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The Case Against Homosexual Activity

by Wayne Lela

*Some of the most emotional and divisive issues in our society---specifically issues such as homosexual marriage, adoption by homosexuals, and other "gay rights" issues---revolve around two central and critical issues. Those issues are: is homosexual activity moral and "legalizeable" or immoral and "illegalizeable"?*

Wayne, you assumed that morality and legality are equatable; they are not.

Slavery has been legal in the past. It is illegal now. According to your logic(?), slavery was moral then and is immoral now.

You are going to have to get pretty creative to spin that one, Wayne.

So your entire argument is built on a false premise. We could stop right here since any argument built on a false premise is officially dead. However, if this is representative of what your essay has to offer, I am looking forward to having a good time.

Please continue.

*If we can rationally conclude that homosexual activity is moral and that it should be protected via legislation, then by logical extension we must also conclude that such things as homosexual marriage and adoption should likewise be legal.*

Wayne, Wayne, Wayne. Logic is not your friend. Your thinking is, once again, completely backwards. Homosexual activity should not be protected by legislation any more than eating apples needs to be protected by legislation. Legislation is required to address criminal activity. When laws are passed to protect people, it isn't because the legislature is legalizing their activity, it is because they are making it illegal for others to discriminate against them.

Wayne, we've barely started and I am already wondering: when your parents were preparing for your birth, did they get your logic circuit from radio shack?

*Conversely, if we can rationally conclude that homosexual activity is immoral and "illegalizeable," then by logical extension we must also conclude that homosexual marriage and adoption should be illegal. To begin, a little history. For many years in this country homosexual activity was deemed immoral and was not legal.*

Wayne, and at the same time, slavery was deemed moral and legal. In fact, hundreds of thousands of men were willing to die to preserve it. Please continue.

*It was only first decriminalized in Illinois in 1961. Other states eventually followed the precedent Illinois set.*

Wayne, see the progress humans are making?

Slavery became criminalized and homosexuality decriminalized. Humans finally began to sort things out ... properly.

*Also, for decades the American Psychiatric Association considered homosexuality a disorder.*

Wayne, and yet they cannot consider religious belief a disorder because if they did, they would all be killed in the ensuing riot.

Humans still have a long way to go Wayne ... but we're getting there.

*The APA only removed homosexuality from its official list of psychological disorders in 1973.*

See Wayne, progress in all walks of life. That was the same year that the Supreme Court ruled on Roe v. Wade granting women the right to choose. Sounds like a banner year to me.

But it sounds like all this human progress has your knickers all bunched up, so why don't you tell us why. Who knows, perhaps the American Psychiatric Association may be able to help you.

*The APA's controversial decision to do so was nowhere near a unanimous decision by its then members*

Wayne, neither was Roe v. Wade. Neither was slavery. There are always going to be rejects who try to hold society back. Losers who long for the golden times of the Dark Ages. They usually go by the name "Conservatives."

*because---just as a female mind in a male body and a male mind in a female body are sure signs that something went wrong somewhere,*

Wayne, something went wrong all right - your brain is sparking again. Where in the world did you come up with the notion of a "female mind?" or a "male mind?"

Wayne ... links please.

*in either nature and/or nurture---a homosexual mind in a heterosexual body was widely considered to be a disorder.*

Wayne, that made no sense whatsoever. There is no such thing as a "homosexual mind" nor is there any such thing as a "heterosexual body."

Wayne, don't worry about the sparking ... your circuit is completely blown out.

*The associated fact that homosexuals were basically impotent with the opposite gender also was part of the equation.*

Wayne, have you ever heard the term "LGBT?"

The 'B' stands for bisexual. Their existence nullifies your ignorant claim.

*Now, why was homosexual activity deemed immoral and why wasn't it legal?*

Wayne, that one's easy. You can thank religious idiots for that one. I estimate that they are behind the gay discrimination about 95% of the time. At least they have an excuse Wayne - they are religious nutjobs. You on the other hand claim to be an Agnostic. You have no excuse for hate and idiocy.

In fact, you have just the kind of mind that religious freaks look for. Take the plunge Wayne. Drop to your knees right now and accept Jesus Christ as your personal Lord and Savior. You will fit in perfectly; and when you die, you get all those virgins.

But if there really is any justice in this world Wayne ... they'll all be lesbians.

*And why do so many people still deem homosexual activity immoral?*

Wayne, lobotomy candidates like you will likely always be with us. It's kind of like weeds or cancer: no matter how much time and effort you put into it, they always keep coming back.

*For centuries, the position of "traditional value" people re homosexual activity essentially boils down to this: homosexual activity is a negative deviation from the reasonable heterosexual norm; and if we condone homosexual deviations then we must fairly allow other aberrant people their own particular deviations.*

Wayne, that's why we can't tear down churches.

*Members of our group have debated many homosexuals and their supporters over the years and we are stunned at how many of them hold this hypocritical and contradictory position: It is okay to "discriminate" against sexual deviants like exhibitionists (e.g., people who masturbate or have sex in public) and incestuous couples, even if these deviants are consenting adults and even if they aren't hurting anybody; but it is NOT okay to "discriminate" against homosexual and bisexual deviants.*

Wayne, congratulations on finding a solution to that hypocritical and contradictory position ... you simply discriminate against everyone.

That saves you the agony of actually having to think.

*They try to rationalize this absurd position by saying things like "Exhibitionists offend people." We point out that tens of millions of Americans and several billion people around the world are offended by homosexual activity, such as public homosexual kissing and hand-holding.*

Wayne, if you were complaining about all public kissing and hand-holding then you might have a point. But you weren't. You were singling out gays. It is only their public displays which offend you.

Exhibitionists are not being singled out because of race, sexual orientation, or religion, but singled out because of their actions. Whether those actions should actually be punishable depends on the circumstances, and is decided by the legal system on an individual basis.

*We don't want to depress homosexuals and their supporters, but their position simply makes no sense. They ARE wrong. It is obvious to us and should be obvious to anyone NOT in denial about reality.*

Wayne, since 85% of Americans believe in invisible, all-powerful ghosts, you've eliminated the vast majority of Americans. But even most of those Americans in denial about reality are able to see the error of your position Wayne. How embarrassing is that?

Even Ghost Worshipers get it.

*Can we justly discriminate in favor of some unreasonable deviations and against others? No. If we tolerate deviations from reasonable sexual standards, then we will fairly have to tolerate deviations from other reasonable standards because all of the different kinds of deviates will demand consistency from us and nondiscriminatory equal treatment.*

Wayne, you discriminate against gays who show affection in public, but make no complaint when heterosexuals do it. So why do you assume everyone else will demand consistency when ... you don't?

*For example, many towns have ordinances restricting what people can do with their homes and yards. These towns want to prevent slums from forming and ruining their environments. Now, what if someone wants to move into a picturesque section of such a town and wants to have a yard of mud with paper littered around it and wants to have a house which has the exterior's coating of paint badly chipped up? We should tolerate that if we tolerate homosexual acts.*

Wayne, the fact that in your mind you could connect those two, makes me feel bad earlier for insulting radio shack.

*To those "freedom-loving" liberals*

Wayne, so you're a Conservative ... what a complete surprise.

*who disagree with that last sentence,*

Wayne, it's not so much that people disagree with that last sentence, as much as they're still trying to figure out how anyone but you ... could understand it.

*we can just ask them if they would outlaw any action that lowered someone's property values. And if they would, we could point out that an openly homosexual person moving into a conservative area would likely lower property values in that area since many conservatives might decide to move out of that area, just like black people moving into certain predominantly white areas can unfortunately and wrongly cause "white flight" and lower property values.*

Wayne, I couldn't help but notice how you inserted "unfortunately and wrongly" into your analogy in order to insulate yourself against accusations that you might be a racist.

But Wayne ... it didn't work. You've said enough about yourself in this essay to make it pretty clear that you probably are a racist. It just kind of goes with the whole "Conservative, anti-gay, mental midget" persona. But nice try, anyway.

One word of advice Wayne: If I were you, I would keep that whole "Agnostic thing" under my hat when you are around your Conservative buddies. That too is part of the Conservative "persona."

*Does that mean liberals would agree to outlaw homosexual behavior in that geographic area? Or would they outlaw black people moving into certain white areas of the country? This gives the reader an idea of the kind of legal and moral swamp liberals are wont to create.*

Wayne, I can't speak for Liberals, since I am not one, but I do think that your choice of the word "swamp" was the perfect description ... of your mind.

*Once liberals have established the principle that negative deviations from reasonable norms are okay, to selectively apply that principle is discriminatory.*

Wayne, yet as I pointed out earlier with the heterosexual kissing example - you have no problem allowing yourself the right to selectively apply discriminatory principles. That makes you the hypocrite Wayne.

*Incidentally, we should stress that we are NOT arguing that homosexual activity is a heinous crime, just ... that legalizing homosexual deviations is an absurd legal precedent.*

Wayne, the absurd legal precedent was in criminalizing gay activity. Legalizing it, is what removes the absurdity.

*Homosexuals like to say, as part of their defense of homosexual acts, that they are not hurting anybody when they engage in such acts ... Many actions are wrong that do not "hurt" anybody.*

Wayne, the point isn't whether or not they are wrong; the point is whether or not they are punishable. Our laws determine that. Our laws used to punish homosexuality just as our laws used to allow slavery. Now our laws do not punish homosexuality and slavery is no longer allowed. See how evolution works, Wayne?

It isn't only a biological term. Civilization is also constantly evolving. Oh sorry Wayne, I meant to say ... most of us are evolving.

*If we tolerate such deviations we will wind up with an ugly, confused, and sick society.*

Wayne, you don't get out much, do you? Do you actually know what goes on throughout the world?

Humans have a long, long way to go before we can call ourselves "civilized." And things will move a lot faster when we can discover the psychological defect in Conservatives that makes them work so hard to prevent the civilizing process.

*Let us learn from the decay and fall of the great Roman and Greek societies, which came to value debauchery.*

Wayne, had you not ditched your history classes to smoke dope behind the gym, you might have learned that those ancient civilizations were savage. They did not decay. Like all other societies on Earth they slowly advanced to the point they are today: semi-savage.

*Once people depart from decent moral standards it is frequently all downhill after that because it is harder to be moral than immoral, generally speaking. Indeed, over the last 40 years or so, as our society has become more accepting of immoral behavior, our divorce rate has soared, as has the out-of-wedlock birthrate and teen suicide rate, we have seen the rise of an epidemic of sexually transmitted diseases, etc., etc.*

Hey Wayne, guess where you find the highest rates of immoral behavior, divorce, out-of-wedlock births, and teen suicides?

Those would be the Conservative-controlled states Wayne. "You people" screw up everything you get your hands on.

*It is a matter of maintaining high standards at the least, and at the most of slowly raising those standards as we make society better.*

Hey Wayne, if you lived in Saudi Arabia, it might start to dawn on you that what other people consider high standards and a better society ... just might not be the same things that you think make for high standards and a better society.

See Wayne, you are the American version of the Mullahs. You work to force everyone to submit to your dictates; to your idea of how everyone should live. Spend some time in a Muslim country and you would quickly learn how disgusting ... people like you are.

*Allowing people to lower our standards, to take us down toward a more animalistic state of being, is to allow people to slowly ruin our advanced and advancing society.*

Wayne, you already confessed to being a Conservative. Halting the advancement of society is what the word conservative means.

SUMMARY

Wayne, I've now delved about halfway into your essay. That is time that I will never get back. I will not put my audience through any more pain.

Wayne, in your email you stated that "Nobody can show us where we're wrong in our proof."

After seeing how easy it was to demolish the nonsense in your so-called 'proof' it is clear to me that many people have already shown you where you went wrong - you simply refuse to admit it. I see the same flaw in all Conservative thinking: the inability to admit defeat even in the face of irrefutable facts; one example being global warming.

But to be fair, that flaw isn't limited only to Conservatives. Liberals also have issues where they reject reality when the science doesn't go their way: for example, in their crusade against GMO's.

That is why I could never be a part of any ideological group. Ideology is for sheep ... and I'm allergic to wool.

You, on the other hand Wayne, have everything it takes to be the perfect ideological puppet, jumping to the orders of the Conservative wingnuts who pull your strings.

While Liberals and Conservatives both need to work on improving their brains, Conservatives have an extra task ... finding a heart.
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THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

New Study On How Mitochondria May Have Begun

Parasitic bacteria were the first cousins of the mitochondria that power cells in animals and plants – and first acted as energy parasites in those cells before becoming beneficial.

The study used next-generation DNA sequencing technologies to decode the genomes of 18 bacteria that are close relatives of mitochondria. It provides an alternative theory to two current theories of how simple bacterial cells were swallowed up by host cells and ultimately became mitochondria, which are the powerhouse organelles within virtually all eukaryotic cells, that contain a nucleus and other features. Mitochondria power the cells by providing them with adenosine triphosphate, or ATP, considered by biologists to be the energy currency of life.

The origin of mitochondria began about 2 billion years ago and is one of the seminal events in the evolutionary history of life. However, little is known about the circumstances surrounding its origin, and that question is considered an enigma in modern biology.

Current theories – claiming that the relationship between the bacteria and the host cell at the very beginning of the symbiosis was mutually beneficial – are likely wrong. Instead, researchers believe that the relationship likely was antagonistic – that the bacteria were parasitic, and only later became beneficial to the host cell by switching the direction of the ATP transport.

The finding is a new insight into an event in the early history of life on Earth that ultimately led to the diverse eukaryotic life we see today. Without mitochondria to provide energy to the rest of a cell, there could not have evolved such amazing biodiversity.

Researchers reconstructed the gene content of mitochondrial ancestors by sequencing DNAs of its close relatives. They concluded that the ancestors were parasites that actually stole energy in the form of ATP from its host, which is completely opposite to the current role of mitochondria.

In addition to the basic essential role of mitochondria in the functioning of cells, the DNA of mitochondria is used by scientists for DNA forensics, genealogy and tracing human evolutionary history.
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FAMOUS QUOTES

Anonymous

"Arguing with idiots is like playing chess with a pigeon ...

No matter how good you are, the bird is going to shit on the board and strut around like it won anyway."

Yes Wayne, today's quote was selected ... especially for you.