, during my reign as President, we decided that the name CAMP was still too politicised for what was then a dedicated counselling service, so we changed the name to “Gays Counselling Service”\textsuperscript{8}, later amended to “Gay and Lesbian Counselling Service of New South Wales”.

Much of the legacy of CAMP lies in the public education outreach members provided to the community: there were training courses for both police and prison officers, prison visitors who went especially to the Cooma Jail and to Long Bay to visit homosexual inmates, seminars for school counsellors, social workers and many others; CAMP successfully lobbied to have homosexuality included in the sex education programs run by the NSW Department of Education in High Schools, and provided input into many university courses, including Medicine. That is not to forget the demos, “zaps”, street marches and on cold and usually wet winter June evenings, the Stonewall “Gay Pride Marches”. Eventually, one of the senior members of CAMP suggested we should move the Gay Pride celebrations to our summer and call it “Sydney Gay Mardi Gras”.

Gay Mardi Gras was established after a series of gay and lesbian community meetings (which at times looked more like a public blood-letting) but until 1984 the city parades were largely all-male affairs. When a rapprochement occurred between gays and lesbians (the so-called “Coalitionism” which is now in vogue), Gay Mardi Gras was re-named the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras — a tourism marketing nightmare compared with the catchy ease of “Sydney Gay Mardi Gras”…. Unfortunately in many ways this reduced the shock value because with women and men now taking part, it looked more heterosexual!

Of course there were many other organisations, both in Sydney and elsewhere around Australia. These included groups dedicated to looking after homeless gay and lesbian kids (2010), a variety of religious organisations such as AngGays (Anglican) and Acceptance (Catholic), GAMMA (Gay and Married Men’s Association), Country Network, a Gay Businessmen’s Group, and several social clubs, including some from the pre-Stonewall era which were revitalised by the gay movement. And serving the growing gay community was first, the “Sydney Star” (now the “Sydney Star Observer”) newspaper — I was once its publisher — and several magazines, including “William and John” the first to hit the news stands, followed by the eternal “Campaign” magazine, among others. There were also a growing number of gay hotels, gay-owned and gay-friendly shops and restaurants and specialised gay medical services. And

\textsuperscript{8} The superfluous “s” of “Gays” was stipulated by some bureaucrat when we sought to change the name.
those are only a few of the Sydney groups and resources which gradually emerged throughout the ‘70s and ‘80s.

In Sydney more than elsewhere in Australia, a “gay ghetto” emerged as gay men became not only more conscious of the specialised services and resources they required, but also more prepared to be visible. This, the “ghetto” was first centred on Darlinghurst and Paddington but spread to the south and west until what became known as “The Pink Triangle” included Newtown, Enmore, Erskinville, Redfern, Waterloo and other inner city suburbs.

As far as gay men were concerned, the primary aim of the gay rights movement was the reform of the criminal law. In fact, this was the major point of contention between gays and lesbians in the late ‘70s and early ‘80s: lesbians did not need law reform (also persecuted, their sex lives were never illegal) and were more concerned with issues such as abortion on demand. Many gay men on the other hand were opposed to abortion and I must admit, being men, most of us were not much interested in the objectives of the Feminist Movement of the day. So the house was divided and it was not until much of the heat dissipated from both the Women’s Movement and the Gay Law Reform movement that “Coalitionism” became a possibility (The anti-homosexual provisions of the Crimes Act were removed in June 1984). Coalitionism is a political convenience: I doubt that the majority of gay men identify with lesbians or lesbians with gay men — it is misleading to think that because we are all labelled “homosexual” that this means we have much in common except what is regarded by a hostile society as a “deviant” sexuality.

The death of “gay”
These days, “gay” is dying⁹. The identity for which so many of us sacrificed careers, family, marriages, even our lives, nowadays is seen much more clearly for what it is, a fashion in the way we in the West individually and culturally conceive human sexuality. Where once we saw a dichotomy in human sexuality between “gay” and “straight”, between “gay” and “breeders”, or from another perspective, between “normal” and “queer” or “regular” and “poofa”, these days the barriers are breaking down and those once absolute categories are merging seamlessly into each other. A good example is the Canadian series — often more mockumentary than soap opera — broadcast these past five years by SBS television, “Queer as Folkⁱ⁰”: in the first series, QAF showed gay culture as it was in its hey-day of the 90s, when men lived life in the fast lane in the inner-city ghetto, spent their nights disco dancing, doing drugs and more or less enjoying endless one-night stands. The last episode showed them now

---

buying houses in suburbia and proposing marriage, even becoming fathers to children conceived and born by the good graces of female friends and turkey basters. Gay, it seems, is evolving itself out of existence. As Andrew Sullivan\(^{11}\) wrote in 2005,

\[
\text{The distinction between gay and straight culture will become so blurred, so fractured, and so intermingled that it may become more helpful not to examine them separately at all….. For many in the gay world, this is both a triumph and a threat. It is a triumph because it is what we always dreamed of: a world in which being gay is a non-issue among our families, friends, and neighbors. But it is a threat in the way that all loss is a threat. For many of us who grew up fighting a world of now-inconceivable silence and shame, distinctive gayness became an integral part of who we are. It helped define us not only to the world but also to ourselves.}
\]

\textbf{Registration, Civil Unions and Gay Marriage.}

Sullivan also pointed out that in the United States in 2000, there were over 600,000 households headed by same-sex couples and more than a quarter of these had children

\[
\text{“If you want to know where the push for civil marriage rights came from”, he wrote, “you need look no further. This was not an agenda invented by activists; it was a movement propelled by ordinary people”}.
\]

In Australia, Census data show that the number of people who identify as partners in a same-sex relationship has doubled from about 10,000 in 1996 to 20,000 in 2001 so that now, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, there are about 11,000 male and 9,000 female same-sex couples in Australia, but those figures represent only those willing to be identified.\(^{12}\) It will be interesting to see what the 2006 Census reveals.

But why, you might ask, would couples whose sex lives are not procreative want to get married? There are many reasons, but the main one is that people in modern times have married not only in order to procreate. After all, there are many people who marry in which the woman is past child-bearing. Neither do most people these days marry so they can have sex with each other — that idea went out with the pill, if not before! People marry for the sake of an intimate companionship which is acknowledged and supported by the community in which they live. This support not only includes a variety of ways in which their

\(^{11}\) Sullivan, A: *The End of Gay Culture- And The Future of Gay Life*

\(^{12}\) See Julie-Anne Davies: “Gay but not happy, John”, in *The Bulletin*, 4 July 2006
relationship is affirmed but also by the allocation of resources which help sustain it, including financial and legal benefits not available to others who are not in similar contractual associations.

Gay marriage is not a new invention. What the late John Boswell\textsuperscript{13} called “same-sex unions” have been accorded public recognition in many cultures (for example, Zuni in North America, the Igbo in Nigeria) as well as in European antiquity. An example is given in a review of a book on the subject by William N Eskridge Jr\textsuperscript{14}:

\textit{Sergius and Bacchus were Roman soldiers who lived in the late third and early fourth centuries. They were male lovers, but it was for their Christian faith that they were persecuted by the Romans. Ultimately, Bacchus was tortured to death by the intolerant Romans. According to Christian tradition, Sergius's faith faltered with the death of his lover only to return when Bacchus appeared to him in a vision and said, "I am still with you in the bond of union." Sergius kept faith and, like his friend, died a martyr to the new religion. During the Middle Ages, the relationship of Sergius and Bacchus was considered an exemplar of compassionate union, and possibly even marriage, based on agape (brotherly love) and mutual respect.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{saints_sergius_bacchus.png}
\caption{Saints Sergius and Bacchus. 7th Century icon.}
\end{figure}

Perhaps the most controversial core of Boswell’s account is his assertion that for more than a thousand years, from roughly 500 to 1500 AD, both the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches conducted a ceremony which created life-long

unions between men (and less often, between women). There is no doubt this form of union existed — and some say still exists in parts of the Balkans — what is in doubt is whether or not this is a sexual union or a “fraternal” union, a blessing of “best mates” as we might say in Australia. The word for this union in Greek was *adelphopoiesis* and in Old Church Slavonic, *bratotvorenie*, both of which literally mean “the making of brothers”. Boswell argued that the context suggest these could have been sexual alliances, but he became too ill and died before he was able to argue the matter further with his critics.

Heterosexual marriage comes mostly from Roman secular practices. Originally it was a ceremony in which the couple were promised to each other and then the nuptials at which the husband assumed the property of the wife. In the Middle Ages, at least until the 12th Century, the ceremony took place in the town square or in private homes, not in the church. It was not until 1215 that marriage became a sacrament administered inside the church, often in conjunction with the Eucharist. It was not until then, also, that the willing consent of both bride and groom were declared an essential component.

At this stage, same-sex marriages are recognized in Belgium, Canada, the Netherlands, Spain, South Africa, and the U.S. state of Massachusetts. A variety of other arrangements, ranging from “almost marriage” to the recognition of same-sex relationships on a par with *de facto* heterosexual spouses are in place in:

- Andorra, Argentina, Brazil, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the U.S. states of California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Maine, New Jersey, Vermont, and the U.S. territory of Washington, D.C.

In Australia, Tasmania has had a form of registration since January 1, 2004. Under this arrangement, same-sex couples can register their relationship with the state's Registry of Births, Death and Marriages and this gives them rights in making decisions about their partner's health, guardianship when a partner is incapacitated, and provides equal access to their partner's public sector pensions. The Relationships Act also allows them to adopt the biological child of their partner. But there is no formal or ceremonial recognition associated with the process of registration. “You register your relationship the same way you register your dog!” complained one disgruntled gay…

---

In other states, some recognition has also been achieved: NSW, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory now legally recognise same-sex couples in matters of superannuation, wills and estates, property settlement, hospital and coronial rights, taxation, and compensation payments. In the Australian Capital Territory, the de-genderising of the Territory laws in March 2004 has meant that same-sex partnerships are equal with de facto relationships — indeed, the term de facto spouse has been entirely replaced with “domestic partner” irrespective of genders. This provides for the distribution of property and finances in the event of a separation or inheritance in the event of death, and inter alia makes partners next-of-kin. The ACT had previously enacted laws permitting adoption. The Civil Unions Act 2006 was disallowed by the Governor-General on 13 June 2006 at the instruction of the Federal Executive Council.

However, the current Commonwealth government is hostile to the prospect of any “gay marriage” or same-sex civil union, stating it might countenance only some form similar to the Tasmanian registration model. Faced with the prospect of same-sex couples who were married abroad coming to Australia and demanding recognition, the Commonwealth Parliament enacted the Marriage Legislation Amendment Bill 2004. This provided that:

Marriage means the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life. Certain unions are not marriages. A union solemnised in a foreign country between: (a) a man and another man; or (b) a woman and another woman; must not be recognised as a marriage in Australia.

In proposing the Bill, the Coalition government argued it was necessary to “protect the institution of marriage” against the “threat” of same-sex marriage, by ensuring that the common law definition was put beyond legal challenge. Supporting this move, the Attorney-General said the government was acting in response to “community concern”. However, in a poll conducted by the Sydney Morning Herald, 64% of the 3,308 people who responded said they were “not in the least concerned” or “not very concerned” while only 25% said they were “very concerned”

Even though the Australian government does not recognise same-sex marriage, since 1988 it has recognised inter-dependent relationships irrespective of genders by granting residence visas to the foreign partners of Australian

---

16 This includes Australians who go abroad to marry, especially to Canada where visitors can marry on payment of the appropriate fee in the same way as heterosexual couples. Other countries often have residential or citizenship requirements, at least for one of the partners.

citizens where the couple prove 12 months’ cohabitation and a committed interdependent relationship.

**Discrimination against same-sex couples in Federal legislation**

Some of the areas in which the denial of marriage benefits affects same-sex couples are as follows:

- **Aged care** - not recognised under the Aged Care Act 1997, which can result in same-sex partners qualifying for less financial assistance under the Residential Care Subsidy Scheme.

- **Child support** - same-sex families are excluded from the Child Support Scheme set up under the Child Support (Assessment) Act 1989.


- **Family law** - same-sex couples are excluded under the Family Law Act 1975 from accessing the Family Court after relationship breakdowns except in disputes relating to children.

- **Insurance** - no federal legislation exists to prohibit insurers' discrimination on the basis of sexuality.

- **Medicare and the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme** - the Medicare and PBS Safety Nets, constituted under the Health Insurance Act 1973 and National Health Act 1953, do not recognise same-sex couples.

- **Superannuation** - In 2004, the Howard Government opened up the possibility of superannuation benefits to some “interdependent relationships”. However — and perhaps of most interest in the ACT — the Superannuation Legislation Amendment (Choice of Superannuation Funds) Act did not extend the same benefits to government and public sector employees, or to military personnel whose partners and dependents therefore remain unrecognized. For example, when someone dies who had been receiving a Commonwealth Superannuation pension, their same-sex partner receives nothing — the benefit dies with their partner — whereas if he or she had been of the opposite sex, they would have received a proportion of that benefit.

- **Taxation** - The tax system is discriminatory: for example, same-sex couples do not receive the spouse rebate of $1540 for a non-working partner.

---

18 I have taken this section from Wikipedia: Same-sex marriage in Australia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Same-sex_marriage_in_Australia
These issues are the nub of the matter of “gay marriage”. While there are sometimes ways in which these benefits can be obtained by same-sex couples, it requires complex, legal and often expensive procedures to obtain them. Heterosexual marriage, on the other hand, confers them from the moment the Certificate is signed. Gay marriage, for most gay and lesbian couples is not a matter of a religious sacrament but of real and practical benefits which, as citizens and tax-payers, we argue should be our right. Not everyone would take advantage of a form of civil union which provided equality with heterosexual marriage, indeed many are opposed to the idea, but to opt out — as many heterosexual couples do — should also be our right.

In Britain, at least 7,000 same-sex couples have committed to civil unions since legislation made it possible there in December 2005\textsuperscript{19}. Of these, about 2/3 were unions between men. In New Zealand which enacted civil union legislation in April 2005, there have been about 500 unions registered, of which about 200 were between men, about 230 between women, and the remainder between a man and a woman (one couple even changed their marriage into a civil union). And in Spain, where same-sex marriage became legal mid-2005, there have been about 1300 gay weddings — and one gay divorce. According to the Spanish newspaper \textit{El Mundo}, the former couple are now fighting over who gets custody of the dogs.

**Will gay marriage ever happen here?**

Historians and others who have followed the progress of gay marriage in other countries predict that gay marriage will become law in Australia within a decade. In general, gay marriage has been introduced in countries which have progressive — but not conservative — governments by what is called “\textit{the law of small change}”, that is, through a series of small legislative changes which either have popular support or are, at least, not controversial. Like Medieval pilgrims doing the Stations of the Cross, legislators follow a well-worn path, pausing every now and then at a significant “station” which, as Jenni Millbank\textsuperscript{20} says, follows the sequence

1. decriminalization of gay sex;
2. some form of anti-discrimination legislation;
3. a limited recognition of relationships in some areas;
4. a broader recognition of relationships;
5. some parenting recognition;
6. status exactly the same as marriage but by another name;

\textsuperscript{19} These figures are from Sydney Star Observer # 822 - \textbf{29/06/2006} “Overseas Progress, Local Pain” by Ian Gould

\textsuperscript{20} Jenni Millbank is Associate Professor of Law at the University of Sydney and an expert on same-sex relationship and parenting recognition. See her articles at http://www.glrl.org.au/issues/superannuation.htm
7. marriage.

In Australia we already have passed at least the first five of these “stations”. The disallowing of the ACT Civil Unions Act 2006 by the Governor-General last June forestalled the move “station 6”, and as already discussed, there are still rights and benefits outstanding under several Commonwealth laws. It is tempting to predict that as we move to a republic and to a communications network comparable to other developed countries, we will also take the small change to marriage between same-sex couples. When that happens, gays and lesbians will have achieved at least equality before the law. Unfortunately, sexual prejudice will surely still remain and religious bigotry, like death and taxes, be with us for evermore.