The Law of Antigayism

Huhnkie Lee
The Law of Antigayism

Huhnkie Lee

A dispute is before the Court of Humanity. To let gay or not to let gay, that is the question. Institutionalization of gayism is a case of the first impression with no precedence in history. Before making permanent changes on a national and even international scale, a society should carefully scrutinize the merits of both sides. This paper is an argument for antigayism, wherein the harmfulness of gayism is demonstrated by deductive and inductive logic.
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1. Introduction

Before a society makes a change in law, it should examine whether the change is beneficial, harmless, or harmful. The conclusion of this paper is that gayism is harmful and thus should be deterred. The author invites the reader to a journey that crosses the boundaries of time and space, history and society, law and philosophy, arts and literatures, fiction and nonfiction, and science and religion.

1.1 Definition

Gayism\(^2\) is physical and mental activities between two individuals of the same gender. A gayist is an actor of gayism. Progayism is an advocacy for gayism. A progayist is an actor of progayism. Antigayism is an advocacy against gayism. An antigayist is an actor of antigayism.

2. The Law of Science

Now, each of us is aware, if he looks back upon his own history, that he was a theologian in his childhood, a metaphysician in his youth, and a natural philosopher in his manhood\(^3\).

What if the natural philosopher remembers the theological mores from his childhood, postulates them into metaphysical forms, and prove their validity by scientific logic?

2.1 The Law of Mathematics

2.11 Addition

To reflect divergent (active, venturing) character of a male, let us assign the numeric value of ‘+1’ to a male. ‘-1’ is assigned to a female to reflect convergent (passive, inviting) character of a female\(^4\).

---

\(^2\) The term includes sexual activities of lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transsexuals.


\(^4\) Gender phenotypes in both behavior and morphology are innate traits that have their origin in gender genotypes. See Genotype-phenotype Distinction (last visited Jan. 28, 2014, 7:36 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genotype-phenotype_distinction. Gender difference in behavior mirrors that of morphology: a male genital extends outwards,
The gender composition of the world is determined by the randomized process by which a sperm enters an egg. Since a sperm with an X-chromosome is as likely to outrun all the other sperms as a sperm with a Y-chromosome, the number of females roughly equals that of males. Thus, the gender summation of the world equals zero, the state of perfect equilibrium. The parental environment of a child is optimal when it reflects the gender composition of the world outside home. The traditional parenthood of one man and one woman sums to 0 (= ‘+1’ + ‘-1’). The single parenthood deviates from the equilibrious state by 1. The gay parenthood deviates by 2: if the parents are females, the gender sum is -2; male gay parents sum up to +2. This is the maximum possible gender imbalance in a monogamous society. Parental influence on children outweighs that of siblings or people outside the house. Parental influence constitutes the mental diet of children. A child’s diet determines how he grows up, and what kind of physical shape he will have for his entire life. It is critical that the child is fed with both meat and vegetables, balancing the dietary intake, satisfying the diverse nutritional needs. Likewise, a child’s mentality develops the best if he experiences both genders at home when he grows up, in order to cope with the two genders outside home. If the parental environment is such that the child is given twice the dose of one gender, and none of the other gender, the foreseeable outcome is developmental deformity in the child’s mentality.

Proposition 2.11: Gay parenting is foreseeably harmful to children’s mental development.

The skewed gender representation in gay parenthood (2:0) is counter to the natural distribution of gender outside home (1:1). The larger the disparity between the home environment and the world outside is, the more difficulty a child will have in adapting to society.

2.12 Set Theory

2.121 Definitions

A set is a group of members sharing a trait. Assume A, B, C are sets. A-trait is the defining characteristic of the set A. A set differential ‘A-B’ is a set of members with A-trait but not B-trait. If every member of C is also a member of A, C is a subset of A and A is a superset of C. Intersection of A and B (denoted as A*B) is a set of members that belongs to both A and B. A is an empty set if it has no members. n(A) denotes the number of members in A.

2.122 UCVDB Model of Behavior

while a female genital folds inwards. A stereotype is a stereotype because it is the most common tendency. Gender stereotype in itself is not a vice, but the truth.

5 For convenience, pronouns like ‘he,’ ‘she,’ ‘one’ are all used to denote a generic, gender-neutral person.

2.1221 Definitions

The set U is the universal set. C is the capability set. V is the volitional set. D is the decisional set. B is the behavioral set. Here, U consists of all people, C of the sexually capable, V of the sexually volitional, D of the sexually decisional, and B of the sexually behavioral.

2.1222 Development of Sexual Behavior

A human is asexual at birth (U). He becomes sexually capable upon puberty (C). His curiosity matures into sexual desire, where he wants to do it (V). His desire passes into decisional stage, where he consciously look for a mate (D). Once he finds one, his sexuality consummates with a sexual behavior with the mate (B).

2.1223 Capability Set

Not everyone in U is sexually capable. A physiologically normal person matures sexually and transmigrate from U-C into C. Everyone starts from U-C as an infant. The impotent and barren stay in U-C. One who gets castrated or accidentally loses one’s genital reverts from C back to U-C.

2.1224 Volitional Set

Not everyone in C is sexually volitional. Celibates stay in C-V. People who recently broke up with emotional trauma emigrate from V to C-V, at least temporarily.

2.1225 Decisional Set

Once one wants sex, one may decide to have sex. But not everyone who wants sex are determined for the venture. The timid, the cautious, the prudent and the like stay in V-D until their desire overcomes the oscillating vacillation, hesitation, fear, precaution.

---

7 For instance, a male baby’s genital never gets erected.
2.1226 Behavioral Set

Decision is only a beginning. Mating does not occur before the meeting of minds of two people. Where search ends, courtship starts. Finally, the sexuality ends in copulation, a physical behavior with evidentiary weight to verify their mutual feelings.

2.123 Location of Homosexuality

U-C is the set of asexuality. If one is sexual at all, one belongs to C. Sexuality is capability of arousal and orgasm. A homosexuality is the capability of homosexual arousal. Let us call this CG, the set of homosexually capable people. CS is the set of heterosexually capable people. The question is, what is the relationship between C, CS, and CG?

Proposition 2.123: CG is a subset of CS.

Proof) Assume CG is not a subset of CS. Then there must exist a member of CG, who is in CG but not in CS. Let x be that person. That is, x can be aroused by the same sex but not by the opposite sex. x’s capability of sexual arousal begins with his puberty. Assume, arguendo, that x is a gay male who has never had sex with anyone. Assume that on the very first day of his puberty, x is transported to an island where there is no one else. Assume that the world’s most sexually attractive female, y, arrives in the island on the next day. y is an experienced straight female, young, slim, pretty, stylish, sensual, intelligent, with every conceivable desirable trait. Now, y is willing to have sex with x. y approaches x, befriends, and entrusts. One night, y lies next to x. y whispers, touches, and moans onto x in her full femininity. x cannot help but being aroused by her femininity, and by his masculinity, which is the gender trait encoded in every single cell of his body. This contradicts the assumption that x does not belong to CS. Therefore, CG is a subset of CS. Q.E.D.9

Sexuality is a physiological capability. In its origin, sexuality is a product of evolution10, a mode of reproduction, and it still is. If one is sexually capable at all (i.e. sexually arouse-able), it means one is capable of reproduction. Hence, C is equal to CS. That is, everyone in C is heterosexual. Then, every homosexual is a bisexual. The bisexual capability set CB is equal to CG.

Next, how does one become homosexually capable? First, one needs to overcome the natural, instinctual discomfort of being physically too close to the same sex. Second, one should train one’s brain so that one can be sexually aroused upon the imagery of a naked same sex. Thus, unlike heterosexual capability that precedes volition, decision, and behaviour, homosexual capability comes at the end. The

---

8 This is a proof by contradiction, where the proof begins by assuming the opposite of the conclusion sought. If the assumption leads to a contradiction, then the assumption must be false, and the target conclusion must be true. See Proof by Contradiction (last visited Jan. 28, 2014, 7:40 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Proof_by_contradiction.
9 See Blue Lagoon (Columbia Pictures 1980); Michael Jackson, Remember the Time (Epic Records 1992), available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LeiFF0gvqcc; Madonna, Power of Goodbye (Warner Bros. 1998), available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nx1ykBc3XUQ. The presented is a mathematical proof not in the strictest sense, but of a commonsense.
10 This paper heavily relies on the theory of evolution to the extent that it would be accused of evolutionary reductionism. The defense is that reductionism is not a vice per se. When there is no possible explanation of a phenomenon otherwise, reductionism is the only right course to resort to.
If one is homosexually capable (CG), one is bisexually capable (CI), because one is already heterosexually capable (CS). If one starts as straight but later decides to become gay or bi, one conducts domain transition from the viewer’s left (i.e., stage-right\(^1\)) to the right side of the Venn diagram.

### 2.1231 Disproof of Kinseyan Hypothesis

Dr. Alfred Kinsey hypothesized that everyone is bisexual varying only in degrees\(^2\). Kinseyan continuum forms a Gaussian distribution curve where bisexuality is the most common, while homosexuality and heterosexuality occupy either extremity of the curve\(^3\). Here is the disproof of Kinseyan hypothesis of bisexual continuum.

Hypothesis: In a given population, bisexuality is the majority, whereas heterosexuality and homosexuality are two extreme minorities.

Disproof 1) Bisexual capability set, CI, is the intersection of CS and CG. Therefore, \(n(\text{CI}) \leq n(\text{CS})\).

---

\(^{11}\) See infra 4.1345 for the significance of stage-right versus stage-left.


and n(CI) ≤ CG. Therefore, CI is a minority, not majority. Q.E.D.

Disproof 2) Sexuality is a behavioral trait. A mental or physical behavior either occurs or not occur. One either thinks of the same sex, or not think of it. One either has sex with the same sex, or does not. That is, behavior is not a continuous but a discrete entity. Thus, sexuality is discrete, not continuous. Therefore, the continuum of bisexuality is nonexistent. Q.E.D.

Proposition 2.1231: Bisexuality continuum is a fiction.

A man either have sex with another man or he doesn’t. A woman either have sex with both genders, or with one gender. There is no in-between sexuality. This is why sexuality does not form a continuous curve, but three discrete sets: CS (straight), CG (gay), and CI (bi). Statistically, bisexual population is smaller than or equal to homosexual population, which ranges 2~4% in a given society. Empirical data attests to the falsehood of the bisexual continuum hypothesis.

2.13 Vector Analysis of Behavior

An individual’s behavior is an end result of influences from both one’s genetic predisposition and external environment. A behavior, then, is a vector summation of various forces inside and outside oneself. The y-axis denotes the moral-immoral environmental influences of society. The x-axis denotes internal dimension of genetic penchant or will-based self-determination. Moral asexuality (m − s) is the

---

pious celibacy. Immoral asexuality is an empty set. Traditionally, there is only one moral sexuality: the consensual union of one man and one woman who are genetically distanced adults. All other variants and deviants are deemed to be immoral sexuality: fornication, bestiality, incest, adultery, promiscuity, and homosexuality.

The directionality of moral-immoral axis has an analogical significance. Immoral temptation is like gravitational and entropic force of nature that pulls humans downwards to the chaotic level of beasts, where murder, theft, and adultery are not forbidden but granted. It is the morality that lifts human up toward the divinity in heaven.

2.2 The Law of Physics

2.21 Newton’s Law of Motion

A stone is stationary unless applied an external force. Society’s status quo has the same inertia. Contemporary progayism set the society into a motion. A counter culture is contravariant to social contition, and always rebels against it. Progayism started as a counter culture, any of which is a reactionary force to tradition, norm, and mainstream. Over the past decade or two, society has accelerated in progayism. The activism has managed to gain the support of the majority populus, and reached a plateau state of change, which is the new status quo of progayism. In a progaist society, gayism is no longer progressive. If we were to change the new status quo, application of force is necessary to set the society into a motion, once more. This newest force is the moral antigayism.

2.22 Galileian Relativity

Everyone has his own coordinate of the universe, where he is at the point of origin- he is the center of the universe. He is right in his own right. As he lives, he judges others in his standard. His judgment, therefore, is correct according to his coordinate, but is so only relative to his frame of

---

15 Celibacy is more than an absence of sexual activity, as it is a conscious counteraction to refrain from it. The commonality between celibacy and homosexuality is the aspect of self-denial that averts heterosexual activity, which is the source of maximum sensual pleasure. The difference is in the target of denial. A celibate does not deny the sexuality itself, but acknowledges it and overcomes the temptation of lust that heterosexuality has to offer. A celibate says no to the blissful offer via self-mortification. In contrast, a gayist denies the truth about the nature of one’s sexual orientation, which is a one-way street with a single direction, i.e., toward the opposite sex. A gayist, through self-deception and forced conditioning, redirects the sexual passion toward the same sex, and calls it an innate nature. A private mind is a black box that no one else can fathom but its possessor. Nonetheless, a human can tell another human’s nature, because both belong to the same species with all the commonalities of the species. A gayist may hide behind the curtain of unfalsifiability, but he or she can never escape the scrutiny of a rational mind: the innateness of gayism is a lie.

16 This is a trivial point. If one is sexually abstinent, there is no possibility of sexual depravity.

17 Social animals rarely commit intra-species killing (a.k.a. murder), as there is a negative evolutionary pressure against it: cooperation is conducive to survival. However, when it comes to the selfish gene’s will to propagate, animals spare no mercy. A reproduction-capable female bee becomes a queen if she defeats her rival in a mortal combat. A male bear kills cubs of a single mother bear so that she can bear his cubs instead. As for thefts in beasts, a bird takes away another bird’s catch of the morning without consent. Cannibalism, common among tadpoles and mosquito larvae, is the combination of murder and theft, as one kills and eats the other’s life property.

18 See wiki

19 See wiki
Here is the theory of relativity for lawyers. It is crucial to understand the relativity in physics before we delve into the relativity of rights.

Assume a car-passenger, M, is tossing a ball, B, upward inside the car’s backseat. A stander on the street, S, is watching M playing with B. M’s car is traveling with the speed \( V_{MS} \). To M, the ball travels straight upwards with the speed \( V_{BM} \). To S, the ball travels diagonally upwards, with the speed \( V_{BS} \). Notice that the perpendicular element of the ball’s speed, \( V_{BM} \), is the same for both M and S. That is, a train seems to go slower to a car driver traveling in the same direction than to a walker on the street, but a ball that a train passenger tosses upward seems to go upward at the same speed to both the car driver and the walker. The reason is that the ball’s movement is orthogonal to the direction of the car, train, and pedestrian.

2.23 Einsteinian Relativity

2.231 Absolutivity of Light

Not everything in the universe is relative. According to the Jewish physicist, the fundamental laws of physics are invariant to an observer’s coordinate, i.e., his inertial frame of reference. The speed of light is one of such laws. Thus, light has the speed that is absolute to all coordinates.

---

\[
\begin{align*}
V_{BS} &= \left( (V_{MS})^2 + (V_{BM})^2 \right)^{0.5} \\
&= \frac{D_{BS}}{T} \\
V_{BM} &= \frac{D_{BM}}{T} \\
V_{MS} &= \frac{D_{MS}}{T}
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 2.22 Galileian Relativity of Speed

---


21 see einstein paper; wiki; jesus ‘heaven earth disappear but words remain’
Now, assume that M throws upward a flash of light, instead of the ball. According to Einstein, there is no such a thing as relative speed of light. Recall that the ball’s total speed relative to S, which is the vector summation of its horizontal element (speed of the car) and vertical element (upward toss), is larger than the ball’s total speed relative to M, which is upward movement only, lacking horizontal element. As for the light, its relative speed to both M and S is equal. To account for the invariance of the light’s speed, Einstein had to change the assumption that Newtonian physics had been based on for centuries, the assumption that time does not change.

2.232 Relativity of Time

Let us go along with the new physicist’s reasoning and time differs: $T_M$ for M, and $T_S$ for S. As the trajectory of the light, C, is orthogonal to the movement of C, the distances traveled by the light seen both by M and S are equal. Then, according to Pythagorean Theorem:

$$\left(V_C T_M\right)^2 = \left(V_C T_S\right)^2 - \left(V_{MS} T_S\right)^2.$$  

$$T_M^2 = \left(T_S\right)^2 \left\{1 - \left(V_{MS} / V_C\right)^2\right\}.$$  

That is, the time for a moving observer, $T_M$, slows down compared to the time for a static observer, $T_S$. For instance, if M moves at the speed of “0.86 times the speed of light,” the time slows down by half:

$$T_M = T_S \ast \left\{1 - (0.86)^2\right\}^{0.5} = T_S \ast \left\{1 - 0.75\right\}^{0.5} = 0.5 \ast T_S.$$  

In other words, when two seconds passed by to S, only one second elapsed to M\(^{22}\). This is the

---

\(^{22}\) See wiki special theory of relativity. The relativity of time and space is the result of absolutivity of the speed of light, which is invariant to observers’ movement. A runner’s time goes slower than a stander’s time. That is, a runner feels only an hour has passed when a stander feels two hours have passed. Analogically, to a busy man, a day feels like an hour, while a day feels like a week to an idle man. When he says time goes fast, he is referring to the relative speed of external time going faster than his internal time. Despite the seeming difference in expression, Einstein’s time dilation theory corresponds exactly to the phenomenon that the perception of time depends on the speed of life. There is a curious connection with a passage in bible: “one day is with the Lord as a thousand years,
phenomenon of time dilation. Length contraction is the consequence of time dilation. In the above diagram, the diagonal trajectory is shortened to the perpendicular line, since $V_C$, the speed of light, is the same but $T_S$ is larger than $T_M$, making the moving observer’s space shorter than that of a static observer.

2.233 Absolutivity of Morality

Proposition 2.233: The fundamental laws of morality are invariant to actors.

A moral truth does not depend on an individual’s value system. A moral is a rule that prohibits an action that harms the actor. Since society is an interconnection of actors, a harm to an actor leads to others as well. Suicide is immoral, first because it harms the actor, second because it harms the actor’s surrounding family, friends, and society in general due to the loss of emotional and pecuniary investment. The man who extinguished his own life could have contributed to society by repaying the debt that one owes to the people who made him who he was, and who he could have been.

The absolutivity of morality is due to the absolutivity of harmfulness. The harm of adultery is not relative, but absolute. If a man cheats on a wife, he is likely to contract an STD. His wife feels betrayed, and the estrangement of relationship results, the dissolution of marriage ensues. The man, the woman, and their children suffer harms from the immoral act of the man. The detriment incurred by the family spreads to the society: the man gets distracted and his work productivity suffers. The children’s school performance suffers. This is the raison d’être of morality: the prevention of harm.

The harm is definite. It does not depend on one’s personality. Whether one is more prone to promiscuity or prudence, it does not change the consequence of an immoral act. The harm results, regardless of one’s relative moral laxity.

2.234 Relativity of Rights

Proposition 2.234a: Right is relative.

An immoral action is the displacement from a moral standard, i.e., a norm. If one steals, one deviates from the anti-theft norm. Analogically, the thief is in motion toward criminality. Justice is achieved when culpability is answered by penalty. Justice is a social constant that is equal to everyone, as the light speed is an invariant in physics. In physics, the constancy of the light speed is possible because the dilation of time compensate for the non-zero speed of the moving observer. In society, the invariance of justice is possible because the right deprivation compensate for the guilty actor. Einstein had to break the commonsensical notion of time in order to explain the absolutivity of the light speed. Now, we are about to break the popular notion of rights in order to preserve the absolutivity of morality. When a thief is imprisoned, his right of liberty is deprived. Is it?

Is life a right or a duty? It is both.

23 In physics, the relativity theory states that time is relative, and the speed of light is absolute. A moving observer’s time slows down. Here, the proposition is that rights are relative, and the morality is absolute. A moral trespasser’s right shrinks as much as the degree of transgression.

24 Life is a composite equity. Life is a right for amount of the equity share that one owns, and a duty for the rest of equity shares of others. Both a man and the people around him have equity stakes in his life. His life is a right for
cliff. He does not own his life. He is a fiduciary, in charge of a life property\textsuperscript{25}, entrusted to him by the society. Everyone who is involved in him has an equity stake in his success, and thus a shareholder of his life. People around him has a right to demand him not to commit a suicide to the extent that they invested in him, to the extent that they would be harmed by his premature death. People’s right on his life is his duty to live his life\textsuperscript{26}.

Life is a right for a woman in front of a serial murderer for two counts. Her right to live is her life property right, which she earned: (1) by working; and (2) by not killing anyone. First, had she not worked, her savings would have run out and she would die of starvation. Her labor earns her salary, which is a property right, which leads to life right. This life property right of hers is the duty of the serial murderer to respect and to not trespass. Law permits passive euthanasia, where a man in comatose does not labor, providing zero services to society\textsuperscript{27}. He does not react to people, providing no consortium, which would have been a pleasant service to his caretakers. His right to live expires, because he is not earning it, and he has no possibility to earn it and repay the debt of past care in the future when he would repay by regaining consciousness\textsuperscript{28}.

Proposition 2.234b: Right is not free, but earned.

Second, she did not kill anyone. The moment she kills someone is when she may lose the right to live. Every day, she earns her right to live by not murdering. The fact that she did not murder yesterday does not prevent her imprisonment, and a possible subsequent execution, from her murdering someone today. Her right to live is renewed every day by her daily observance of the anti-murder norm. The day she violates, the life right expires.

Proposition 2.234c: Right is an exhaustible entity.

---

\textsuperscript{25} Life property is a composite interest. Even a child in filial bondage retains an interest to his life property to the extent that he bears the burden of living. His caretakers hold an interest in his life property insomuch as they put resources (money, time, emotion) for his survival and wellbeing. For a more detailed discussion of a child’s life property interest, see infra § 4.28421 footnote.

\textsuperscript{26} See infra, right and duty.

\textsuperscript{27} Should society allow active euthanasia, where a terminal cancer patient may let the doctor to administer a lethal injection? Kantian generalization comes in handy when a moral and/or legal question gets difficult. Assume that anyone who wants to die may die by paying a doctor to aid him towards a painless suicide. More people will die of impasioned moment decisions. A bad time comes to everyone. But it passes. One should overcome it and society should encourage overcoming it. Thus, active euthanasia is harmful, and thus immoral. A few liberal states have legalized physician-assisted suicide that permits doctors to provide death medication to terminal patients so that they can self-administer it. See Euthanasia in the United States (last visited Feb. 3, 2014, 11:26 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euthanasia_in_the_United_States. The pro-death activists’ rationale is that a person has a right to die with dignity. The question is, who on earth isn’t a terminal patient? And who on earth is not in pain? If anyone were allowed to commit a suicide by the least painful way in medical science, as long as he is suffering a pain, is certain to die, and wants to die sooner, the population would be decimated. The rest of the people would get demoralized and depressed. Suicide can never be a dignified death. Suicide is the ultimate defeatism.

\textsuperscript{28} An interesting analogy can be found in the context of legal abortion. A fetus is like brain-dead patient: it lives not an active but a passive life. Both are fed by tubes. For both, the burden of life (eating, defecating, keeping warm, etc.) is incurred by caretakers. Without earning one’s own living, so no right to life given. This explains why society approves the legality of both abortion and passive euthanasia (i.e., plug-pulling).
Let us conduct a thought experiment. Assume she does not know that he is a serial murderer and he does not threaten or assault her, but peaceably passing her by. She, in a fit of an unknown motive, pulls out a gun from her purse, and aims at him. He struggles with her, accidentally shoots her, and she dies. He walks out free, as the act was a self-defense. She lost her life right the moment she infringed on his life right. Next, assume that she pulled out a knife instead of a gun, and tried to stab the man. There was a police officer there and then, who warned her to stop the violence, she ignored the warning, and the officer shot her. The same results: she dies, and neither the officer nor the man is liable to her death. Is the right to move one’s limbs around a fundamental one? No. Assume she is a mental patient in a psychiatric warden, watching a TV next to the serial murderer. She starts to strangle him out of blue. The result is the deprivation of corporeal movement- she gets strapped and tied down on a bed. Why? It is because there is no such a thing as a fundamental right. Right to privacy? It expires when one molest a child. It is not that one loses, or gets deprived of, a right that has been freely granted to all, but that one never had the right until one earns it by abiding by the law. When one violates a law, the pertinent right expires because one stopped earning it, by ceasing to working to follow the law, and thus one does deserves the right. By the same token, the moment one violates the antigayist moral rule is the moment when one’s right to be respected as a moral person expires, at least in a society that appreciates morality.

Proposition 2.234d: No right is fundamental.

Corollary 2.234d: Every right is acquisitional.

The application of the proposition is that there is no such a thing as a gay marriage right. A man has no right to marry unless he earns it by conforming to the norm of marriage, i.e., by acquiring the consent of a woman. There is no such a thing as an LGBT right either. Many of a man’s rights expire at the moment that he violates the sexual norm of society. Is it a human rights violation if a man with undeniable body odor is treated differently than another man who showers daily? The unkempt man loses respect and dignity to the extent that he causes discomfort to others. Gayists, likewise. A gay man merits a respect insomuch as he is a fellow human being, but at the same time, he deserves a disrespect to the extent that he is a gayist. This is the moral justice. Gayism is not a right to freedom, but an abuse of freedom.

2.235 Relevance of Relativity

This right to “liberty” is, however, subject to such reasonable restraint of action as the State may impose in the exercise of the police power for the protection of health, safety, morals, and the general welfare.

---

30 In other words, every right is exhaustible and subject to expiration. The ‘fundamentality’ argument of human rights is not founded upon a logical rigor but based on emotional appeal. A jurist should strive to approach jurisprudence not as a rhetorician with the heat of passion but as a scientist with cold and poised reason.
31 Curt MULLER, Plaintiff in Error, v. THE STATE OF OREGON, Defendant in Error., 1908 WL 27605 (U.S.), 9 (U.S., 1908) (also known as the “Brandeis Brief”).
Does an individual have a right to be gay or a duty not to be gay? A citizen of a society have a right to demand another citizen not to be gay to the extent that the latter’s gayism harms the former. What possible harm would a gayist cause to a non-gayist? This is why gayism is a hard case. The harm is neither immediate nor apparent.

2.236. \( E = mc^2 \)

One of the implication of the special theory of relativity is the equivalence between mass and energy. An infinitesimal decay of atomic mass leads to a release of gigantic energy of an atomic bomb, whose destructive force from exponential atomic chain reactions can easily erase human civilization. To many, the abolition of antigayist moral may seem trivial, a small concession that society may grant without much loss. Is it?

2.237 Moral Black Hole

According to the theory of general relativity, the gravitation bends the light. Gayism warps truth. Progayism engulfs even the bible. To them, Jesus is a progayist, perhaps even a gayist. Like a black hole that bend and entraps light, gayism in an individual sucks up one’s rationality into irretrievable darkness. The more gayism feeds on reasons, the more mass it acquires, and the more gravitational force it will have. Gayism is a vicious circle, an abysmal state of moral vacuum, a positive feedback loop that gets thicker as it gains more footing in society. Does the reader believe that gayism is harmless? Please read on and think again.

2.24 The First Law of Thermodynamics

The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun.

The law concerns the conservation of energy and mass, where a substance can be changed or dislocated, but cannot be created anew or eliminated from existence. One cannot make more coffee by adding water, which only dilutes it. Printing more money when the volume of economic activity stays the same results in inflation, which is dilution of currency value. Science is discovery of the principle in

---

33 Id at Consequences for nuclear physics. Conversely, if the atomic energy is harnessed, it can serve to power an atomic energy plant. For an uncanny parallel similitude, see Jesus’ parable of mustard seed.
34 How many apples does it take to spoil the whole bunch? How many AIDS patients did San Francisco originally have? In a sexually promiscuous society, the spread of AIDS is exponential precisely by the degree of promiscuity. For instance, if every person has sex with 10 people in a month, it takes 10 month for one AIDS patient to infect 10 billion people \((10,000,000,000 = 10^{10})\). That is, promiscuity alone can wipe out the entire humanity in less than a year. See World Population (last visited Feb. 9, 2014, 2:16 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_population. Promiscuity is more potent than an atomic bomb.
35 see general theory of relativity.
36 wiki
37 Ecclesiastes 1:9; http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Ecclesiastes%201&version=KJV
nature that has always existed. Art is rearrangement of pigments of elements in nature.

The mutuality principle in contracts has relevance to the law. When a chattel is transferred from A’s possession to B’s, A loses and B gains. That is why B pays A cash in return. Otherwise, it’s a theft. If the unilateral transfer is voluntary, it is a gift. No gift is free in essence, however. A gift has either condition precedent or condition subsequent. A gives a gift to B because A owes B for B’s past consideration of consortium and rapport. This is the condition precedent of a gift transaction. No one gives a gift to a stranger. If one does, it is from expectation and anticipation of future performance, such as purchase. This is the condition subsequent, albeit non-binding.

2.241 Idlism

One cannot earn a living by sitting. It does not matter where one sits- one may sit in a couch, or one may sit on the Wall Street. The recent ‘Occupy’ movement violates the law of conservation. One cannot get a high-paying job without qualification, which necessitates an advanced degree, which follows a hard work at school. High salary is the payment for the investment of time that one spent with books while others went out on a date. The Occupy Movement is no more than an anachronistic nostalgia to communism.

Hippism in the 70’s falls in the same category. Idling is not an alternative life, but is no life at all. If one idles, who pays for the food? Someone else who works. Hippism is a theft whereby one gets something for nothing. The Hippist sexual liberation works the same way. The institution of marriage is society’s enforcement of the balanced payment system of sexuality: in return for getting an unlimited supply of sex, one should limit one’s partner to one opposite sex, for one’s life time. The consideration that an individual pays to society is adherence and compliance to the norm. Hippists refused. They wanted free sex with anyone around. The consequence were STDs, unwanted pregnancy, and abortion.

2.242 The Birth of Modern Gayism

Gayism made the first modern public appearance in the early 1980’s. Gay males in San Francisco contracted rare diseases due to compromised immune system. The modern gayism was born at the same time, at the same place with AIDS. Of course, both AIDS and gayism preexisted somewhere else, but their debut coincided in time and place. This was not a coincidence.

Gayism is a child of Hippism of the 70’s- the pursuit for alternatives, rebellion against the norm and the mainstream, contradiction of tradition, sexual liberation, etc. Gayism, like Hippism, seeks to get something for nothing. Gayists avoid the cost of a normal relationship: there is no inter-gender judgmentality, no courtship, or overcoming of the initiation barrier. A gayist needs not improve one’s competency to get a mate, as gay mating is more like a judgment-free friendship. A gayist also needs not work hard to gain the other’s trust, because there is no need for trustworthiness as there is no risk of pregnancy in gay relationship. But still gayists get the consortium. Gayism is a deal of steal.

38 Hippism, both liberalistic and idlistic, is one parent of gayism. The other parent of gayism is Dr. Freud, who can ‘turn a stone into bread’ by imputing sexuality onto it (see infra).
39 Here is an illustration of the drastic difference in the cost of relationship between same-sex versus opposite-sex. How easier is it to hang out with the same sex than to ask out an opposite sex for a date? How more painful is it to be rejected by the opposite sex and by the same sex? How less risky is it to talk to a same-sex stranger than to an opposite-sex stranger? Men fear rejection, women fear rape. This heterophobia, the fear of the opposite sex, is one of the reasons why some become gayists.
Gayists gradually became progayists, and recruited progayists who are not gayists. As clientele in racism and sexism diminish in volume in the 90’s, ACLU lawyers were out of job. How about civil rights for gayists? The new reservoir of progayist clients would keep the civil rights lawyers busy for the next two decades.

2.243. Equality and Inequality

Here is a surprising connection between the law of physics and the law of America: the energy-mass conservation and the Fourteenth Amendment. Leftists regard the Fourteenth Amendment as a cure-all, silver bullet, panacea for every conceivable civil complaint. But their argument of equal protection of law is antithetical to the amendment’s intention, i.e., the equality in due process, not in the result of judgment. Equality in result entails inequality in judgment. Here is an easy illustration. Both x and y are charged with murder. In factuality, x is innocent, and Y is the culprit, and there are credible witnesses. If equality is in judgment standard, x goes home, y goes to jail. If equality is in judgment result, either both go to jail or both go home. Either way, the judgment standard was favorable to y, and unfavorable to x, when the court decided to impeach the witness’ credibility. The court is committing double standards. That is, when two actors differ in action, and thus are unequal in culpability, the equality in result (both going to jail or home) entails inequality in judgment standard (double standard).

For another example, assume x works full time, 40 hours a week, and y works part time, 20 hours a week in the job same position. If equality is in result, i.e., if both get the same wage, the wage system is favoring y over x. Again, the equality in result entails the inequality in judgment standard. The bottom line is, an inequality in action generates an inequality in consequence, and the consequential inequality does not disappear: it goes to either judgment standard, or judgment result. The consequential inequality can disappear no more easily than a mass or energy. This is the convergent connection between the two laws that have been developed in two disparate disciplines, i.e., science and jurisprudence.

A just system is the one that assigns the consequential inequality to where it belongs to, to the result, not the standard. Since x worked harder than y, it is fair when x gets more money. Since y, not x, committed murder, only y should go to jail, not x. Then do the valid 14th Amendment claims, such as feminism or abolitionism, factor into the picture? Race, sex, disability, age are not actions, but conditions. No one chooses to be an Asian, a male, thirty-five-year-old with a chronic knee pain. On the other hand, homosexuality is not a condition but an action, because homosexual capability is the result of homosexual action. One is homosexual if and only if one engages in mental or physical homosexual acts, such as homosexual thinking or homosexual touching.

A homosexual should be given equal right if and only if homosexual acts harms neither the actor nor others. If homosexuality does harm either the actor or others, homosexual actor’s right should be deprived to the extent that the society deters the activity and protect the non-actors. If the society are made aware of the harm of homosexuality but nonetheless grants the homosexuals the set of rights equal to that of non-homosexuals, the society is committing favoritism, double standards, and thus the inequality in judgment criteria. The overprotection of law on gayists and underprotection of antigayists are, counterintuitively, the violation of the equal protection principle of the Fourteenth Amendment. Progayism is an advocacy of the equality in judgment result, which entails an unconstitutional, unequal protection of law, an inequality in the judgment standard, i.e., the equal protection by equal due process.

40 See supra, 2.123.
2.25 The Second Law of Thermodynamics\textsuperscript{41}

The law is probabilistic. There are infinitely many ways billiard balls can be laid, but there is only one way for them to be aligned from the north to south at the center of the table in a descending numeric order. Unless applied an external energy exertion, the balls will be spread in disorder. Even after they are arranged in a straight line, as times go by, the alignment will become disarray. The nature’s direction is such that the degree of disorderliness, i.e., entropy, increases. In society, the external force that resists the entropic force is what we call law, mores, or norm. There are many ways to pair up for sex, but traditional society set the standard where only one of many possibilities is legitimate- one adult male human and one adult female human who are genetically distanced by a degree more than three. The norm of marriage reflects society’s anti-entropic force.

2.3 The Law of Chemistry

2.31 Atom

A hydrogen atom has a proton and an electron. The electron orbits around the proton due to the electrostatic force of attraction between the two opposite charges. An ionized atom is not stable and sooner than later, it will get an electron or two and re-stabilize into electrostatic balance where the numbers of protons and of electrons equalize.

2.32 Chemical Bond

Two atoms form a bonding to make a molecule. A hydrogen atom rarely exists in nature on its own, but pairs up with another atom of the same kind. What keeps them together is, again, the electrostatic force between positively charged protons and negatively charged electrons. In electrostatics, the same charges repulse, the opposite charges attract. The same is true in humans. Like every single atom in her body, she is naturally attracted to the opposite gender. The bonding of a relationship is the most stable and the strongest when two are of opposite genders.

Proposition 2.32: The bonding in a gayist relationship is potentially weaker than that of straights.

2.321 The Strength of Bonding

The chemical bonding between two atoms is possible owing to the attraction of two opposite charges\textsuperscript{42}:

\[
F = k \frac{Q_1 Q_2}{r^2}
\]

The bonding between two animated beings works the same. The more masculine a man is, and the more feminine a woman is, the stronger attractive force one exerts to the opposite gender. The closer one is,

\textsuperscript{41} See wiki
the harder it gets to resist the attraction. Or, the term ‘r’ can be thought as the compatibility distance. That is, the less difference in competence or quality between the two people is, the stronger the mutual attraction is\textsuperscript{43}.

There is another aspect in the bonding strength between two individuals. How come a mother bear cherishes her cubs more than a father bear? It is because she paid a steep cost by the discomfort during the gestation, the pain during the delivery, and by the endeavor during the rearing of the child bear. The romantic bonding works the same way. The harder it has been to attain the relationship, the more the couple cherishes the union. How hard is it for a man to get a woman’s heart? Very hard. It takes tremendous amount of time, energy, money, emotion, patience, heart ache, head ache, and on. A man can have sex with any woman, but a woman can’t. She needs to know him, and trust him before she lets him in. Her policy is to take it slow, take time, observe him in various situations, and test his character. When she has enough confidence that he won’t impregnate her and run away, and that he is capable of supporting both her and her child, she finally says yes to him. The more the cost of attaining the relationship is, the stronger and durable the bonding of the relationship is.

Gayist relationship bypasses all such troubles. There is no risk of pregnancy, and thus there needs no precaution or test. The cost of obtaining a gay relationship is considerably lower than that of straights, resulting in lesser bonding strength. The parental bonding in gayists is weakened as well, because adoption is the primary mode of getting a child for them, and adoption bypasses both gestation and delivery. The less the cost of the relationship is, the weaker the relationship is.

2.4 The Law of Biology

2.41 Unicellular Organism

The most primitive sexuality does not involve reproduction. Bacteria reproduce asexually, by binary fission. Bacterial conjugation is a mechanism that a bacterium donates its genetic material to other bacteria\textsuperscript{44}. A ‘male’ bacterium is one with F-plasmid, which enables it to form a pilus, an elongated limb that transfers a copy of its plasmid to others. This is not a sex, in which the transferred genetic material does not become a part of the recipient but form a new individual. Even then, bacteria are ‘heterosexual’ in that ‘male’ bacteria never extend pilus to other ‘male’ bacteria, but only to ‘female’ bacteria who lacks F-plasmid.

2.42 Hermaphroditism

2.421 In Botany

\textsuperscript{43} When a woman selects a man based on his income statement, she is not discriminating but rewarding for his talent and industry. Since any man can enhance his earning power if he wills and endeavors, the judgment of hers is a fair one. Both men and women can upgrade romance-marketability by pursuing advanced degrees, and looking better by proper exercise and healthy diet. Conjugal selection is about compatibility and fairness. What she means is, “I know my worth, so should you,” or “if I give you this, what do I get in return?” In general, if x is of better quality than y but they conjugate anyway, x gets under-satisfied by the amount that y gets over-satisfied about the union. If x makes y the happiest man on earth, x may become the unhappiest woman on earth, because the deal is a steal. See supra § 2.24 First Law of Thermodynamics.

\textsuperscript{44} see wiki
A typical flower has both stamens and a pistil. Botanical hermaphroditism is the ingenuity of evolution to make reproduction efficient. If a flower has only pistils and another only stamens, a honeybee should visit a ‘male’ flower first to pick up pollens, then a ‘female’ flower to drop it off. If a flower has both stamens and a pistil, the order of visit does not matter. The bee can pick up pollens and drop off pollens from other flowers at the same time. The plant of the flower with both stamens and pistils is not ‘bisexual,’ however, because it is not homosexual- two stamens touching each other is a happenstance, and initiates no biochemical reaction, let alone reproduction.

2.422 In Zoology

A clown fish\(^{45}\) is a sex changer: it is born a male, transforms into a female. The sequential hermaphroditism is programmed in the genes of the species. Transsexualism in humans\(^{46}\), in contrast, has no genetic prescription as such. A snail has both male and female genitals at once. It mates with another snail, each snail extending its male gonad to the other’s female gonad, simultaneously. The simultaneous hermaphroditism is neither heterosexuality nor homosexuality, because snails, for instance, have only one gender. It is better called ‘monosexuality.’ Even then, the hermaphroditism in both simultaneous and sequential modes resemble heterosexuality in that a male gonad interact only with a female gonad.

3. The Law of Philosophy

3.1 Ontology

3.11 Existence and Nonexistence

3.111 Cartesian Inquiry

I am in doubt as to the propriety of making my first meditations in the place above mentioned matter of discourse; for these are so metaphysical, and so uncommon, as not, perhaps, to be acceptable to every one. And yet, that it may be determined whether the foundations that I have laid are sufficiently secure, I find myself in a measure constrained to advert to them. I had long before remarked that, in relation to practice, it is sometimes necessary to adopt, as if above doubt, opinions which we discern to be highly uncertain, as has been already said; but as I then desired to give my attention solely to the search after truth, I thought that a procedure exactly the opposite was called for, and that I ought to reject as absolutely false all opinions in regard to which I could suppose the least ground for doubt, in order to ascertain whether after that there remained aught in my belief that was wholly indubitable. Accordingly, seeing that our senses sometimes deceive us, I was willing to suppose that there existed nothing really such as they presented to us; and because some men err in reasoning, and fall into paralogisms, even on the simplest matters of geometry, I, convinced that I was as open to error as any other, rejected as false all the reasonings I had hitherto taken for demonstrations; and finally, when I considered that the very same thoughts

\(^{45}\) see Finding Nemo

\(^{46}\) Transsexualism is the extremity of gayism where one not only defies but also denies one’s innate gender. Gender modification surgery is nothing but a window dressing, however, as no medical process can change sex chromosomes in every cell of one’s body.
(presentations) which we experience when awake may also be experienced when we are asleep, while there is at that time not one of them true, I supposed that all the objects (presentations) that had ever entered into my mind when awake, had in them no more truth than the illusions of my dreams. But immediately upon this I observed that, whilst I thus wished to think that all was false, it was absolutely necessary that I, who thus thought, should be somewhat; and as I observed that this truth, I think, therefore I am (COGITO ERGO SUM), was so certain and of such evidence that no ground of doubt, however extravagant, could be alleged by the sceptics capable of shaking it, I concluded that I might, without scruple, accept it as the first principle of the philosophy of which I was in search. 47

According to the French philosopher, cerebration is the starting point of proof of existence. It is undeniable that if there is a thought, there is a thinker, i.e., the actor of the mental act of thinking. The next step is the proof of existence of a physical entity, say, an apple. How can one tell the apple that one sees on the table exists? He may be delirious or dreaming48, where he can equally see, touch, smell, and eat. The bridge between metaphysical existence and physical existence is the language. The word ‘apple’ exists because more than one person share the phenomenon of the entity of that spherical, reddish, sweet, pungent fruit. How about a unicorn? The word exists because the imagination of the entity is shared, although the entity does not exist. Therefore, the existence of a word, or a concept, does not necessarily entail an actual existence.

Proposition 3.111a: Imaginary existence does not equal factual existence.

Let us find an application of the proposition in the issue at hand. Does homosexuality exist? What certainly exists is the homosexual act. Does homosexual attraction exist? That is, is homosexuality a stand-alone attraction, or is it a simulation of heterosexuality? Is a gay man, x, attracted to the other man, y, because x genuinely likes a man? Or is it that x, for certain reasons, is having a hard time to get a woman and at the same time, that y looks enough like a woman and is available for ‘sex?’ The answer lies in the way gay individuals have ‘sex.’ The mode of sex in gay males is anal sex49, where a man’s genital penetrates the other’s rectum. Is it a mere coincidence that such act resembles the penetration of a male genital to a female genital? The mode of sex in female gays are even more revealing—one wears a prosthetic male genital to penetrate the other’s female genital. The true homosexuality, i.e., the non-

48 See Norval Morris, Somnambulistic Homicide: Ghosts, Spiders, and North Koreans, 5 Res Judicatae 29, 29-30 (1951) (an Australian somnambulist killed her daughter with an axe, in a dream state where she thought she was killing a soldier who was attacking her daughter).
imitative sexual attraction and activities on the same gender, does not factually exist.

Proposition 3.111b: The true homosexuality is an imaginary existence, not a factual existence.

Proposition 3.111c: Homosexuality in existence is a simulation of heterosexuality

Empirical evidences of the proposition is the occurrence of homosexuality in prisons and farms for domestic animals, where the physical separation of genders is enforced. Homosexuality is not a true sexuality, but a pseudosexuality.

3.12 Objectivity and Subjectivity

Subjectivity is the truth according to an individual. Objectivity is the truth according to a society. A society is an aggregation of individuals. Therefore, objectivity is the average of subjectivities.

Proposition 3.12: Objectivity is the average of subjectivities.

3.13 Absolutivity and Relativity

Absolutivity is the truth that is invariant over space and time. Relativity is the truth of one life-coordinate of an individual or a society. An absolute truth is discovered, a relative opinion is formed. An individual changes over time. This is the temporal relativity of subjectivity. Two different individuals have varying view on a subject. This is the spatial relativity of subjectivity. Since an individual changes over time, a society changes over time as well. This is the relativity of objectivity. Since two individuals differ, two disparate societies in a given time differ. This is the spatial relativity of objectivity. Since objectivity varies over space and time, objectivity is not absolutivity.

Proposition 3.13: Objectivity is not absolutivity.

Progayists succeeded in subverting societal objectivity from antigayism to progayism. A couple

---

50 Emulation is a desirable activity. Everyone learns by imitating a senior, or superior. Gender emulation, however, is dead end. No matter how a woman imitates a man, no matter how closely a man pretends to be a woman, no one can achieve a sex change, unless one can change the sex genes in every cell of one’s body. Gayism is a mission impossible, a project set out for failure. By the same token, a gay relationship just won’t work, because it is not a human nature, or any sexually reproductive animal’s nature, to be sexual with the same gender. One may pursue happiness, but one may not dictate the way to reach the happiness. For instance, a man cannot smell the fragrance of a flower off of a dung, without deluding himself. It may not be too bad if gayists just delude themselves. But the problem inflates to a bigger sphere of a society when gayists become progayists, and leading the entire society into the mass delirium that gay is okay.

51 It is not that the Beatles is not “better” than the Beach Boys, but that some like the former better than the latter, while others like the latter more that the former. The two bands are different, rather than better.

52 People’s tendency that equalizes objectivity and absolutivity (i.e., x must be true because most people believe x is true) is a mathematical one. It is assumed that the probability of 100 people being wrong is less likely than one person being wrong. Perhaps that is the case in most occasions. Then, objectivity is not a definite proof but a circumstantial evidence of absolutivity. Unfortunately, truth is not always additive, especially when it is counterintuitive.
of decades ago, gayists were predominantly within their closet. Now, they are openly gayists. It is antigayists who hide in their closets. The objectivity is reversed. Nonetheless, this does not mean gayism is right, for objectivity does not always equal absolutivity. Likewise, in a society where antigayism predominates, the objectivity of antigayism does not prove gayism is wrong. Then, how do we prove the absolute truth? How can we tell whether gayism is right or wrong?

3.2 Ethics

3.21 Right and Wrong

An act is right if it is beneficial. An act is a matter of diversity only if it is harmless. An act is wrong if it is harmful. An act is beneficial if the act results in a net benefit. An act is harmful if the act results in a net detriment.

3.22 Kantian Generalization

An act is right if its generalization is right. Is tailgating a right thing to do? To shed the uncertainty, let us look at it through a magnifying glass. Should society allow tailgating? What happens if everyone tailgates? Any accident will result in chain collision. Therefore, tailgating is a wrong thing to do. Now, what happens if everyone is homosexual? The extinction of homo sapiens results. What if every living being is homosexual? The earth will be left with asexually reproductive organisms. This is

53 We say it is a matter of diversity is when we talk about what kinds of music we like, what states or countries we are from, or what attires we wear. A man having anal sex with another man and calling it a marriage, two women calling each other wives and having their child to tell their friends that he has two mothers, a woman going through sex-change surgery to remove breasts and transplant a penis, a man injected with female hormones and cutting his penis off, these are not diversity, but perversity, lunacy, ludicrousness, and a farce. See Transgender Pregnancy (last visited Feb. 2, 2014, 9:49 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transgender_pregnancy; Male Pregnancy (last visited Feb. 2, 2014, 9:50 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Male_pregnancy#Humans; Sex Reassignment Surgery (male-to-female) (last visited Feb. 2, 2014, 9:50 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sex_reassignment_surgery_(male-to-female); Sex Reassignment Surgery (female-to-male) (last visited Feb. 2, 2014, 9:51 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sex_reassignment_surgery_(female-to-male). An experiment on a human is no less a human experiment even if it is done with the consent of the subject. The society has dived so deep into turpitudinousness that nowadays, what Nazis used to on prisoners in obscure concentration camps are done in a broad daylight, on a voluntary basis, under the heart-felt approval of society. See Nazi Human Experimentation (last visited Feb. 2, 2013, 10:08 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nazi_human_experimentation. A society that condones gayism forfeits the moral defense mechanism to all this LGBT madness. Does the reader still opine that antigayism is an intolerance? Is it right to tolerate these stupendously aberrational activities? Doesn’t it make sense to draw a line somewhere as to disallow what one can legally do to one’s body? Is the gender-switching surgery less harmful than illegal drug use? Is it too harsh to condemn LGBT? Isn’t it the legal duty for a U.S. attorney to condemn the morally depraved?

54 See wiki, Categorical Imperative; bible golden rule

55 Kantian generalization applies to normative, prescriptive proposition. The fallacy of hasty generalization occurs when generalization is applied to a positive, descriptive proposition. An instance of the fallacy in the progayist argument that X is gay for life if there is a slightest indication that X engaged in homosexual thought or act, even once in one’s life time. See infra, section 4.1347.

56 There is an apparent similarity between Kantian magnifier and straw man fallacy, or slippery slope argument. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Straw_man; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slippery_slope. The distinction is that Kantian magnifier is not a gun to shoot down an argument, but a tool to thoroughly scrutinize the soundness of an
not only an undesirable but also unthinkable outcome. Therefore, homosexuality is harmful.

Proposition 3.22: Kantian magnifier predicts the harmfulness of gayism. But perhaps, it is unrealistic to expect that everyone will become a gayist in the future. Then, is homosexuality still harmful? Jesusian ‘Golden Rule’ predates and is similar to Kantian generalization:

Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.

Let us conduct a thought experiment. The question is, would you be willing to be raised by two fathers or by two mothers? Would you choose to never have a father in your life, or never to know what it is like to have a mother? If not, how can you allow a helpless child to be adopted by gay parents?

3.3 Aesthetics

3.3.1 Absolutivity and Relativity of Aesthetics

Is beauty in the eyes of the beholder? Not quite. Human aesthetics is an invention of evolution. Nutritious food pleases one’s taste bud so that one consumes it and survives. Youths are pleasant to eyes and ears of adults so that they be protected, and the species survive to the next generation. Females are beautiful to the eyes of males of the same species so that they pursue them and reproduce. A male elephant sees more beauty in a female elephant than in a Miss Universe. Therefore, aesthetics is relativistic over species. On the contrary, aesthetics is absolutistic within a species. The most sexually conducive female is the one with the most probabilities to procreate healthy progeny and to nourish them well. This is why the judgment standard for Miss Universe can be objective and women in fashion catalogues have a uniform body type: they are the ‘models’ that appeal to everyone. On the other hand, action or a policy. An action is a cause that has an effect. Any policy has effects on society: the effects on society is the very purpose of a policy in the first place. The question is, would there be a negative or unforeseen effects from the action or policy? Kantian magnifier enables us to conduct a thought experiment to scrutinize all possible consequences. It is better to conduct a surgery drill exercise on a straw man than on a live man. It is safer to imagine a slippery slope than to actually slide on it. Kantian generalization enables us to experiment inside a safe environment, the brain.

57 Let us examine if gayism has any benefit by applying reverse-Kantian generalizer. Assume there are no gays in society. The gayist gift of AIDS and lesbian limbo in bed will vanish from humanity. Do we lose anything? We will miss all the gay jokes, at most.

58 If gay parents are allowed to have a child by adoption or surrogacy, the opportunity cost that their child incur is the experience of having a mother and a father. Is this an acceptable cost? Even if it were, why should the child bear such cost for the decision of two adults, one of whom is a genetic stranger? Most of gay parents are the first generation gays who were born to traditional families of straight parents. They did not experience gay parenting themselves, and thus do not know whether gay parenting is good or bad for the children. They are experimenting with their children to prove the viability of gay parenting. This yet another unacceptable immorality that gayists introduce to society: human experimentation.

59 Lean figure, pronounced bosoms, narrow shoulders, long wavv hair, embossed necklines, rosy protruded lips, blushed cheeks, elevated nose, soft ears, gentle knees, shy toes, elegant elbows, concave groin, convex hips, slim and curvy waist, slender legs, delicate fingers, polished finger nails, exposed ankles, convergent thighs, divergent eyebrows, sensible eyes, extended eyelashes, sensitive skin, fair teeth, stylish apparels, high heels, fashionable hairdo, and inviting smiles. Beauty is more than a skin deep. Idealized womanhood, however, conveys no more
the most desirable man is the one with the most probabilities to procreate and protect. However, the trait that ensures survival is relative to society. In a lawless society, like in the prehistoric society, a man of the most physical strength is the one with comparative advantage to survive, prosper, and reproduce. In a medieval time where class mobility is restricted, a man born of a high class is the one with the silver spoon in mouth. In a modern society where class mobility is possible, the smartest and the most earnest man is the one who get the best girl. What is absolute, though, is that the most desirable man is the one who can protect and preserve the family the best. What takes to protect and preserve may change, but the desirability of male’s ability to protect and preserve does not change. Therefore, aesthetics is absolutistic in substance, and relativistic in form.

Proposition 3.31: Aesthetics is absolute in substance, relative in form.

3.32 Fantasy A Priori and Jealousy A Priori

It is easy to understand why a man perceives beauty in a woman and how a woman judge the desirability in a man- it is the eugenic mechanism of evolution. A male virgin, x, knows by programmed instinct that out of two women w and y, he would have better time in bed with w than with y. Such is the working of fantasy a priori. Now, there is another male, z, who is richer, more muscular, more handsome, more suave, more experienced, more mature. x knows, instinctually, that both w and y would have better time in bed with z than with him. Why and how so?

Assume x does not know the fact that z is more desirable than him, and what makes z more attractive to women than him. Then x is in evolutionary trouble- he does not know how to make himself more competent than he is now. x fails to procreate and x’s genetic makeup goes extinct. Therefore, there is an evolutionary pressure for a species to recognize desirability of the same gender in the eyes of the opposite gender. This invention of the nature is the jealousy a priori.

Proposition 3.32a: The ability to recognize the same-gender desirability is to enable an individual to improve his desirability by emulation.

The same principle mirrors in females as well. Without knowing whether and why w is more attractive than y, y cannot improve her chance of procreation. y has to know it. If y does not know and another female, u, knows, then u will leave legacy of such instinct to the next generation, while the ignorance of y is sentenced to extinction by evolution. This opens up a new possibility:

Proposition 3.32b: Gayism is an overexpression of jealousy a priori.

than a reproductive success potential in itself. Nonetheless, it is known that appearance matters in job interviews and promotion opportunities. It definitely affects how one is treated by others, and thus one’s happiness. This is not a discrimination but a reward system, both natural and social. The more beauty, the better society. The upkeep of appearance requires daily discipline of diet and exercise. The good news is, everyone can be beautiful, if one wants it and works on it. See Matthew 7:7-11 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+7&version=KJV.

60 In laymen’s term, gayism is an overindulgence of same-sex appreciation capacity. A man can appreciate another man’s musculature and may compliment on it. But if the former fantasizes about kissing the pectoralis major of the latter in order to fully appreciate its mass, he is going too far.
In a more plain term, gayism is an exaggeration, a self-indulgence in appreciation of others of the same-sex.

There may be other reasons why some decide to be gay. Perhaps gayism is a form of escapism in some gayists, out of ennui of heterosexuality. Homosexuality, however, is no exception to the law of diminishing return: the tedium of gayism is bound to cave in faster than heterosex. Perhaps some are gay because what they want a sex-lite. For people to whom heterosex is too strong, homosex, i.e., pseudo-sex, may be a convenient choice. Then, gayism seems to be a response to a demand. Why should it be wrong? It is wrong because it is harmful. If gayism were to end with a choice without negative consequences, antigayism would be unfounded. A man who is being sexual with another man undergoes disfigurement in his mentality, because he is going against his own nature. And others will imitate him and become gay. As gayism spreads, more people get disfigured. As progayism forces the society to accept gayism as a new normality, the entire society gets deformed.

3.33 Aesthetical Depletion in Gayists

Human aesthetics is driven by the desire to be desired. A woman exerts the maximum sensuality when her audience are male. A flower lasts until pollination. Biological aesthetics, including that of Homo sapiens, stops when it fulfills or loses its purpose.

Proposition 3.33: Gayism decreases human aesthetics.

Female aesthetics is an analeptic of human society and there is no substitute. Prevalence of gayism will further drive the aphroditian race, an already endangered species, into extinction. If they are no more, will there be poetry of Byron, love songs of the Beatles, sculptures of Rodin, and paintings of Renoir? Isn’t the human beauty of femininity the source of inspiration for almost all the historic artists, most of whom happen to be males? Is that a coincidence? Or is it the workings of gender biology?

Women adorn themselves to attract men. When that purpose is frustrated, women stop caring about appearance. With exceptions acknowledged, the positive correlation between lesbianism and obesity is the statistical reality. Envisage typical lesbians: they are short-haired, wear no make-ups, and

---

61 The gayist disfiguration extends to physiology as well in transgender individuals.
62 See infra § 4.111.
63 Compare madonna’s express yourself http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GsVcUzP_O_8 with gaga’s born this way http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wV1FrqwZyKw. This is the contrast between heterosexual eutopia of the past and the homosexual dystopia of the future, unless we stop the conquest of progayism. It is well known that the prima-donna is a progayist. See Madonna, American Pie (remake), http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8B1Aj3Oo7To (the music video is cordial in ingenious to depict the various walks of life of Americans, until its approval of gayism that ruined everything. Will Americans let gayism demolish everything they’ve built over three centuries? Only time will tell). Well, beauty, blonde, blue-eyes, and brain don’t always go hand in hand, so to speak.
64 See infra, § 4.231 footnote.
never wear skirts or high-heels\textsuperscript{65}. Why make themselves less beautiful\textsuperscript{66}? Why make this world not as beautiful as it can be? Does the reader still think gayism is harmless?

4 The Law of Human Science

4.1 The Law of Psychology

4.11 Nature v. Nurture

4.111 Disproof of the Innateness Conjecture

Is gayism innate or acquired?

Proposition 4.111: Gayism is acquired.

Proof) Assume gayism is innate. Then there are two possibilities: spontaneous mutation or inheritance.

Hypothesis A: Gayism occurs by spontaneous mutation in gamete productions in straight parents.

Disproof) The mutation rate in human germ line cells is \(0.000001.1\%\) per DNA base in a gene, per generation\textsuperscript{67}. The incidence of gayism in a given population is about 4\% (2\% gay, 2\% bisexual)\textsuperscript{68}. Therefore, spontaneous mutation does not account for gayism.

Proposition 4.111a: Spontaneous mutation is not the cause of the incidence of gayism.

Hypothesis B: Gayism occurs by a genetically inherited trait whose existence has accumulated over multiple generations.

Disproof) Strictly homosexual people cannot procreate as they are incapable of straight sex. Then, gayism must be inherited by bisexual parents. The best-case scenario is that the half of their progeny are bisexual so as to pass the ‘gay’ gene to the next generation, and the other half are strictly homosexual. Since strictly homosexual children die out without procreation, only half of the children of the bisexual parent generation can pass the ‘gay gene’ to the next generation. That is, the number of people with the ‘gay gene’ decreases exponentially by half, in each successive generation. Gay gene will go extinct after a dozen generations. This contradicts the reality where

\textsuperscript{65} Some may argue that gayists, both male and female, still want to impress their potential gay gametes. This may be true, but less so. The incentive for a woman to impress another woman is, by any means, not nearly as strong as that to impress another man. The reason is, only heterosexual desire is fueled by physiological impetus and backed by evolutionary pressure. The same if true for men. See infra § 4.322.

\textsuperscript{66} Unsightliness and gayism, which is the egg and which is the chicken? The causal linkage is circular, as they form negative feedback loop. The less sexually attractive a woman is, the more she is prone to be gay. The deeper she lunges into gayism, the less attractive she becomes.

\textsuperscript{67} Variation in genome-wide mutation rates within and between human families

\textsuperscript{68} Nat Genet. 2011 June 12; 43(7): 712–714; wiki

\textsuperscript{69} Donald F. Conrad et al.
gay population persists throughout human history. Therefore, genetic inheritance accounts for neither spatial incidence nor temporal persistence of gayism.

Proposition 4.111b: Genetic inheritance is not the cause of the incidence of gayism.

By proposition 4.111a and 4.111b, gayism cannot be an innate trait\(^69\). Therefore, gayism is acquired. Q.E.D.

Empirical data supports the proposition\(^70\). As social environment has changed from antigayistic to progayistic, the number of gay population has exploded in number\(^71\).

4.112 Causes of Gayism

A better explanation of the reason why gayism occurs would be by analysis of the traits common in gayists.

4.1121 Novelty

One cannot be gay without a certain degree of mental strength. One becomes officially gay by engaging in a homosexual activity, either mental or physical. Even in a society where progayism is majority, gayism is minority. Gayism is something that distinguishes its members from the majority, the mainstream. This is an attractive feature for people who pursue novelty. Nonetheless, not every new is a good new\(^72\). An entity should not be presumed to worthy only because it is new and rare.

4.1122 Amorality

One cannot be gay without a certain degree of moral relaxation. Gayism is the declaration of dissociation from traditional ethics. Tradition, norm, authority, normalcy, mores are anathemas to many.

---

\(^69\) Contra Dongkyu Park et al., Male-like Sexual Behavior of Female Mouse Lacking Fucose Mutarotase, 11 BMC Genetics 62, 62 (2010) (genetic manipulation created a lesbian lab rat), available at http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2156/11/62. There are two reasons that renders the genetic induction of homosexuality irrelevant. First, the natural point mutation rate in homo sapiens is too low to account for the 4\% incidence of gayism in population. Second, the experimental induction of homosexuality is an artificially constructed anomaly, which is exactly what gayism is.

\(^70\) 76-80\% of gayists who are parts of identical twins have straight twin siblings. See John M. Bailey & Michael P. Dunne, Genetic and Environmental Influences on Sexual Orientation and Its Correlates in an Australian Twin Sample, 78 J. Personality & Soc. Psychol. 524, 533 (2000) (monozygotic concordance rate of homosexuality is 20\% in male, and 24\% in female).


\(^72\) Not every status quo is a bad status quo either. A change can be destructive. The legalization of murder would be very new. But society bars it because it agrees that the sanctity of human life is a timeless value. What about the sanctity of marriage? A man penetrating another man’s anus, open relationship agreement, a child never to have a father but two mothers instead, a child not born of the love of her parents but a pecuniary contract of surrogacy or artificial insemination, inheriting the half of her genome from a stranger she will never meet, all under the semblance of legal marriage- is this constructive or destructive of human sanctity?
Gayism, perhaps, serves as a refuge for those who aspire to rebel without a cause\textsuperscript{73}. Of course, not every old is a good old. Not every old is a bad old either. One should not reject something just because it is common or conventional.

4.1123 Contragendability

One cannot be gay without having a certain degree of traits characteristic of the opposite gender. As summarized in the proposition 3.111c, gayism is imitative. In gay relationships, a male plays the role of a female, and a female acts as if she were a male. Then, at least the half of the gay population have contra-gender capability, or contragendability for short. Contragendability itself is a talent, a highly desirable trait. A man with sensitivity of a female, a woman with the courage of a male, are welcome in society. Contragendability makes a person wholesome. The truth is, although one gifted with contragendability may be tempted to be gay, one does not have to be gay in order to keep his or her contragendability. Amazonians, tomboys\textsuperscript{74}, and contemporary concept of metrosexuality all encapsulate the desirability and viability of contragendability in straights.

4.11231 Contragendability Distinguished

Contragendability is a dynamic trait whereas androgyny is a static trait. Contragendability is the ability to switch from the default mode of one’s gender to the contingent mode of the opposite gender whenever necessity arises. A woman facing a physical danger or situational crisis can handle the exigency better if she acts more like a male than a female. A man in front of a child will better handle with softness than with roughness. Contragendability is a talent. Every talent comes with a price, to be paid by installment. Talents benefit a person throughout lifetime, so should the talented pay the price as long as benefit is conferred. One talented with bravery should constantly guard against recklessness. One talented with ingenuity should constantly fend off the degeneracy into insanity. One of audacity should see to it that he not be violent. The price of contragendability, then, is the unswerving defence against the temptation of gayism.

4.113 Synthesis of Causes of Gayism

Assume, for simplicity, the three aforementioned traits (novelty, amorality, contragendability) occur independently in a given population. That is, none of the three sets is a subset of the other two sets.

\textsuperscript{73} see Rebel without Cause. Young adults are one of the overwhelming supporters of gayism. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_opinion_of_same-sex_marriage_in_the_United_States#By_age. This smacks of a teen spirit, who just got released from the two decades of dependency, obedience, and subjection under their traditional parents. With exceptions acknowledged, these new adults are liberal by age, because they the liberated recently. See Nirvana, Smells Like a Teen Spirit. Most people in their twenties are adults in body, teens in mentality: they are emotional, eager, and want to change the world. They have yet to appreciate why things are what they are. A rebel for rebellion’s sake, a change for change’s sake achieves nothing more than self-gratification. A woman who acts and sounds like a man has an exotic, a very different kind of beauty. A man who behaves like a woman has a peculiar, a very distinct type of hilarity. Contragendability is a very special and precious species of diversity. Obesity, to a certain extent, is a matter of diversity as well- they look absolutely terrific, in their own ways. The world where everyone is fit and thin would be a monotone. Nonetheless, excessive fat and sugar consumption may harm one’s health, uncontrovertibly. Likewise, once one with contragendability becomes homosexual, the conduit for the contribution of the talent gets diverted, and harm results.
For instance, not everyone who is novel is amoral, not every amoral person has contragendability, etc. It is not an unreasonable assumption that 30% of population have the novelty trait. Likewise, let us assume 30% of population is amoral. Finally, 30% of population is contragender-capable. Then, by the product rule\textsuperscript{75}, the percentage of people who have both novelty and contragendability is 9% (= 0.3 * 0.3). This is the population susceptible to gayism, or the people who are gay-susceptible. Out of these people, 30% are amoral. Then we have 2.7% (= 9% * 0.3) of population who are amoral, novel, and contragendable. This figure closely match the incidence of gayism in a given population.

4.12 Cost of Relationship

There ain't no mountain high enough
Ain't no valley low enough
Ain't no river wide enough
To keep me from getting to you\textsuperscript{76}

Romance is a market with extremely high transaction cost. What are the odds of the happenstance that the ideal woman of a man lives in the same city as he, and she is single when he is single, at the time they run into each other, and she is in the right mood that day, and she likes him as much as he does? The search is lengthy, the rejection is painful. But, of course, love overcomes obstacles, no matter how insurmountable it may be. How can it be? “Nothing is better than sex.” The magnitude of sexual pleasure results from the summation of all five senses: sound, sight, smell, smell, and savor. To animals, sex is the raison d’être. To humans, sex is the source of drive to move forward. Such is sex’s special seat in society.

4.121 Burden of Initiation

By accosting a suitable, nubile damsel, a man exposes himself to the judgmentality of the women’s eyes. So does a woman when she enters the romance market\textsuperscript{77}. A man is judged by competency, woman by beauty, both of which requires constant diligence and up-keep. Romance is asymmetrical\textsuperscript{78}. Men are active, women are passive. The burden of initiation is on the man, while the

\textsuperscript{75} wiki
\textsuperscript{76} Marvin Gaye, Ain’t No Mountain High Enough
\textsuperscript{77} See The Gentle People, Shopping World, \url{http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yv70qSY-hCQ}. With exceptions acknowledged, romance market is materialistic in that one desires someone who is at least commensurate to oneself in socioeconomic echelon, or better. In general, romance market is no charity, but a cold, rational, objective, and ruthless business. It is where heartbreaks, headaches, tears, betrayal, rejection, disappointment, and despair are the name of the game. But people still do it because they need the nest to comfort themselves, the eggs to hatch, to reproduce. See Annie Hall (Woody Allen). Premarital relationship is conditional on mutual benefit of pleasure, and thus is fragile. Once it matures into marriage, however, the relationship become durable, unconditional: “for better or worse.” The raison d’être of relationship is no longer hedonism, but responsibility. Marriage is a meritorious and virtuous institution because of its balancing act between happiness and responsibility. See Frank Sinatra, Love and Marriage.

\textsuperscript{78} to be more exact, it is asymmetrical by axis, but symmetrical by origin. infra xxx, law of complementation. For instance, women are the audience of courtship where men are performers, while men are the audience of the display of the pulchritudinousness that women perform. See Michael Jackson, The Way You Make Me Feel \url{http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HzZ_upj4As};
burden of maintenance is on the woman. Women alone bear the risk of pregnancy. As homo sapiens, a race known for extensive duration of infant dependency, women must be selective in their choice of men. Nature endowed women with sexual patience, i.e., prudence, and the sixth sense, i.e., the woman’s intuition. Initiation of a relationship is the first hurdle the man faces. This is when she judges him— is he worth a chance? Can he afford and protect me and baby? After that, the man should pass the endurance test. This is the test of trustworthiness. Is he gonna stick around once a baby is born? She takes time, he rushes. If he is impatient, he fails. He doesn’t care, just wants sex. She doesn’t indulge him, doesn’t stand him. She must be cautious. He is stronger, he can overpower her. If she gets pregnant, he can walk away, she can’t. She has only limited chances— her eggs are numbered whereas his sperms are numberless. The risk is a double-edged sword— abuse and pregnancy. But if he proves trustworthiness, she lets him in.

4.1211 Risk of Romance

Pregnancy is one of many risks that make women hesitate and think twice before going out on a date. Since men are physiologically more muscular, mentally more violent, and sexually more aggressive, rape is a big fear factor for women. An intercourse is a rape if and only if consent is absent both before and after sex. If a woman consents before but dissents after, it is not a rape but a regret. If she non-consents before but consents after, it is either a role-playing, or change of heart for the better view of him. Let us digress a bit more into the discussion of the rape law. Traditionally, women had a duty to forcefully resist a rapist, as lack of resistance constituted a consent to sex. Feminists led the rape law reform movement in the 70’s to lift the ‘resistance requirement’ from criminal statutes, for an alleged rape victim in proving that it was indeed a rape. A traditional but now-unpopular view is that women tend to say ‘no’ even if she means ‘yes,’ because to do so is more befitting of the female gender, or “customary.” A view that would be even more unpopular is one step closer to the truth: women say ‘no’ to sex because it is their nature to do so. When a man and a woman have sex for the first time since they met, it is the most likely that she says ‘something like no,’ or something subtly short of a definite ‘no.’

In any situation, women rarely say ‘yes’ to sex. Even when they mean ‘yes,’ women prefer acquiescence by silence: words cheapen the mood. In no romance a man asks a woman for a consent unless he is a complete novice to the game. She would say no just because he is asking an obvious question, “May I have sex with you?” The language of romance is not words but the absence thereof. A part of the reason of women’s preference for silent consent is their coyness. Women are not that proud of the fact that they have sex, which is a sharp contrast to men.

Next, women prefer to say ‘no,’ regardless of whether they mean ‘yes’ or ‘no,’ because women are static, inertial, and passive by nature. The passivity of female gender is the law of the nature that

---

79 It is a man’s job to win a woman’s heart, and it is her job to keep him in the wedlock.
80 The asymmetric distribution of risk explains why only women can get paid for sex, even though both men and women enjoy it.
governs all the sexually reproductive species. It is males that fight over females, conduct the courtship, and chase after females. It is millions of sperms that swim after one sitting egg. In general, women hesitate to have sex due to the pregnancy risk, unless she is bent on having a child in a marriage setting. Since there is such a thing as rape between a husband and a wife (at least in practicality and from traditional viewpoint), rape occurs in either fornication or adultery context. Thus, even if the sex was not a rape, it still is a moral wrong. And moral wrong, from a common law standpoint and still in some jurisdictions, is enough to convict the perpetrator, as the moral wrong may serve as a substitute for mens rea\textsuperscript{84}.

The feminist assertion that ‘no’ means ‘no’ is a factually flawed argument. Is it really a rare occurrence that a woman plays a game of passivity with a man that she is truly willing to sleep with? Nonetheless, the removal of resistance requirement in rape law is a sensible move, because it shifts the sexual responsibility from victims to men. Such strict rape law can foreseeably deter irresponsible, immoral sexual acts of fornication and adultery, because under the new law, it is easier to prove the sex was a rape and that will make men think twice before acting on impulse. It is men who initiate the sexual act, so it only makes sense to hold them responsible for what happened.

A rape proves not strength but weakness, the inability to overcome one’s carnal impulse. ‘No means yes’ is a nonsense, because if it is so, there is no way to express a real ‘no’. ‘No means no’ is unrealistic because lovemaking is a time to be playful, not a time to be literal. The bottom line is, ‘no’ sometimes means no, but not always. Silence sometimes means yes, but not always. Women's consent-dissent issue seems like an ambiguity impossible to decrypt, but in reality, it is all too painfully obvious to a man. The language of eyes, body, face, voice tonality bespeak everything there is to be known\textsuperscript{85}. A man who says he thought she wanted it is a liar, mostly. Probably, he knew that she didn't want it, but he did it anyway because he wanted it so bad. He may have done it as a revenge for the rejection, because he was so disappointed, frustrated, and angry. Or perchance he is the kind who gets off on the sadistic subjugation, where dissent is an essential ingredient of the pleasure sought. On the other hand, a woman who consented before but regrets after the sex may pour all the blame on the man by saying she never consented. Or she may want to extort him for money by the threat of lawsuit. A victim can be a liar too.

As for sex or otherwise, women are more capable than men in making more balanced and rational judgment on whether a relationship would work or not, because the risk of pregnancy makes them think twice while men tend to make rash decision from impulse. Thus, when she says no, it is the best that he

\textsuperscript{84} See http://defensewiki.ibj.org/index.php/Mistake_of_Fact.

\textsuperscript{85} In romance, the difficulty is in discerning the degree of affection. It is hard to know how much she likes him, not whether she likes him. Affection is very finely graduated. She may have a favorable view of him. She may want to talk to him. She wants to be his acquaintance, to say hello when she runs into him. She wants to befriend him in a group social setting. She wants to go out with him on a one-on-one date. She wants to be kissed and touched lightly. She wants to be kissed deeply and touched everywhere. She wants to get laid. She wants to get married. In all these levels, both she and he tends to overrate the opposite sex’ affection to one level higher. When he wants to befriend her, she thinks that he wants to date her, because it is flattering to think so. We all engage in wishful thinking because it feels good. Again, romance is all but rationality. Here is the concluding remark for this section: the motif behind the long and winding discussion of the rape law to present the reader what this paper is about. The author does not intend to force-feed some random religious doctrine to the reader’s eyes and brain, but invites the reader to the thought process founded on reason and rationality, with pun intended.
heeds it. It is true persistence works at times. Perhaps it is persistence that is usually required. It is the last thing that she would want to be with a guy who is willing to settle with her as the second best, or who just wants her for sex, out of desperation. She wants a man who really wants her for who she is. And initial ‘no’ may be her test to see how much and how real he wants her. Nonetheless, the persistence should be in asking, not overcoming. Her body is her private property. A trespass on her property without permission is illegal, not because it is a fundamental human right, but because it is her exclusive corporeal property right. Nevertheless, guys should keep trying with different targets. There are plenty of fish in the sea, they say. Asking is a virtue, even if rejected. Present her the right of first refusal: she will be honored and relish every moment of the boosted ego. How beautiful a sight a human courtship behavior makes!

4.12111 Impossibility of Reasonable Standard

Permission is demonstrated when the evidence, in whatever form, is sufficient to demonstrate that a reasonable person would have believed that the alleged victim had affirmatively and freely given authorization to the act.

The begging question is, who in love is being reasonable? Lovemaking is one of the few time slot when anyone becomes irrational, no matter how disciplined he is, no matter how educated she is. The irrationality of carnal affection is due to its purely biological nature of the activity. Traditionally, lovers and fools have been synonymous. People fall in love, not rise to love. Love is blind, not farsighted. Romance is the field of irrationality. People resort to romance when they need to escape from rationality. The rational, or reasonable standard in rape cases is a fiction, as nobody is being reasonable when they make love, be it with or without consent. This is why the strict liability standard makes sense in rape cases. And who is being objective when they are in love? Romantic affection is the most subjective area in life. Almost everything that a rapist does is replicated in the bedroom of a venturous young couple for the sake of ‘romantic fantasies.’ Nobody makes love the same way. If lovemaking is not an objective act, how can there be an objective standard in rape cases?

Rape law is said to be a mess, the she-said-he-said quagmire, but it doesn’t have to be. The most complex question may have the simplest solution. Most rape cases occurs outside the marriage: fornication or adultery. The solution to the problem of rape is prevention, not some rocket science of jurisprudence. Would a Supreme Court case decision on a rape case ever reach a sixteen-year-old boy and a fourteen-year-old girl? Not unless they are bent on going to the law school, it won’t. Neither will a rape statute of the state of the youngsters will ever reach their eyes before they meet each other. It is the

---

86 For the critique of ‘fundamental human right’ argumentation, see § 4.28421.
88 The only reason that sex, an extremely vulgar and filthy act, is ok is that it procreates life - everyone is born from it. The procreative functionality of sex neutralizes and justifies its vulgarity. Since the act of the gay sex has no procreative function, only the vulgarity and filth remain in it. That is, gay sex is a pure lust without a positive purpose. This is yet another reason of the inherent immorality and baseness of gayism.
89 Under the strict liability standard (or something similar to that in essence), a man who honestly thought that she consented to sex can still be convicted or rape if she says otherwise. See Com. v. Lopez, 433 Mass. 722, 729 (2001) (“The mistake of fact defense is incompatible with the evolution of our jurisprudence with respect to the crime of rape”).
90 See Com. v. Fischer, 721 A.2d 1111, 1117 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1998) (the court refuses to take the defendant’s reasonable belief that the victim consented to sex).
school and home that should teach the adolescents the good old-fashioned ethics against fornication. Otherwise, boys will keep pushing girls to sex, girls will keep accusing boys, boys will keep going to jails, girls will keep getting pregnant, doctors will keep aborting fetuses, babies will keep being raised by single teens, girls will keep dropping out of schools. Is this something to laugh about? Then why do people laugh at the morality that forbids fornication? Prevention of harms, that is the raison d’être of morality.

4.122 Burden of Maintenance

The burden shifts after the first night over. He may wanna move on, she wants to hang on. So he stays. Loyalty is harder for a man to keep. If he sleeps out, she suffers. Her job is to keep him in.

4.123 Dissociation of Sex and Reproduction

Invention of contraceptives freed sex from nature. Sex is no longer reproduction but pleasure. None the less, the risk of pregnancy is not eradicated. No contraceptive is fail-proof.

4.124 Cost Avoidance

4.1241 Promiscuity

Promiscuity avoids cost of maintenance and loyalty. Spatial promiscuity is having multiple partners at once. Temporal promiscuity is switching partners one after another. The cost of promiscuity is sexually transmitted diseases, or STDs. Any contagious disease is an STD. If a disease is not genetic but caused by vectors like fungus, germs, bacteria or viruses, it will pass as two individuals intimately conjoin, shortening the distance that the pathogenous vector has to travel.

4.1242 Homosexuality

There are two ways to avoid cost of initiation. The first is homosexuality. There is no risk of pregnancy. The perceived risk of abuse and violence (e.g. battery, rape, or murder) is less as well, because a man can defend himself against another man, and a woman is less fatal to another woman.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) 20% of straight females are victims of intimate partner violence, while corresponding figures are 15% for gay males and 11% for lesbians. Patricia Tjaden & Nancy Thoennes, Nat'l Inst. Just., Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey 30 (2000), available at https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/181867.pdf. The diminished risk of violence, however, is only of perception that may not equal the reality. See Linda A. Bernhard, Physical and Sexual Violence Experienced by Lesbian and Heterosexual Women, 6 Violence Against Women 68, 68 (2000) (lesbian couples experience more spousal violence than women in straight relationships); Patricia Tjaden, Nancy Thoennes & Christine J. Allison, Comparing Violence Over the Life Span in Samples of Same-Sex and Opposite-Sex Cohabitants, 14 Violence & Victims 413, 413 (1999) (male gay couples experience more spousal violence than men in straight relationships). Then, gayists are in the worst possible situations: they engage in gay relationship partly because of the presumed less risk of violence, but the violence is heightened in actuality. The reason for the increased violence in gay couple is not hard to comprehend- by nature, the two individuals of the same gender clash, not unite. Without the lubricant of sexual
Most importantly, there is no evolutionarily designed barrier to jump over. The prudence, the caution of a woman on a man is to raise the probability of successful reproduction and rearing. This is why social initiation between same sexes is easier than between opposite sexes. Moreover, a man knows exactly what another man wants, a woman understand another woman perfectly. The very advantage of homosexuality proves to result in disadvantage, however. Since a man knows another man, there is no surprise, no magic, no mystery, as everything is expected and understood. The very fact that gay sex does not result in pregnancy deprives participants of the maximum possible extent of sexual pleasure- pleasure is a physiological response, an instrument of evolution. The very fact that the gay relationship was obtained easily makes it easier to lose. The less it costs, the less one cherishes. Finally, since a child of a gay couple can have at most one parent with genetic connection, the child cannot bond the parents together as strongly as the child of a straight parents, the genetic bridge that reconciles the husband and wife in dispute and binds them thereafter.

4.1243 Celibacy

The second way to avoid cost of relation initiation is celibacy. Traditional celibacy is born out of religious piety where the sacrifice of sexuality is an expression of divine devotion. An apparently obvious point is surprisingly subject to common misunderstanding.

Proposition 4.143: Celibacy is not homosexuality.

Proof) Celibacy, by definition, is voluntary asceticism against sexual desire. Thus, celibacy is devoid of sexuality. Hence, celibacy is neither homosexuality nor heterosexuality, both of which involve engagement in mental or physical sexual activities. Nonetheless, the biological capability of sexuality remains in celibates. Biological sexuality is heterosexuality. Therefore, celibacy belongs to the set C-V, where C = CS92. Q.E.D.

Corollary 4.143: Homosexual celibacy is an empty set93.

Pre-modern society also had political or occupational celibates who consist of castrated eunuchs. Post-modern secular celibacy, or neocelibacism, is the pledge of sexual abstinence for self-development, career furtherance, and sexual independence. Unlike past celibacy which were asexual, neocelibacism features virtual sexuality, where sex is evanescent that leaves no trace. The modern invention of media that includes prints, motion pictures, and internet, is the driving force of virtual sexuality. Since the sex is virtual, neocelibacism bypasses the costs of relationship. Neocelibates can be eclectic and not promiscuous at the same time, as there is no relationship94. Intellectual giants, as Kant, Schopenhauer,
Adam Smith and others were celibates who left the legacy of metaphysical genes that replicate, mutate, and propagate to beget more progeny to eternity.

4.12431 Kantian Generalization of Celibacy

Will Kantian generalizer outputs extinction of homo sapiens?

And Jesus answering said unto them, the children of this world marry, and are given in marriage. But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.

Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.

For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb.

Kama is the enjoyment of appropriate objects by the five senses of hearing, feeling, seeing, tasting and smelling, assisted by the mind together with the soul. . . . Sexual intercourse being a thing dependent on man and woman requires the application of proper means by them.

Kama Sutra pretty much sums up the life of a lawyer: reading the law and pro bono works (Dharma), billable hours (Artha), and leisure (Kama).

---

96 Matthew 16:28 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%2016&version=KJV.
97 Romans 6:23 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Romans%206&version=KJV.
98 John 3:16 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John%203&version=KJV.
The eternal life— isn’t that the holy grail of humankind? We will leave the mysticism here. In the mean-
time, rest assured: people will marry and multiply. Nonetheless, the increase of popularity of celibatic
lifestyle is likely to increase the incidence of geniuses.

4.13 Imputation Fallacy

If there be time to expose through discussion the falsehood and fallacies, to avert the evil by the
processes of education, the remedy to be applied is more speech, not enforced silence.

Imputation fallacy is a logical error where the identity between x and y is inferred from the
similarity therebetween.

4.131 Freudian Imputation

For some reason, the Austrian doctor overrated sexuality. To him, everything that resembles
sexuality is related to sexuality. Eating, touching, even smoking of a cigar, according to Dr. Freud, is
sexual in nature. How would you feel if someone characterizes the relationship between you and your
parents, between you and your children, as something sexual? Freudian imputation of sexuality in
parental and filial interaction is not only fallacious but also an insult. Not everyone is a pedophile or a
child molester. Freudian imputation covers imputation of sexuality on asexual relationships in general.
Oedipusian imputation is a subset of Freudian imputation, where sexuality is imputed to parental-filial
relationship. The falsehood of Oedipusian imputation is surprisingly easy to prove. A mother and her
son, or a father and his daughter reduce corporeal contact as the child gets older. Skin to skin interaction
between a parent and a child practically stops when the child reaches puberty, i.e., sexual capability.
If parent-child relationship were sexual, puberty would be the time when the tactile interaction starts. The
opposite is true in reality. Therefore, parent-filial relationship is asexual and Oedipus complex a fiction.

4.1311 Commonality of Evolutionary Device

As hinted in the section 3.32, aesthetics is an evolutionary tool. A porcupine sees more beauty in
her cubs than in kittens. Tactile zest is a versatile evolutionary device. A soft surface is pleasant to

---

100 See Indiana Jones 3: The Temple of Doom. The merger of this world and the prophesied ‘Kingdom of Heaven,’
despite its apparent remote possibility, deserves a space in this paper.
102 The only commonality between infantile aesthetics and sexual aesthetics is their corporeality. Handshaking is a
corporeal interaction as well, but it is not sane to say that people are being sexual whenever they shake hands with
one another.
103 The reason for the cease of tactile interaction between parents and now-adolescent children is the anti-incest
instinct of the children and parents. Humans, as well as any sexually reproductive animals, has this evolutionarily
devised instinct to prevent intra-familial sex so that an individual looks for a sex mate outside one’s family line.
This way, the next generation would form a more genetically diverse gene pool, enhancing the chance for survival
of the species upon environmental changes.
104 Evolution prescribed adults’ perception of beauty upon children, so that parents cherish them more, bind to them
more, and protect them more. A greater degree of sympathy goes to a dead child than to a dead adult because a
child has more adorable appearance than an adult (relative vulnerability is irrelevant when comparing two dead
people). Pedophilia is the infusion of sexuality into this perception of infantile aesthetics. Likewise, incest,
bestiality, gayism amalgamate sexuality into what is supposed to be an asexual relationships like parenthood,
humans so that he recognizes its potential for warmth, which is necessary for him to survive a winter. Tactile interaction is shared by parental-filial relationship, friendship, and spousal relationship. Evolution favors efficiency. It is more efficient to invent one tool that can be used for different purposes than to invent several tools, each of which serve a single purpose. A knife can be used to cut both meat and a celery, but that does not make meat a celery.

4.132 Wildean Imputation

Sexuality is not an extreme form of friendship. Rather, sexuality is an element foreign to parent-child relationship or friendship. Sexuality is akin only to romantic relationship. Two total strangers can have sex, which is always the case in nature. Thus, friendship is not a necessary condition of sexuality. Friendship is not a sufficient condition of sexuality either, as friendship is asexual in essence. Oscar Wilde famously characterized the friendship between David and Jonathan as homosexual. Was it? Does friendship become a romance if it is strong enough?

Proposition 4.132: Sexuality is not the positive extremity of friendship spectrum.

Proof) Friendship starts with commonality between two individuals. The strongest form of friendship is where the element of common interest vanishes. Assume x and y are friends. If the friendship last only as long as x and y can benefit from each other, the friendship is weak. If it lasts even if there is no mutual benefit, the friendship is strong. The strongest form of friendship is where x suffers detriment for the sake of y’s benefit. This is the loyalty of self-sacrifice. Sexuality is conditioned on mutual benefit, the exchange of pleasure. Thus, sexuality is not the strongest form of friendship.

105 “The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul.” 1 Samuel 18:1 (King James), available at [http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Samuel+18&version=KJV](http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Samuel+18&version=KJV). The question is, what is so sexual about it? Not every love is sexual in nature. The love between parents and their child, the love between siblings, the love between friends, between colleagues, between teachers and pupils, between comrades, compatriots, even between global cosmopolitans…, love is everywhere! None of these enumerated loves is sexual, at all. How come it is so hard for Freudian pro-gayists to understand that love is possible outside the context of sexuality? Do pro-gayists want Jonathan and David to have been sexual? Or are pro-gayists incapable of a pure asexual affection? If every close relationship has to be a sexual one, pro-gayists have a real problem. They cannot function in society- nobody wants to be around perennially sexual people who get sexual with everyone that they come in contact with. Probably this is the root cause of the problem of AIDS in gay males. A promiscuous gay male has such a hypertrophic sexual exuberance that he is incapable of an asexual relationship, to the extent that he cannot stop himself from thinking of sex, from wanting sex, and gets on with it whenever he can. This man is trapped into a path that not only destroys himself, but also everyone whom he sleeps with, by getting and passing AIDS and other STD’s. The fact that pro-gayists cannot help but seeing David and Jonathan’s relationship as a sexual one reveals the pro-gayists disability, i.e., an inability to keep a human relationship asexual. In a sharp contrast, gay females suffer from sexual atrophy. There is no risk, as they cannot have a ‘real’ sex, but they can have no satisfaction either. Sexual hypertrophy in gay males and atrophy in gay females is the inevitable consequences of the gender imbalance in conjugation: two people of the same sexually active gender and two of the same sexually passive gender put together, what results is an obvious consequence.

106 “The strongest love anyone can have is this. He will die to save his friends.” John 15:13 (Worldwide English), available at [http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John%2015&version=WE](http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John%2015&version=WE).
Progayists apply Wildean imputation to the friendship between Jesus and John, Ruth and Naomi, Achilles and Patroclus, Gilgamesh and Enkidu, and so on. Nietzsche aptly commented on the phenomenon:

The worst readers are those who act like plundering soldiers. They take out some things that they might use, cover the rest with filth and confusion, and blaspheme about the whole.\(^{107}\)

No matter how much a man loves his friend, he never gets sexual with him if it is a true friendship. Rather, he would want what is best for his friend, perhaps by introducing the best girl he can find to his friend, rather than having her to himself. The color of sexuality compromises the integrity and muddles the purity of friendship. It is analogous to the situation where the more a father loves his daughter, the less sexual he gets with her, actually none of such whatsoever, because he knows incestuousness is bad for the child. Asexual and sexual relationships are oriented toward two different directions. The further one deepens an asexual relationship, the farther it distances from sexuality.

Do progayists really think David had anal sex with Jonathan? Both warriors were God-fearing men. Why would God, who severely punished David for murder and adultery, have left David’s sodomy unrequited if it had been committed indeed? Are progayists being serious to imagine Gilgamesh and Enkidu were sexual with each other? When the two ancient heroes slept next to each other before the cedar forest, they held hands, not genitals. The writer of Gilgamesh saga was not shy about describing sexual acts. Had they been homosexual, it would have been recorded as such. To progayists, metaphor and simile evaporate from literature as soon as two same-sex characters are put together. They are just like their father, Dr. Freud, who so conveniently and expediently resorted to literalism whenever words smacked of sexuality.

The imputation of sexuality on asexual relationship is a metaphysical pollution. Pollution is the placement of x to an environment where x does not belong. Hot water is a pollution if poured in a creek, not in a bathtub. Cement is a pollution if dumped to a lake, not if used in a construction site. Rubbish is a pollution if tossed out the car window, not if discarded in a trash can. Defecation and urination have right place and time. Sexuality is a pollution if introduced to friendship or parental-filial relationship, not if applied in romantic relationship.

4.133 Kinseyan Imputation

According to Dr. Kinsey, everyone is bisexual, only differing in degrees. Heterosexuality and

\(^{107}\) Friedrich Nietzsche, Human, All Too Human, Part II 137 (1879), available at http://www.gutenberg.org/files/37841/37841-h/37841-h.html.


\(^{110}\) See http://www.ancienttexts.org/library/mesopotamian/gilgamesh/tab1.htm

\(^{111}\) See id. (Gilgamesh loved Enkidu as a wife); 1 Samuel 18 (King James) (Jonathan loved David as his own soul), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1%20Samuel%2018&version=KJV

\(^{112}\) See Mary C. Geach, Lying with the Body, 91 The Monist 523, 533 (2008) (“One should see, in the story of Sodom, a warning, based on primitive experience, that society can decay to the point where there is no separate class of homosexuals, but one undifferentiated lustful multitude.”).
homosexuality occupy either ends of the bisexual spectrum. The hypothesis was disproved in section 2.1231. Now let us examine where the misunderstanding is coming from. Two causes: the similarity between jealousy a priori and fantasy a priori, and the Freudian imputation. As examined in the section 3.32, a man is capable of appreciating another man’s sexual competency by jealousy a priori, which resembles a woman’s appreciation of a man by fantasy a priori. The man is also capable of befriending another man, and makes corporeal contact such as handshaking, patting on the back, etc.

Proposition 4.133: Kinseyan imputation is a subset of Freudian imputation.

Proof) Freudian imputation is fallacious inference of sexuality from the similarity between sexual relationship and asexual relationship. Kinseyan imputation infers homosexuality from the similarity between friendship and romantic relationship. Therefore, Kinseyan imputation is fallacious as much as Freudian imputation. Q.E.D.

4.133 Bagemihlian Imputation

Dr. Kinsey generalized homosexuality over homo sapiens. Dr. Bagemihl\textsuperscript{114} takes the step even further by generalizing homosexuality over every sexually reproductive species in nature\textsuperscript{115}. He observes the kiss of two male ducks. It is an expression of male homosexuality in ducks, a progayist may argue\textsuperscript{116}. Is it? In birds, beaks are like hands in humans. A bird pick up things, scratches its back, punches others, all with its beak, because it is the most agile part of its body. Two birds ‘kissing’ each other with beaks, therefore, is shaking hands in the world of birds\textsuperscript{117}. Also, animals have the same mechanism of corporeal communication that is social but asexual. They rub each other’s faces to express friendship, a behavior that occurs between a father and his daughter in humans. Bagemihlian imputation, like Kinseyan imputation, is a subset of Freudian imputation in the same line of reasoning as the proposition 4.132. The impossibility of natural homosexuality requires no mathematical proof- no ass wills to suffer the pain in the keister.

Bonobos are known to stimulate each other’s genitals to ease social tension. First of all, such behaviour does not mean they are bisexual, because there is no homosexual pairing is involved. To bonobos, it is the way everyone treats everyone else. Second of all, we are not bonobos. We don’t ‘emulate’ primates. To do so is to degenerate humanity to the level of beasts. When two male ducks go out together, they are adopting a buddy system. If they stay together, it is no different than having roommates.

Of course, it is possible that the two ducks are indeed feeling homosexual in their brains. Such assertion, however, is even more unfalsifiable than what goes on in a human mind. If no one can read another person’s mind, how can one read an animal’s mind? What is certain is that

\textsuperscript{114} Bruce Bagemihl is a linguist, not biologist. It is doubtful whether he published the book out of objective scientific inquiry or subjective political activism.

\textsuperscript{115} See Bruce Bagemihl, Biological Exuberance: Animal Homosexuality and Natural Diversity 78-79, 159 (1999).

\textsuperscript{116} See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexual_behavior_in_animals.

\textsuperscript{117} Imagine how awkward and cumbersome it would be for two birds to unfold their wings just to express friendship. Are two male ducks’ kiss ritualistic? So is two men's handshaking. The firmness of handshaking matters because it signifies sincerity, trust, and amity. Kiss on the cheek, forehead, or hand, genuflection, bow, all are asexual social ritual of comity. Not every ritual is sexual. To regard as such is to subscribe to the Freudian perversion, where every conceivable activity reduces to sexuality. The male ducks that kiss each other will no doubt end up mating female ducks. The ducks are not homosexual.
progayists want the wild animals to be gay. And people are known to see what they want to see. Does a mantis pray to God for forgiveness, or do we want it to pray because we cannot forgive the mantis preying on a beautiful butterfly? When gayists look at the animals, do they see the pristine nature or their gayist selves?

4.134 Victims of Homosexual Imputation

Progayists not only recruit live people, but also dead people as well. Such endeavor can be understood as gayists’ need for historical legitimacy.

4.1341 Pederasty

In ancient Greece, pederasty is a custom where an adult male indulged in a sexual favor of a young male of the age between 12-14, in exchange for patronage. Pederasty should be distinguished from gayism for three accounts. One, pederasty is not a full-blown homosexuality but a pseudo-homosexuality, because it is between a man and a quasi-man, not between two mature adult males. Two, to be more exact, pederasty is a pseudo-bisexuality, as most old men therein were married to women. Pederasty stops when the young male starts to be a real man. Pederasty lasts until the young man resemble a woman, with high-pitched voice and beardless face. Three, pederasty forbade anal sex, as such practice was deemed demeaning to the young man. Pederasty permitted intercrural sex, where the old man rubs his genital between the thighs of the young man. The only commonality between pederasty and gayism that both are no more than aided masturbations. In ancient Greece, society was a asexual prison for both men and women. Virtually no contraceptives existed then, thus sex outside wedlock was a tremendous threat. Women heavily covered their bodies, and seldom went outside home. Outside home, it was all men. Even at home, a man cannot have sex for pleasure, unless he is rich enough to support a dozen children. Outside home, there were no women. The condonement of pederasty was to cope with such prison-like situation where two genders were segregated into home and workplace. That is, pederasty was essentially a prison homosexuality. Today, genders are no longer segregated and contraceptives are freely available. There is diminished need for pederasty, if any. Attributing a precedential weight of social legitimacy of gayism is an anachronism.

Plus, the very fact that progayists proudly regard pederasty as a historical precedence of socially approved gayism betrays a serious problem in itself. Can pedophilia be justified just because it is between the same sex? This is a common pattern in progayist claims: a socially forbidden act become suddenly acceptable if it is associated with gayism because gayism is a protected group and because of the special protection, everything that gayists do is protected. Political censorship of scientific research\textsuperscript{118}, legal bullyism\textsuperscript{119}, restriction of free speech\textsuperscript{120}, deprivation of property right\textsuperscript{121}, distortion of

\textsuperscript{118} see regnerus affair
\textsuperscript{119} see forced business closure
\textsuperscript{120} see antigayist remark sanctioned
\textsuperscript{121} see adam’s hypo
history, distortion of science, pollution of friendship, adultery, even AIDS, every problem suddenly stops being a problem if it is gay. The glasses of gayism is a metaphysical hallucinogen that tears apart the moral texture of society: it generates a state of euphoria that anesthetizes sensibility, moral qualm, and alertness necessary to perceive potential danger and prevent predictable harms.

4.1342 Tutelage

Tutelagial relationship between a master and an apprentice is the intersection of parental-filial relationship and friendship, neither of which is sexual. Therefore, the progayist ‘tradition’ of imputation to portray the relationship as homosexual is the intersection of Oedipusian imputation and Wildean imputation.

4.1343 Camaraderie

Battlefield is where life and death are everyday business. It is a solemn duty of a soldier never to leave a fallen comrade. When soldiers risk their lives and limbs to save those of others, a very special kind of relationship develops. The bond is often ‘thicker than blood.’ To characterize such sacred relationship as sexuality is a sacrilege, if not insanity. Progayists are advised to think twice before their fiendish fever leads to any further metaphysical crimes.

In single-gender schools, boy scouts, monastery, jail, sports teams, and military, two genders are separated to preclude sexuality for morale and disciplinary purpose. ‘Don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy (“DADT”) is an unwritten disapproval of gayism in the military. Now that it is repealed, how can the military preclude sexuality? Should there be four quarters to separate males, females, male gays, and lesbians? The two gay quarters will result in homosexual depravity. Then the only solution is to give each gay soldier a private quarter, which is not only impractical and impossible but also nonsensical and

---

122 see michelangelo
123 see two authors
124 see david
125 see extradyadic
126 see stat
127 cite army value
129 The talent of a career criminal is the ability to manipulate others by lie, sympathy and threat. Progayists boast their expertise in all three: lie (innateness and immutability of gayism), sympathy (equality, fairness, pictures of happy gay families, holocaust of gays by Nazi, gay teen suicide, school bullyism on gays), and threat (weaponized litigation of gay right advocates, social excommunication, media excoriation, and job termination on antigayists).
130 The DADT issue exposes a bigger problem of gayism generally applicable to society- the bathroom paradox. The reason why society separates genders in restrooms, locker rooms, and shower facilities is to avoid unwanted sexual tensions and attentions. In a progayist society, gender separation becomes meaningless and dysfunctional in prevention of public sexuality, as a gay man in a male restroom is no better than letting a straight man enter a female locker room. A man who surgically became a woman is still a man in every cell of his body, no matter how he denies it. Will women of today or tomorrow be ok with the she-male seeing them naked in the gym’s shower facility? Here is a conundrum: if the segregation of males and females in restrooms is not unconstitutional, the segregation of straight males and gay males in restrooms should not be unconstitutional either. Then should we segregate gays? This is an impasse. The problem becomes unsolvable if society recognizes LGBT as legitimate gender classes. The only way out of the mire is to not recognize LGBT and to deny their claims of legitimacy. LGBT, no matter how much popular support it has now, is an anomaly and aberration. To accept LGBT as legitimate genders is to derail the entire society.
absurd. Here is an illustration of how open gayism can jeopardize military morale. Imagine you are a soldier deployed oversea. You are sleeping next to a soldier who is harboring homosexual fantasy about you. Can he hide the infatuation? What if he is not even forced to hide it? Gayists should not be allowed to be soldiers precisely because they are gay, because they impede others to serve their country. Worrying about people next to them having homosexual crushes is the last thing they need to unite and survive to win the war they are fighting.

4.1344 Socrates

(blockquote charmides, socrates’ comment on young man)

Stars does not shine save the darkness surrounding them. Heroes are born not in the brightest, but in the grimmest age. Without the background of the mediocre, a genius cannot stand on the foreground. In Symposium, Plato narrates the prevalence of pederastic culture. People surround Socrates, arguing for the merit of homoeroticism, and try to persuade the philosopher. In the end, the conclusion Socrates reaches is Platonic love, the antithesis of erotic love, where the love is not of lust but of knowledge. Platonic love is ethereal, erotic love is corporeal. In Charmides, the philosopher was introduced a beau, a young and willing young man who is no stranger to pederasty. Socrates, in the face of pederastic temptation, teaches the young man the virtue of temperance. The progayist view of pederasty in Symposium and Charmides is the background that is to be countered, and eventually negated by the protagonist, Socrates. The progayists’ allegation of homosexuality of Plato and Socrates commits the fallacy of selective attention\textsuperscript{131}, to say the least\textsuperscript{132}.

4.1345 Michelangelo Buonarroti

It is not impossible that Michelangelo (“Mike”) was gay: a dead man cannot speak. Even if he were alive, who can tell whether he is telling the truth? Mike was a celibate. As briefly covered in the section 4.143, pre-modern celibacy has a religious hue. For Mike, sexual abstinence presumably contributed to the monumental achievement, where a single-minded focus and absence of distraction are conducive, if not necessary, elements. Perhaps that was the motivation of his celibacy, the priority of work over family or sexual pleasure. Mike was a poet. In many of his poems, he expresses friendly affections.

(blockquote luigio, beauty of eyes)

Of course, Mike was an artist above all. The job of an artist is to see beauty in everything. Even as mundane a thing as a stone, an artist perceive the crude, blunt, rugged, primordial aesthetics that is unique to each stone. That does not make the artist a man who harbors fetish fantasy about stones. The

\textsuperscript{131} wiki cherry picking. The situation is analogous to Blades of Glory. The two skaters maintained their heterosexuality despite the circumstances inductive to homosexuality, which only proves how steadfast their heterosexuality is.

perception of beauty far exceeds the gamut of sexuality. Sexuality is only a small, perhaps an infinitesimal fraction of nature, of the universe. When we see a picture of a galaxy whose spiral arms swirl around the shining center, we are not being sexual. Back to the earthen artist, when Mike sees beauty in a young man’s eyes, or in the body of a muscular man, he is witnessing the pristine beauty of the nature that his God created in the Garden of Eden.

While Mike was never sexually explicit in his private mails, he was always sexually explicit in his public paintings. The Last Judgment on the wall of Sistine Chapel are full of nude figures. Traditionally, biblical apocalypse is a common theme among medieval painters. The theme is based on a passage in Bible:

(block quote Matthews 15:31-46)

In those paintings, Jesus is at the center, on his right (viewer’s left) are the righteous, and on his left (viewer’s right) are the iniquitous. Mike followed the tradition by placing Jesus at the center, the redeemed on the stage-right, and the condemned on the stage-left. On the stage-left are two men passionately cuddling each other, another couple of men actually kissing each other. Remember, Mike feared neither objection nor controversy from church officials or fellow Christians. His usage of nudity in biblical figures ired many of his contemporaries. He did it anyways. Had Mike been a gayist or progayist, he would have placed the homosexual characters on the stage-right, not stage-left. Or he could have omitted the subject completely, as not every painters of the apocalyptic theme depicted homosexuality. Mike had no personal obligation to draw homosexual men. Rather, a devout Christian, Mike perhaps felt a religious duty to pronounce the biblical antigayism, with which he personally agreed. Michelangelo, therefore, was neither a gayist nor progayist, but an antigayist. On the stage-right are figures with feminine bosoms and masculine musculatures that resemble the statue of Hermaphroditus. Did the 16th-century painter envision the desirability of contragendability?

4.1346 Leonardo da Vinci

Progayists vehemently contend that da Vinci was a gayist. The portrait of St. John the Baptist is, to many, too ‘gay.’ Then, is Mona Lisa too ‘lesbian?’ Like his career interests that span over multiple disciplines, da Vinci’s genius is in amorphousness, proteaneness, nebulousness. The indefinable mystery of ambiguity is the key quality of the painter. It may be arguably true that da Vinci, in his younger days, might have dabbled with different forms of sexuality. Nonetheless, da Vinci was a career celibate, not unlike Mike. It used to be da Vinci’s detractors who claimed his homosexuality, now it is progayists. What one should remember is that androgyny is neither sufficient nor necessary condition for homosexuality. A man can be effeminate without being gay, and can be gay and not effeminate. As

133 website in hungary
134 cite dismissed sodomy charge. Da Vinci was tried in court for the sodomy in 1476, and the charge was dismissed for lack of evidence. More than five centuries later, the late painter is now posthumously brought back to the Court of Humanity for the charge of homosexuality. Apparently, the statute of limitation does not apply in this Court.
examined in the section 4.113, contragendability may raise the chance for one’s gay-susceptibility, but does not make one a gayist. As examined in the section 4.1242, one without contragendability may choose to be gay out of convenience, to avoid the cost of heterosexual relationship. It is understandable that da Vinci’s unequivocalness confuses viewers and readers, who do not know what to make of his painting or even his life.

It is doubtful, however, that the painter intended homosexuality to be the answer to his enigma. It is undoubtable that da Vinci knew about biblical antigayism, as sodomy was a capital crime in his era. At the same time, as the painter left few writing about his personal beliefs, it is uncertain whether he was even a devout Christian. Then, is it likely that da Vinci parodied the bible by portraying John the Baptist as a gay man? Were all the Christian-themed painting, including The Last Supper, nothing but a facade to the Christian society that he disdained, and works for hire to make money? To answer on the positive is to deny rationality. Look at da Vinci’s paintings. No painter, not even as great a genius as da Vinci, can draw such works of art without the unity of mind, spirit, and soul. No one can achieve such degree of original perfection by faking, by pretending the belief he does not subscribe to.

There is another painting of Saint John the Baptist, commonly attributed to some of da Vinci’s pupils. The painting was later overpainted to give a laurel on the Saint’s head and grapes on his left hand. The purpose was to transform the Saint into Bacchus, the roman god of wine, revelry, and debauchery. The episode mirrors progayism, where the biographies of pious celibates are overwritten to make the stories of historic homosexuals.

4.13461 Bacchus and Gayism

Gayists often associate themselves with Bacchus, or Bacchanalia, i.e. a roman cult of Bacchus. Historically, Bacchanalia is one of the most extreme forms of moral decadence, whose religious orgy had no lower limit:

At first these were divulged to only a few; then they began to spread amongst both men and women, and the attractions of wine and feasting increased the number of his followers. When they were heated with wine and the nightly commingling of men and women, those of tender age with their seniors, had extinguished all sense of modesty, debaucheries of every kind commenced; each had pleasures at hand to satisfy the lust he was most prone to. Nor was the mischief confined to the promiscuous intercourse of men and women; false witness, the forging of seals and testaments, and false informations, all proceeded from the same source, as also poisonings and murders of families where the bodies could not even be found for burial. Many crimes were committed by treachery; most by violence, which was kept secret, because the cries of those who were being violated or murdered could not be heard owing to the noise of drums and cymbals. This pestilential evil penetrated from Etruria to Rome like a contagious disease. . . . One way of corrupting the youth's morals was through the Bacchanalia.

At first they were confined to women; no male was admitted, and they had three stated days in the year on which persons were initiated during the daytime, and matrons were chosen to act as priestesses. Paculla Annia, a Campanian, when she was priestess, made a complete change, as

though by divine monition, for she was the first to admit men, and she initiated her own sons, Minius Cerinnius and Herennius Cerinnius. At the same time she made the rite a nocturnal one, and instead of three days in the year celebrated it five times a month. When once the mysteries had assumed this promiscuous character, and men were mingled with women with all the licence of nocturnal orgies, there was no crime, no deed of shame, wanting. More uncleanness was wrought by men with men than with women. Whoever would not submit to defilement, or shrank from violating others, was sacrificed as a victim. To regard nothing as impious or criminal was the very sum of their religion. The men, as though seized with madness and with frenzied distortions of their bodies, shrieked out prophecies; the matrons, dressed as Bacchae, their hair dishevelled, rushed down to the Tiber with burning torches, plunged them into the water, and drew them out again, the flame undiminished, as they were made of sulphur mixed with lime. Men were fastened to a machine and hurried off to hidden caves, and they were said to have been rapt away by the gods; these were the men who refused to join their conspiracy or take a part in their crimes or submit to pollution. They formed an immense multitude, almost equal to the population of Rome; amongst them were members of noble families both men and women. It had been made a rule for the last two years that no one more than twenty years old should be initiated; they captured those to be deceived and polluted.

The praetor L. Duronius... was further charged with an investigation into the Bacchanalia, some remains of which had come to light the previous year, seeds as it were sown by the earlier mischief... The senate sent orders to the new praetor to cut the evil out and prevent it from spreading.

Did gayists consciously choose Bacchus their god, or is it a result of subconscious affinity therewith?

4.1347 Others

Progayists as a long list of ‘historic gays’ that includes Alexander the Great, Leonardo Da Vinci, Tchaikovsky, Shakespeare, Byron, Virginia Woolf, Wittgenstein, Proust, John Cage, and even St. Augustine! Let us briefly cover three of the giants—Shakespeare, Byron, and Tchaikovsky. It defies reason to think that their inspiration of music and literature comes from homoeroticism. Had they been

---

139 See Alan Soble, Correcting Some Misconceptions about St. Augustine's Sex Life, 11 J. Hist. Sexuality 545, 546-47 (2002) (there is no historical evidence that St. Augustine was gay). Contra The Gay 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential Gay Men and Lesbians, Past and Present (last visited Jan. 27, 2014, 10:36 PM), http://www.adherents.com/people/100_gay.html; Famous GLB People in History: You're in Good Company! (last visited Jan. 27, 2014, 10:38 PM), http://www.lambda.org/famous.htm. It takes only one person's lie to distort the history, if the public is eager to accept the story as the history. Progayists suspect St. Augustine was gay because he was promiscuous in his youth. Progayists suspect Michelangelo was gay because he was celibate for life (see infra, 4.1345). To progayists, X must be gay because X had sex more than normal people, and Y must be gay because Y had no sex at all. That is, no matter what one does or how one lives, one just has to be gay because progayists want them to. Progayists are forcing the eyes to the queer. It is hard to imagine how much humiliation and offense these historic figures would feel if they were to be alive today. The dead do not talk, but it is also said, "speak no ill of the dead." Progayists, ever devoid of respect for the tradition, ancestors, and morality, are willing to color the entire civilization with the blunt dub of gay gray, if they can. This is why we must put a stop on this orgy of irrationality, before too late, before it spreads, propagates, and engulfs.
homosexual, how could they have rooted the plots of romance between a man and a woman so consistently, vividly, and intimately? Could they have imagined all of it, had they not felt any sense of sexuality towards women? Was Shakespeare thinking of Romeo and Julius when he wrote Romeo and Juliet? Was it a story of Clara and Princess that Tchaikovsky had in mind when he composed The Nutcracker? Was it a man that Byron envisaged when he wrote She Walks in Beauty?

For the rest, it is uncertain how many of them were indeed homosexual for life, or left casual notes recording transient, perhaps experimental stream of homosexual thoughts, or simply were horse-playing. It is conceivable that many of them were falsely accused to be gay by their occupational competitors or political opponents who wanted to denigrate them by any means. It is not a fair play to characterize one’s entire life based on a momentary flow of consciousness. Lastly, it is highly plausible that most of them are imputed to be gay by progayists, who have every reason to embrace the historic icons' homosexuality, if true, and to believe in their homosexuality, even if untrue. The progayist self-deception is understandable but deplorable. Desperation of self-preservation breaks the chain of rationality. If one is true and honest to oneself, one will not find legitimacy of gayism in history. The only pre-modern society in record that condoned gay marriage is Sodom and Gomorrah\(^\text{140}\). Even if one finds a historic achiever, does it make him a model human to live and dream after? Oscar Wildes, Alan Turing, Michel Foucault, Maynard Keynes, Andy Warhol, Gianni Versace, all of whom were openly gay, ended their lives with untimely deaths. Is the tragedy a coincidence? Or is it a consequence\(^\text{141}\)?

4.1348 Gay and the Rainbow

The word ‘gay’ used to mean happy, as in gayety or in ‘Gay Science’ by Nietzsche. Gayist expropriated the word without permission and abolished the the traditional usage of the word from the tongues of the public. A rainbow used to symbolize childhood, innocence, and the promise of hope\(^\text{142}\). Now, one cannot picture a rainbow without thinking gayist exhibitionism. This is yet another metaphysical pollution of gayism.

4.14 Psychoanalysis

4.141 Happiness

Pleasure and pain are physiological responses by which evolution guides an organism toward survival to survival of the individual and perpetuity of the species. Happiness is the pursuit of pleasure and avoidance of pain. Therefore, the way, the method to achieve happiness is dictated by the confines of biology. Free will works under such constraints of physiology and psychology\(^\text{143}\). One is free to pursue happiness, but never free to determine how one can be happy: one cannot smell honey off of a stone,

\(^{140}\) see Genesis 19 (male requested to have sex with a ‘male’ angel)


\(^{142}\) see The Wizard of Oz

\(^{143}\) “Thus an infant believes that of its own free will it desires milk . . . a timid child believes that it freely desires to run away . . . the dictates of the mind are but another name for the appetites, and therefore vary according to the varying state of the body.” Benedict de Spinoza, Ethics (1677).
without deluding oneself. Homosexuality generates pleasure only to the extent of its similarity to heterosexuality.

As a side, let us make another analogy off of the Cartesian coordinate of inertial frame. Wage of $x per month can be thought as a speed with which one earns one’s living. The constancy of wage speed cannot generate happiness. It is the acceleration of the speed (e.g. salary raise, promotion) that can make one happy\(^{144}\). Previously, we examined how time dilation phenomenon relates to the perception of time in a busier man\(^ {145}\). To be more precise, when one feels time goes faster, one is comparing his clock not with others’ but with his past self, the past state of his wherein the pace of his life was slower. Happiness is not about the speed of life, but the acceleration thereof. No matter what speed of life one lives in, the human condition of habituation bars the derivation of happiness from it\(^ {146}\). Inertia of life speed leads to habituation, which begets Sisyphean tedium, which brings about the diminishing return of happiness. This explains why the lack of acceleration (e.g. no progress), as well as deceleration (e.g. demotion), leads to unhappiness.

4.142 Free-will Analysis

Gayism starts with self-contradiction. Gender and gender propensity is determined by the genes in every single cell of one’s body. Human psyche can mask the genetic code by free will, but the degree of pleasure the body allows cannot be altered by free will. Gayism is an impersonated reasoning where one assumes an identity of fiction. A gayist, for one reason or another, consciously conditions oneself to silence one’s heterosexual impulse and to transfer the libido toward the same-sex, and train one’s brain to homosexual arousal. Gayism is a product of self-imposed mental habit. Antigayistic repulsion against the same-sex is a biological response, as much as attraction to the opposite-sex is. A gayist overcomes the natural instinct by mental working of free will. A gayist convinces himself that sexual attraction to men is what he is. This is the start of self-deception.

4.143 Deception Domino

The gayist moves on to outside himself. He declares to the world that homosexuality is who he is. This is the second deception. The gayist finds a partner, engages in kissing and touching on the same-sex, overcoming natural repulsion by free will. This is the third deception. He plays a recipient. The pain in the rectum is undeniable, but his mind overrides the warning system of his body. He consciously perceives the pain as masochistic pleasure. This is the fourth deception. Now he plays a penetrator. The squalor of feces and stench of his partner’s rectum are unmistakable. His gayist will, again, supercedes biological warning of aversion to filth. He affirms filth as something acceptable. This is the Fifth deception. Since gayist sex does not lead to pregnancy, the gayist has less reason to use contraceptives. There is a risk of STDs, however, but he again overrides the warning of rationality and engage himself in ‘barebacking’ (unprotected anal sex). This is the sixth deception. Once one is deep down the self-

\(^{144}\) Wage acceleration is one instance. There are zillions of ways for positive changes that qualifies as happiness quantum: losing weight, gaining muscle weight, fashion shopping, home decoration, new hobby, new foreign language, new friends, cutting on smoking or drinking, marriage, having children, taking classes, moving to a different state, traveling, etc. What is common in these happiness-generating activities is that they all take the miniplastic trajectory. See infra 4.241.

\(^{145}\) See supra, § 2.232.

\(^{146}\) See infra, § 5.157.
destructive path of self-deception that dismisses biological, rational, and moral warnings, the next warning has lesser and lesser effect on him. The gayist becomes an activist to justify his act, i.e., a progayist. He weaponizes legal system to engage in the legal witch-hunting against antigayists. The juggernaut of progayism effuses reality distortion field\textsuperscript{147}, and magnifies itself to claim its territory in history, law, literature, science, politics, and even religion.

4.2 Law of Sociology

4.21 Problems in Methodology

4.211 Researcher Bias

Who would be the most motivated to devote their lives in the single subject of LGBT study, progayists or antigayists? For most antigayists, the presence of gayism is no more than an ethical nuisance. For all progayists, progayism is a matter of existential survival, if they themselves are gayists, or a matter of compassion if their loved ones are gayists. It is no surprise the majority of academics in LGBT ‘science’ claim their studies show that gayism leads to no harm\textsuperscript{148}. The amount of discretion in designing, conducting, and interpreting a social study is enormous, if not unlimited. There are ways to select study subjects that would support the researcher’s ready-made conclusion. There are ways to structure questionnaire to induce desirable answers. For the harm analysis of gayism, reliance on progayist social scientists, who consists the super-majority in LGBT studies, is as absurd as putting a cat in charge of a hamster out of the cage\textsuperscript{149}.

4.212 Subject Bias

It is impossible for a survey in LGBT study to be double-blinded. The impact of an answer to a survey question is transparent. If responders are intelligent enough to answer the question, they should very well understand what answer is favorable to themselves or their parents. Assume an LGBT study’s

\textsuperscript{147} For the origin of the term, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reality_distortion_field

\textsuperscript{148} See Loes van Gelderen, Henny M. W. Bos, Nanette Gartrell, Jo Hermans, Ellen C. Perrin, Quality of life of adolescents raised from birth by lesbian mothers: the US National Longitudinal Family Study, 33 J. Dev. & Behav. Pediatrics 17, (2012) (there is no difference in quality of life between children of lesbian parents and those of straights). Simple internet name searches would reveal that at least two of the authors of the study are LGBT activists. In criminal law context, a willful ignorance is a punishable crime. See United States v. Jewell, 532 F.2d 697, 700 (9th Cir. 1976) (citing Prof. Rollin M. Perkins, “One with a deliberate antisocial purpose in mind... may deliberately 'shut his eyes' to avoid knowing what would otherwise be obvious to view. In such cases, so far as criminal law is concerned, the person acts at his peril in this regard, and is treated as having 'knowledge' of the facts as they are ultimately discovered to be.”). See also United States v. Giovannetti, 919 F.2d 1223, 1228 (7th Cir. 1990) (“[t]hey [, the ostriches] bury their heads in the sand so that they will not see or hear bad things. They deliberately avoid acquiring unpleasant knowledge.”). The corpus of LGBT studies constitute the willful blindness that not only blinds progayists and gayists themselves, but the society at large as well.

\textsuperscript{149} “No man is allowed to be a judge in his own cause, because his interest would certainly bias his judgment, and, not improbably, corrupt his integrity.” Federalist 10, James Madison, available at http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/18/pg18.html.
subjects are 100 volunteering individuals. Assume the advertisement for the survey announces the nature of the study beforehand. An individual with unsuccessful relationship, if he is loyal to gayism, has reasons not to participate in the study. Assume the advertisement does not inform even the general subject matter that it regards to LGBT. The first question of gives it away: “what is your sexuality? a. heterosexual; b. homosexual; c. bisexual; d. decline to answer.” The next question asks, “how satisfied is your current relationship, or was your most recent relationship?” A loyal gayist with unsuccessful relationship experience has reasons to either quit the survey, or be dishonest in answers.

Now assume the LGBT study is about the impact of LGBT parents on their adopted or surrogated children. If one cannot change one’s environment, it is the best policy to affirm it, accept it, and live with it, rather than to deny or negate it. The children of gayist parents have reasons to answer in ways favorable to gayism. For instance, a question asks, “How do you evaluate your parents from 1 to 10?” How many children would not answer 10 when they have years to live with their parents? Especially they know that their parents are gayists, that answering “1” will prejudice their parents, and that their parents are in dire need of defense from antigayist criticisms?

4.22 Society as an Organism

4.221 Mirror Image

In a eukaryotic cell, there are a cell membrane, a nucleus, mitochondria, and lysosomes. In a mammal, there are a skin, a brain, a heart, and an immune system. In a nation, there are a borderline, a government, factories, and a law enforcement.

4.222 Homeostasis

Homeostasis is an organism's anti-entropic force. An organism maintains consistency and integrity against random variation of environment. In single cell organisms, homeostasis is achieved through biochemical reactions. In a higher organism, the sensation of pleasure and pain further guides the host toward homeostatic equilibrium. Homeostatic law is subjective and relative across species, objective and absolute within species. An elephant’s paradise is a whale’s hell. A whale’s playground shared by other whales. The body of an organism causes pain when the host violates homeostatic law, and pleasure when it complies. The homeostasis of a society is called status quo. The body of law is the society’s anti-entropic force to prevent social disorder. Reward and punishment system is the homeostatic mechanism of society as an organism.

4.2221 Absolutivity of Homeostasis

Environmental variation is relativistic in both time and space. One wears a shirt in summer, a coat in winter. In March, one wears a shirt in Texas, a coat in Alaska. One’s reaction to ambient temperature, i.e., the decision to wear what, is relative to the weather of one’s whereabouts. What does

150 cite genesis ‘man is image of God’
151 The overturn of a society’s status quo is justified only if there is a change in social condition that justifies the change of social policy. Feminism is a justified change of status quo, as technology freed women from home. See infra 4.282. Abolitionism is a justified change, as forced immigrants from Africa obtained language skill and acculturation equivalent to the Caucasian counterpart. See id.
not change is the body temperature. Since one’s body must maintain 98.6 Fahrenheit no matter when and where one finds oneself, one change one’s clothing. Thus, the relativity of one’s action is to preserve the homeostatic absolutivity in reaction to the relativity of environment.

4.223 Evolution

Environmental variation is randomized over time and space. The specificity of an environment dictates the specificity of the evolution of a species. Evolution starts with the random process of mutation and continues with nonrandom process of natural selection. Mutation continues and individuals with relative advantages over others win competitions and their genes predominate the next generation. Accumulation of advantageous mutated genes achieves more complexity in the physiology of a species, increasing the degree of order, decreasing entropy. The more billiard balls there are, the more ways where balls can be arranged, and so the less probable it gets for the balls to be aligned in a descending order. Likewise, the more evolved a species is, the more complex it gets, and the more ways there will be for its organism to go malfunction. An organism’s homeostatic laws increase complexity to mirror the complexity of the physiology.

Societal evolution mirrors that of the nature. In the beginning, there were a man and a woman, and there was one law: do not eat the fruit of the tree. Then there gathered more people, increasing complexity of society, and they had ten laws, the Commandments of Moses. Millennia later, the body of laws spans over multiple databases.

4.23 Metaphysical Mutation

Microevolution occurs in homo sapiens. A person changes over time and space. Not every mutation leads to evolution, as evolution selects only beneficial mutation. When one is exposed to a foreign idea, the first reaction is defense. One objects before one examines. Once one encounters the same idea repeatedly, the idea is no longer foreign. One then examines, and if cogent, the idea gets incorporated into one’s value system.

Certain mutations are fatal. Radicalization turns one into a terrorist, whose life may be terminated due to the detrimental mutation. Metaphysical genes propagate through communicative media, such as conversation, email, books, news, movies, songs, and internet. Not every civilization is immortal. A nation is a single-organism species, a species with one individual that rejuvenates itself in every generation. A nation falls when it allows a mutant cell to propagate, proliferate, and prevail. Cancer becomes fatal not when it is covertly localized, but when cancer cells overtly metastasizes via legitimate circulatory system of the body, like blood or lymphatic vessels. The legitimization of gayism means more than gay marriage. It is the ratification of immorality. Gayism is a metaphysical carcinogen that is about to usurp the social conduits of media and legal system unless we stop it.

4.231 Gayism as Incomplete Mutation

Metaphysical mutation at will is feasible, physiological mutation at will is not. It may not take too long for a single cell organism to mutate to make a new species. For a multicellular organism as complex as homo sapiens, perhaps the most complex of all, physiological evolution takes a ‘fairly’ long time, probably thousands of millennia, if not more. Hardship of courtship in males, impatience against
‘waiting’ in females, and aversion of judgmentality by the opposite sex in both sexes cause the declaration of gayism. The determination is a metaphysical mutation unaccompanied by physiological mutation. Sexuality is tied to physiology- it is both mental and physical in essence. Thus, homosexuality is an incomplete mutation that creates conflict between body and mind\(^{152}\). If one is not amoral, one suffers another conflict between mind and spirit. This is the cause of metaphysical instability in gayists\(^{153}\). No matter how accepting a society becomes towards gayism, the problem will not part from gayists. Inner conflict is a problem inherent in gayism.

4.2.32 Repercussion of Incomplete Mutation

Homosexual sex is coercive. The minds of two individuals force what their bodies are not equipped, designed, or evolved to handle. The result is injury in male gayists and dissatisfaction in female gayists\(^{154}\). Male gayists substitute rectal opening for female genital. In a straight sex, both partners experience sensual pleasure. In a male gay sex, only the penetrator experience a simulative sensation, as the location and size of rectal opening resembles the female counterpart’s. The recipient, on the other hand, incurs the pain in the rectum. Rectal opening does not support continuous, extended period of shuttling motion of a foreign object. Its physiological function dictates the organ to have one outward direction, defecation. In a female gay sex, the recipient feels the sensation of penetration similar to that of a male genital. The penetrator feels nothing, as her nerves do not extend to the wearable prosthetic. Even the orgasmic experience of the gay male penetrator and lesbian recipient is not satisfactory, as the effect is a mere mimicry of biological sex. Gay males compensate for the dissatisfaction with promiscuity and adultery. Infidelity is an inherent consequence of male gayism and institutionalization of gay marriage will not make it go away.

In both male and female gay sex, the pleasure is not mutual but unilateral. In a given sexual episode, only one partner can reach an orgasm. If an adult, on average, needs two libidinal discharges per week, a gay couple needs to have sex four times a week, twice for each partner. This is a significant burden. Male gayists’ solution to the problem, again, is the infidelity agreement, where both parties agree


\(^{153}\) See Michael King et al., *A Systematic Review of Mental Disorder, Suicide, and Deliberate Self-Harm in Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People*, 8 BMC Psychiatry 70, 70 (2008) (gayists suffer more mental illness than straights); Thomas C. Mills et al., *Distress and Depression in Men Who Have Sex With Men: The Urban Men’s Health Study*, 161 Am. J. Psychiatry 278, 278 (2004) (gay men get depressed more than straight men). Contra Apu Chakraborty et al., *Mental health of the non-heterosexual population of England*, 198 Brit. J. Psychiatry 143, 145-46 (2011) (increased mental illness in gays are due to perceived discrimination). People’s aversion toward gayism has evolutionary origin (infra 4.2.845), and so antigayism is biological response ingrained in genetic level. No matter how progayist a society gets, gayists will be treated differently. No matter how snake-friendly a society becomes, however many endangered species laws protect snakes, people will still avoid snakes. No law, no social condition can change genetic dispositions.

\(^{154}\) Sexual dissatisfaction in gayists, in turn, leads to weakened spousal bonding.
to keep the sexual relationship open and nonexclusive. The solution leads to more problems, however. First, promiscuity weakens relationship. Second, promiscuity invites STDs, including AIDS. Female gayists, on the other hand, have no solution. Unlike males, whose natural propensity is promiscuity, females are not inclined to sexual adventures. Still belonging the gender of sexual passivity, lesbians tend to stay home, unsatisfied. The result is what is known as the lesbian death bed. Sexual dissatisfaction weakens relationship. Adultery destabilizes relationship. Dissatisfaction in lesbians and adultery in male gays are inherent characteristics, inevitable consequence of same-sex coupling. Therefore, the weakness of relationship is inherent in gayism. Two nuts do not bind. Two bolts do not tighten. Two keys cannot protect the family from invaders. Two locks cannot open to door to happiness.

In a sex where only one partner reaches an orgasm, the other partner suffers detriment of disappointment and tantalization. If such a negative mental state recurs over one’s lifetime, it is not hard to foresee its impact on the person’s mental health. The situation is worse in gay males. Anal sex is a physical abuse in essence, where one derives pleasure at the other’s expense. The receiving partner cannot help but suffering pain while the other enjoys the act. Imagine such masochistic and sadistic practices last for five decades. Will there be any humanity left in them?

4.24 Harm

To review, subjectivity is about opinion of minority, objectivity about majority common sense, or consensus. Relativity is about variability and absolutivity about invariance. An opinion is covariant to circumstances, thus is relative. A fact or truth is invariant to observers, thus is absolute. Absolutivity transcends subjectivity and objectivity. Relativity governs subjectivity and objectivity, as both of them are subject to changes. An act is harmful if its cost exceeds its benefit. Cost is the sum of pre-act price and post-act detriment. A act is immoral, if there is a mores that forbids the act. Since a mores is a rule to prevent a harm, an immoral act is an act that society perceives as harmful. Therefore, an individual’s mores is subjective and social mores is objective. Nonetheless, since a harm is a factual entity, a mores

---

155 In Amsterdam, the relationship of a male gay couple under the age 30 lasts 1.5 years on average. Maria Xiridou et al., The contribution of steady and casual partnerships to the incidence of HIV infection among homosexual men in Amsterdam, 17 AIDS 2003,1030-32. AIDS transmission is more likely to occur in a ‘committed’ relationship, where male gays engage in unprotected anal intercourse (UAI), than in a casual sex. Id. Since the relationship expires in a couple of years and the gay men move one for others, the short-term commitment has no preventive force against AIDS.


158 “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.” Genesis 2:24 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+2&version=KJV. The corporeal union of two people can achieve a unity, the one-ness of their bodies, only when the pleasure and pain of the two are synchronized. When two men have sex, one enjoys pleasure while the other suffers from pain. When two women have sex, one enjoys the stimulation while the other feels nothing. Asynchrony of sexual pleasure is yet another cause of homosexual dissatisfaction. A serious implication is on the nature of relationship. If one rejoices when the other suffers, that is not a relationship of allies but of enemies. If one is in bliss when the other is indifferent, it is not a conjugation of intimacy, but a juxtaposition of estrangement.
has a possibility of absolutivity. What x wants depends on x’s need. If x’s body lacks vitamin C, x wants an orange. When x’s body does not lack it, x does not have an appetite for an orange. Thus, desire is relativistic: it depends on x’s nutritional needs. In contrast, what x needs is absolutistic\textsuperscript{159}. If x suffers from cavity, it does not matter whether x wants to visit a dentist or not. x needs to go to dentist. Harmfulness of an act is factual, and thus absolutistic. A mushroom’s poisonousness does not depend on a hiker’s relative knowledge\textsuperscript{160}. x’s subjective assessment of the mushroom is either absolutely correct or incorrect. A consensual conjecture of 100 others that the mushroom is not poisonous has no effect on the fact.

4.241 Utilitarian Modeling

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Fig. 4.241a}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Fig.4.241b}
\end{figure}

Pleasure and pain are constants in life\textsuperscript{161}. Fig. 4.241a illustrates the life trajectory of work and reward. The work-reward curve yields a positive-sum of +1 (\(\approx -1 + 2\))\textsuperscript{162}, as a result of observance of positive moral maxim, such as ‘be diligent.’ Fig. 4.241b is the trajectory of violation and consequence. The break-suffer curve yields a negative-sum of -1 (\(\approx +1 - 2\)), as a consequence of breaking an inhibitory moral such as ‘do not steal.’ An act or inact is beneficial, neutral, harmful if it yields positive-sum, zero-

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{159} Relativity is local while absolutivity is global. x’s need of vitamin C may change from minute to minute depending his dietary composition, but x’s monthly, or yearly intake amount needed for health does not change.

\textsuperscript{160} Cf. One woman’s medicine is another’s poison. Peanuts, for instance, are Jane’s snack but Jill’s poison, as she is allergic to it.

\textsuperscript{161} See Jeremy Bentham, Theory of Legislation, available at \url{http://archive.org/stream/benthamstheoryof01bent/benthamstheoryof01bent_djvu.txt}. Bentham is said to have wrote an unpublished progayist paper. See Jeremy Bentham (Jan.17, 2014, 5:22 AM), \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeremy_Bentham}. Even Bentham is a human being. The fact that one is right on one issue does not mean one is right on every issue. To regard so is to commit the fallacy of hasty generalization.

\textsuperscript{162} The second quantum in either figure is larger than the first quantum, to reflect the fact that what matters is the result, what one ends up with: all’s well (bad) that ends well (bad). Alternatively, it can be thought as an interest accrual of the consequence on an action.
sum, negative-sum, respectively. A gayist may find contentment of consortium in the same sex. But, will it last?

Let us examine the curves in detail. We will call the first minuplastic curve (or minuplusism), the second pluminustic curve (or pluminusism). A minuplastic or pluminustic trajectories is the sequential dyadic pair of two quanta that we will call an antecedent and a consequent. To learn a foreign language takes investment of money, time, and effort. These are the minustic antecedent. Once acquired, the new language skill opens multiple doors. One may use it to travel, make new friends, or get a new job. These are the plastic consequent. The example of relevance is the traditional courtship. It takes tremendous efforts of a man to get a woman’s yes. But once the chivalrous man jumps over all the trust hoops, passing all the competency tests, she is his. He gets the woman, children, and a family.

The other side of the story is the pluminustic trajectory. It is costless to steal something without paying for it. It doesn’t cost much to speed on the highway. It is easy to get high by smoking marijuana. It is tempting to sleep around the town. But eventually, the fate will catch up with the pluminusist: jail or accident or addiction or STD that may affect the pluminusist for life. Now, back to the main issue: gayism is a pluminusism. A gayist gets conjugation and consortium far more easily than a straight person. But precisely because of the ease of relationship initiation, the satisfaction wears out as quickly as it was easy to get the relationship in the first place.

4.2411 Justice and Injustice

The afore-diagrammed minuplusism and pluminusism also serve as the modeling of justice system where honest works are rewarded and legal wrongs are punished. All the other combinations of antecedents and consequents result in injustice. Here are non-exhaustive instances of such:

![Diagram of Justice and Injustice](image-url)

See supra § 4.1242.
The first (Fig. 4.2411a) is unusually harsh punishment for petty crimes, like (1) death sentence for (2) insulting the president. In this country, the latter is an exercise of the First Amendment right and the former would be a violation of the Eighth Amendment. The next (Fig. 4.2411b) is the punishment of the innocent, which is the raison d’être of the due process clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. The cases in point is racism and sexism. Innate condition of race or gender is not an action but a condition. A colored man or a woman has done nothing wrong to deserve a prejudice against them, and that is why discrimination against them is an injustice. The third model describes non-punishment of the guilty, such as theft being condoned.

The fourth models of injustice represent the reward of the undeserving. A man who meet another man does not incur the expensive transaction cost (trust test) typical in heterosexual relationship. It would be cool and dandy if the relationship stops at friendship. But if the two men veer toward the queer, the result is an unfounded, unwarranted homosexual pleasure as in Fig. 4.2411d. Gay marriage deepens and worsens the pattern of guilt, because society is not only condoning the baseless pleasure but also awarding them further by bestowing the sacred marriage right to the morally culpable. In Fig. 4.2411d, antecedent was zero (no heterosexual transaction cost), and consequent was positive (+10, homosexual pleasure). This positive consequent carries over to become the positive antecedent in Fig. 4.2411e, which is followed by an additional positive consequent (+20, procurement of gay marriage right). The two men never earned marriage right by conforming to the norm of marriage, by paying the due respect to the ancestral tradition that gave birth to the institution of marriage. They never had to overcome the burden of relationship initiation inherent in heterosexual relationship, and will never have to incur the cost of childbirth. Gayism is a steal deal. Therefore, the institution of gay marriage is an injustice.

Only if the story end here, this paper may end here as well. Here is the scary part, the truth that hurts. In Fig. 4.2411e, the sum of antecedent and consequent is ‘+30’ (= ‘+10’ + ‘+20’). This positive quantum constitutes a positive antecedent that justifies a negative consequent of ‘-40,’ whose negative value is so large that it exceeds the threshold of reparability. This is why the morality of antigayism is not optional but imperative. A human body has a tolerance threshold to injuries beyond which no recuperation is possible. A human mind works the same way. One day, all the accumulated harms of gayism will overwhelm the gayists to the extent that no human mind may tolerate. This is a foreseeable harm, as demonstrated in numerous parts of this paper, and reemphasized here.
4.25 Norm

A norm is a rule that promotes benefit and deters harm in society. Morality is the set of norms.
Society is an organized aggregation of individuals. No member of society lives in isolation. As everyone is connected to everyone only differing in degree, harm to an individual results in harm to society. Plus, an act or an idea is contagious as individuals imitate and emulate others.¹⁶⁴

No person is an entirely isolated being; it is impossible for a person to do anything seriously or permanently hurtful to himself, without mischief reaching at least to his near connections, and often far beyond them. If he injures his property, he does harm to those who directly or indirectly derived support from it, and usually diminishes, by a greater or less amount, the general resources of the community. If he deteriorates his bodily or mental faculties, he not only brings evil upon all who depended on him for any portion of their happiness, but disqualifies himself for rendering the services which he owes to his fellow-creatures generally; perhaps becomes a burden on their affection or benevolence; and if such conduct were very frequent, hardly any offence that is committed would detract more from the general sum of good. Finally, if by his vices or follies a person does no direct harm to others, he is nevertheless (it may be said) injurious by his example; and ought to be compelled to control himself, for the sake of those whom the sight or knowledge of his conduct might corrupt or mislead.¹⁶⁵

Morality isn’t some abstract concept that matters only in churches. An act is immoral because it is foreseeably harmful. For instance, fornication is immoral because it leads to unwanted pregnancy, teen pregnancy, abortion¹⁶⁶, and single parenthood. All these negative consequences result in harm to fornicators: distraction from studying and self-development, and incapacity to work efficiently. The next harm is to the children. Since their parents are unmarried and/or not even together anymore, the children’s environment is deficient in parental and financial stability. The final victim is the society. Fornication leads to unwanted pregnancy, which results in abortion and pro-abortionism, which cheapens the value of human lives.

Another example is adultery. Adultery is immoral because it is foreseeably harmful. Adultery leads to discordance in relationship, STDs, which traumatize both the adulterer and the spouse. The next victim is the children, whose familial stability is undermined by their parent’s act. Assume the adultery

¹⁶⁴ This is the reason why society criminalizes a mere possession of child pornography. Demand invites supply, and sometimes, demand incites self-supply.
¹⁶⁶ 83% of abortion is by unmarried women. http://www.prochoice.org/about_abortion/facts/women_who.html Abortion is never mentioned in bible, as it is a modern technology nonexistent in biblical times. It is the fornication that bible prohibits, and that a moral Christian should be advocating against. By the time the issue of abortion arises, it is already too late. The politicized anti-abortion campaign of the right smacks of the all-too-familiar Christian hypocrisy. Religion can neither proselytize, nor vaccinate against immorality. It was the Catholic church of the middle age that condemned Galileo, the Christian church that made fun of Darwin, and the synagogue of Judaism that crucified Jesus. There is no doubt that there exist some gayists who are more morally upright than some Christians, in aspects other than homosexuality. See Cliff Kincaid, The Story on the Journalist who Broke the Snowden Story, World Tribune, July 2, 2013 (a gay journalist helped a whistleblower expose an unethical government program), available at http://www.worldtribune.com/2013/07/02/the-story-on-the-journalist-who-broke-the-snowden-story/. Having said that, abortion is indeed an ethical issue of importance, as the pro-choice activism condones the human sacrifice of an innocent life, or a possibility thereof, for the sake of one night’s passion between a man and a woman.
leads to divorce. It is not fair for the children to lose a parent for life because one parent just wanted to have some fun one night with a stranger. The parent’s moral lapse has consequences not only to him or her, but also to the children, potentially for their entire lives. Adultery destabilizes family, and without sustainable familial infrastructure, society cannot stand.

The final instance is to gayism. Gayism is immoral because it is harmful. First, gay sex is an imitation of straight sex, and it lacks physiological genuineness, resulting in less sensory satisfaction. Gay males compensate for the dissatisfaction with diversifying partners. Promiscuity and adultery in male gayism is the cause of AIDS epidemic\textsuperscript{167} in them. Lesbians stay dissatisfied, resulting in unhappiness or early divorce\textsuperscript{168}. The next victim is the children. In gay parenting, a child has genetic linkage to at most one parent, and the other parent is a genetic stranger, like a step- or adoptive parent. Such diminished and lopsided genetic connection between a child and parents result in favoritism, antipathy, apathy, and imbalance, all of which detriment the child. The final victim is society, where progayism distorts the history, science, law, and corrupts the art, music, literature, and devitalizes religion, all in order to justify the unjustifiable. If society lets progayists fool it, it will become a fool. Gayists are gay because they do not realize the harm of gayism. Society condones gayism because it is unsure of the gayist harm. Progayists assure society that gayism is harmless. This way, progayist leadership is the blind leading the blind into the bottomless pit of more blindness. If progayists succeed in destigmatizing gayism, the gayist harm will be materialized in society. The society that protects gayism will have gayist harm institutionalized, and will suffer its full brunt.

4.26 Laws and Mores

If an act causes imminent or serious harm, society institutionalizes the norm against the act into a law. If an act is harmful only in latent or perceivably benign manner, society deters the act by means of mores. Legalization of mores verges on hyperpaternalism\textsuperscript{169}. Thus, society legislates norms only to the extent that laws do not infringe on individual autonomy\textsuperscript{170}. Religion is a societal system that preserves mores. In society, government enforces laws, religion reinforces mores. For instance, affirmative duty to help a stranger and injunction against insulting others are not legally enforceable but religiously reinforceable\textsuperscript{171}.

Proposition 4.26: Morality equals beneficence and immorality equals maleficence.

\textsuperscript{167} 78\% of new male patients of AIDS are gay.
\textsuperscript{168} See lesbian death bed (infra) and lesbian divorce rate (supra).
\textsuperscript{169} See James Madison, Federalist 10 (“There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction: the one, by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence . . . . It could never be more truly said than of the first remedy, that it was worse than the disease”), available at http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa10.htm. Free will is the moisture that lubricates the care-free wheel of society. Had the court in Britain not ordered Turing to go through the hormone injection therapy, the genius who contributed ending the WW II may not have committed suicide. See Alan Turing (last visited Feb. 9, 2014 11:57 AM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alan_Turing.
\textsuperscript{170} Both hobos and homos seek dangerous, undesirable and aesthetically displeasing lifestyles, and cannot be outlawed by legislation in a society that values autonomy: both anti-sodomy and anti-vagrancy laws were abolished. Nonetheless, they need to be discouraged through different channels other than law.
\textsuperscript{171} see idle doctor refuse to come;const freedom speech; jesus good samaritan;do not call brothers fools.
Proof) Mores are rules that prescribe acts that are beneficial, or prohibit acts that are harmful. If mores acquire temporal objectivity of multiple millennia and spatial objectivity of multiple continents, the mores attests to its absolutivity.

The relevant question is, is antigayism a subjective idea of a particular religion? It is not. Antigayism started in nature as a negative evolutionary pressure to prevent extinction of a species, including homo sapiens. Antigayism has evolved with society to become a collective moral consciousness of humanity to preserve human decency. That is why antigayism is a universal moral like anti-murder or anti-theft. There are only a handful of temporally and spatially isolated incidents of social legitimation of gayism. One is pederasty in Ancient Greece; the other is the custom of the twin city, Sodom and Gomorrah. It is not that gayism is wrong because it is immoral, but that Gayism is immoral because it is harmful. Gayism should be deterred not because it is defined as immoral, but because it is harmful, which is why it is defined as immoral.

4.261 Legality and Morality

The law is the witness and external deposit of our moral life. Its history is the history of the moral development of the race.

Legality is enforced by the government, while morality is reinforced by parents, friends, teachers, and preachers. Legal compliance is a ‘must,’ moral conformity is a ‘may.’ Legality lets one survive, morality makes one succeed.

---

172 The very fact that the practice of pederasty ceased to exist except in ancient history literatures is the evidence of its unviability.
173 Not quite. Pederasty isn’t exactly homosexuality. See supra, 4.1341.
174 Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., The Path of the Law, 10 Harvard Law Review 457 (1897), available at http://www.constitution.org/rev/owh/path_law.htm. Sexual aberrations like bestiality, adultery, fornication, and sodomy are no longer parts of law. Then, does that signify the escape of the sexual morality from law and society? Or does it hint the social maturity where members of the free society need not the law to tell them what to do, as they can take responsibility themselves? How about introduction of progayism into law? Doesn’t it reflect the influx of immorality into society? The legalization of progayism declares gayism as a protected class, and send the wrong signal to society: schools and employers endow affirmative advantage to gayists in admission and employment, incentivizing more and more people to be gay. Contemporary society tends to marginalize religion. Gayism further downplays religion. In an age where morality is de-legalizes, religion is the only system to uphold and preserve morality. Religion is to be emphasized, not marginalized.
175 Here is a brief enumeration of the seven virtues, golden means, and the seven vices:
175
176 Pride-confidence-servility; wrath-courage-cowardice; sloth-diligence-obsession;
176 Lust-moderation-indifference; envy-emulation-defeatism; greed-charity-martyrdom;
176 Gluttony-temperance-atrophy. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_deadly_sins;
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Golden_mean_%28philosophy%29. Contrary to popular belief, morality is not some abstract, outmoded notion. It is the key to the happiness, health, and success.
175
Let \( L \) be a set of acts (actions, behaviours) that is legal, and \( M \) a set of moral acts. Then, quadrant 1 corresponds to \( L \cap M \), quadrant 2 to \( L - M \), quadrant 3 to \( M - L \), and quadrant 4 to \( -L - M \).

There can be four rules: moral law, immoral law, legal mores, illegal mores. An act that obeys an immoral law falls in the quadrant 2, and its disobedience in the quadrant 3. Likewise, a moral law flips between quadrants 1 and 4, an illegal mores between 3 and 2, a legal mores between 1 and 2.

In 1942 Germany under Nazist regime, citizens were required by law to report to police when they see a Jewish person. Such is an immoral law, because ethnocide dehumanizes society, and dehumanization is a harm. Germans sympathetic to Jews hid or did not report them to police. Such is an illegal mores.

Assume \( x \) is a Christian baker in a hypothetical nation \( N \). \( N \) has two laws concerning bakers:

A. Bakers must pay taxes.
B. Bakers must sell wedding cakes to gay newlyweds.

\( x \) has two personal mores:

C. Everyone has a moral duty not to be gay to preserve human decency.
D. Gayism should not be condoned.

Rule A is a moral law, as widespread tax evasions cause harms to \( N \) and eventually to \( x \). Rule B is an immoral law to \( x \), as social protection of gayism spreads gayism in society, and \( x \) thinks that gayism is harmful. Rule C is a legal mores, as both breaking and obeying the rule are legal. Rule D is an illegal mores that conflict with Rule B.

### 4.27 Perception of Harm

Not every harm is visible at first\(^{176}\). Latency does not entail benignity—every fatal disease starts with a period of latency. It is the latency of a disease that make it more dangerous, as asymptomatic patient would do nothing to cure the disease until it is too late. If a society fails to foresee the harm of an ism, catastrophe and human casualty down the road will be the cost of ignorance.

### 4.28 Foreseeability of Harm

\(^{176}\) The reason why progayism has been successful is that gayist harm is not imminent but latent, not apparent but undisclosed.
Some harms are foreseeable, if not apparent. Gayism is not new, but its legalization is. Gayism has been a taboo in virtually all societies in record. The detriment that gayists suffered in the past, thus, may be inherent in gayism or a product of antigayist environment of society. When induction fails, deduction intervenes. The question of whether gayism is harmful or harmless should be answered through logical reasoning for two reasons. First, sociological data is premature because legalization of gay marriage is a relatively new development. Second, even with the few existing data, the removal of researcher/responder bias from the study is impossible, especially when gayism is a highly politicized and polarized subject matter.

4.281 Deterrence

When a child misbehaves, parents chastise him by not giving what he wants. The penalty of grounding or sitting is deprivation of freedom. Society works the same. Law violators are deprived of property in terms of fines, or of liberty in terms of imprisonment. Societal deterrence works by contingent deprivation of rights, or temporary suspension thereof.

4.282 Cogency

Antigayism differs from both sexism and racism. Both feminism and antiracism is extension of past norms, whereas gayism is reversal of a past norm. Progayism is the free-rider of the civil rights movement of feminism and abolitionism. Women in the past were domestic because the labor therein were onerous. Development of technology and specialization of occupations left women with no job at home. Women working outside is the logical result. In the past, women did everything by hand—laundry, cleaning, maintaining fire, everything. Machines freed women. Women used to teach children but now education specialists in schools took over the task. The work women do outside is no less than the extension of the jobs they used to do at home—managing finance, healing children, teaching, and so on. Then what should women do now? No work? There is only one answer to the change in social condition—give them the job that they can do. This is the justification and historical necessity of feminism.

African Americans were involuntary immigrants. In their home continent, they were the mainstream race. After the forced immigration into America, they knew no English. This was not a problem as they served as labor force in the old America. Over time, they acquired language, knowledge, and acculturation. Limiting them within the context of labor no longer made sense. Being no less competent and as intelligent as other races, African Americans started to go beyond labor market. Abolition of racism was a necessary course of history.

177 Conservatism is good (bad) when it holds on to a good (bad) law. Progressivism is good (bad) when it makes a good (bad) new law. No one can be right on everything, every time. The progressive firmer union states of the bi-coast and Midwest were right to fight for abolitionism, while the former confederate states of the South were not so right to hang on to slavery. This time, however, the conservative states of the South got it right this time to reject progayism. Progayism is the far-left, the undesirable extremity of liberalism. It is about time for the pendulum of society to swing back to the right, so as to reach the desirable middle.

178 Racism is an ancestral senioritism where one argues one has superior right than the other, because one’s ancestors came to the country earlier than the other’s. If it is to be strictly applied, Asian race won the race and should get the gold medal, caucasians the silver, Afro-Americans the bronze, as native Americans are Asians who
Feminism is the recognition of female competency. Women performed all kinds of work at home that is equivalent to men’s work outside home. As technology freed women from home, why shouldn’t women work outside home, which is not much different from what they used to do at home? Antiracism works the same way. In African continent, African Americans were the members of society, working in every sector of society. When they first came to America, labor was the only thing they could do as they did not speak English. Passage of time changed the situation. African American learned not only English but other trades. Why shouldn’t they do all the kinds of works they used to do and occupy different echelons of society, as they used to in Africa?

Gayism, on the other hand, has no counterpart of such manifest destiny. While feminism and abolitionism is the reinstatement of women and African Americans to their previous state of legitimacy, gayists has no legitimacy to revert to. Gayism has always been a banned activity. Progayist legislation breaks the historical continuity of tradition and mores, and only serves to prolong the period of confusion of gay-susceptible individuals. Race and sex are both innate and immutable. So are age and disability, which is why they constitute protected classes. Gayism, in contrast, is neither innate nor immutable. To change one’s race or sex is as hard as genetic conversion of every single cell in one’s body. To change age or disability is as impossible as inventing a time machine. How about gayism? Well, all that a gayist needs to do is to stop thinking and acting the gay way. Sexism and Racism is prejudice of incompetence on sex and gender. Antigayism does not question work competency of gayists. Rather, antigayism is a remedy to prevent gayism from compromising corporate moral culture.

The analogy of gayists to women and African Americans a superficial construction. A better analogy would be criminality and mental infirmity. Some are more prone to crimes than others but that does not exculpate them when they violate law. Some may have harder time to curb criminal impulse than others, but society does not reward them when they observe law. Some are more prone to suicide than others, but society does not lessen the deterrence of suicide. Rather, they should be given more attention so that they don’t harm themselves.

There is no change in social condition that would justify gayism, or the reversal of the traditional antigayist norm. The only conceivable justifying change would be that homo sapiens evolve to be hermaphroditic, which is relatively the closest form in nature to gayism. That is an impossibility. How about the social change, where contraceptives were invented, dissociating sex from reproduction, where marriage is no longer a mode of reproduction but of consortium? Does it justify gayism? Well, gayists never needed contraceptives anyways. To gayists, the invention of contraceptives is an irrelevant change in social condition.

Then, how come so many people find progayist theory convincing? Most people do not give deep and thorough thoughts to a given social issue. It is not to their discredit, however. They simply crossed Bering Sea, when it was a dry land in the Ice Age, long before any other races. Jokes aside, none of the past matters, really.

Gayist youths have higher suicide attempt rate than straight counterparts. Stephen T. Russell & Kara Joyner, Adolescent Sexual Orientation and Suicide Risk: Evidence From a National Study, 91 Am. J. Pub. Health 1276, 1278 (2001). Aversion of gayism is a biological response, a product of evolution. It creates inner conflict in gay individuals and discomfort from their social surroundings, regardless of social policy. Hence, progayism does not solve but perpetuates the problem.

Society has always allowed a marriage between a barren woman and an impotent man. Then is procreation irrelevant? Even though adoptive parenting is second-best to natural parenting, it still is better than orphanage. A man and a woman who adopt a child still can provide a gender-balanced parental environment, while gay parents provide a gender-skewed one. Even if the barren couple does not adopt children, the marriage is a worthwhile and meaningful pledge between the two gender, a way to honor their mutual fidelity.
cannot afford to doing so. People have jobs and families. When a controversy arises, they are passive readers of newspapers and watchers of TVs. It’s either they are not that interested or lack expertise to fully scrutinize the issue. They are prone to take the view of the most vocal. This is the danger of basing public policy on the majority view of the public.

4.283 Persistency

Persistence of existence does not justify existence. Both criminality and gayism predates Moses. Is murder any less of a crime because it has existed for so long? Does society honor the long history of its existence? The longevity of gayism in history gives it no legitimacy. Eugenic Nazis once tried to eliminate all gayists on earth\textsuperscript{181}. Even if they had been successful in that venue, gayism would not have disappeared from the earth\textsuperscript{182}. The only solution to gayist problem is understanding of gayist harm and social deterrence of gayism. Like the criminal justice system that may not eliminate criminality but keep it to minimum, moral justice system is necessary to maintain the integrity of society.

4.284 Guise of Harmlessness

4.2841 Diversity

Both mutation and reproduction are easier in unicellular species than in multicellular organisms. Bacteria, being so small, have limited mobility. To compensate for it, they replicate in quantity. As environmental condition changes, animals can move out and search for the geography that is similar to the one they evolved into. Bacteria, in contrast, die out if they are not fit, except the newly fit mutants. This once-minority recolonizes the new environment to make a new majority. Since speciation takes a lot more than a point-mutation in multicellular organisms, evolution came up with a new strategy to diversify a given population. It is what we call sexual reproduction.

In homo sapiens, there are 46 chromosomes, consisting of 23 pairs of homologous chromosomes\textsuperscript{183}. In each pair of homologues, one originates from one’s father, the other from one’s mother. When one’s body produces a gamete cell, either an egg or a sperm, the 46 chromosomes pair up with their homologues. Next, the pairs split into two cells, each of which now has 23 chromosomes\textsuperscript{184}. Before the split, the homologous pairs align, pair by pair, but within a pair, the orientation is random. That is, in some pair, the mother-side chromosome is located on the right, while in another pair, the father-side chromosome is on the right. Randomness determines which of the two daughter cells inherits which of the host’s parent genes.

After the split, the resulting gamete cell has inherited about 11 chromosomes from the host’s mother and 12 chromosomes from the host’s father. This process alone, the metaphase and anaphase of

\textsuperscript{181} Historical sympathy for homosexuals camped and killed in holocaust probably accounts for the overwhelming approval rate of gay marriage in Jewish community. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Holocaust#Non-Jewish; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persecution_of_homosexuals_in_Nazi_Germany_and_the_Holocaust; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_opinion_of_same-sex_marriage_in_the_United_States#By_religion. While such sentiment is understandable, emotion is known to cloud rationality. Sympathy toward gayists cannot change the past, but it will change the future, for the worse.

\textsuperscript{182} cite jesus, ‘sins that make others sin cannot disappear but woe to them.’

\textsuperscript{183} wiki chromosome, human genome

\textsuperscript{184} wiki meiosis
meiosis I, generates the diversity of $2^{23} (\approx 8,000,000)$ gametes that differ from each other in genetic composition. The process of cross-over in prophase I multiplies this diversity by another factor. The next step is sex. The randomness in pairing of a sperm and an egg of two unrelated individuals further increases the diversity in progeny. The end result is a progeny whose gene set, i.e., genome, differs from its father, mother, grandfather, and grandmother altogether. Diversity is the evolutionary purpose of natural sexuality, a.k.a., the heterosexuality.

Homosexuality, in contrast, has no place in nature. Above all, it is not a mode of reproduction. A gay gene, if created in nature by chance mutation, will not last past a single generation, but die out with the gay host, because the the animal is incapable of reproduction. Such is the negative evolutionary pressure against gayism. Even if gayists have children by adoption or surrogation, the parental environment is not a diversity, but gender-monotony. Gayism homogenizes parental environment. Even for gay individuals do not marry, gayism reduces gender diversity by dilution of gender characteristics. Gayism results in androgyny, where males become more masculine, and females become more feminine. Gayism is the force toward ‘one’ gray middle, from ‘two’ extremities of black and white.

A distinction should be made between gayism and interracialism, however. The union of two different races begets the third race, a biologically viable. A progeny that equals neither its father nor its mother is the theme of sexual reproduction. Thus, interracial marriage is not a deviation, but an even stricter conformance to the evolution’s doctrine of progeny diversification. Furthermore, interracial parenthood adds racial diversity to the parental environment of the child, on top of gender diversity. Such added benefits outweighs the downside of the high divorce rate in interracial couples. Gayism, on the other hand, results in impaired development in children. Remember, not every variation qualifies as diversity. To be a diversity trait, it should be at least harm-neutral. A trait from a malignant mutation that gives disadvantage to the host does not withstand the passage of time, and does not get passed into the next generation. Evolution sentences the traitor trait to extinction. The abolition of gay parenting will occur as a matter of time as gayist harm will be more and more evident in the near future. It is up to the society to prevent the foreseeable harm by eliminating gayism, or let the mass delusion of gayism wreak havoc on every sector of the society before its demise, and go down along with it.

4.2842 Equality

A system is fair if it applies an equal judgment standard to individuals. A society is just when its system is fair. A society consists of individuals differing by diligence and talents. Therefore, a just society is the one whose reward-punishment system implements equality in judgment, and inequality in

---

185 The phenomenal race of Hispanic is the beautiful product of miscegenation of Asian (native Latin Americans), Africans (forced migrants from Africa), and Caucasians (European settlers). See Laird W. Bergad & Herbert S. Klein, Hispanics in the United States 364-66 (2010).
187 One may answer to an equation in infinite number of ways, but there is only one correct answer. For instance, the equation, $X^2 + x - 2=0$, there is only one correct set of answer, {1, -2}. In Euclidean geometry, there is only one straight line, only one shortest path, between two points. There are infinitely many curves therebetween, however.
result. For instance, in a capitalist society, an individual who studies harder in school get a higher degree of education, which leads to a higher salary than others. In a workplace, a harder-working individual get promotion than others. Also, the society deprives property of liberty right of law infringers. The end result is inequality of entitlement in individuals- some get rewarded, others get punished, depending on what they did.

In a purely communistic society, everyone gets the same wage, no matter how much one works harder than others. Such equalization of reward discourage diligence. Equality in result penalizes diligence and prizes lassitude. Equality in result is inequality in judgment, because the lassitudinous are judged more favorably than the diligent. For instance, if x needs to work 4 hours a day and y 8 hours a day, and if x and y get the same wage, x is favored over y.

Gayim is a moral communism because gayism is equality in result, inequality in judgment. Society grants marriage right to the ones who conforms to the norm of marriage. In a just society, nonconformists who practice bestiality, incest, pedophilia, necrophilia, polygamy, polyandry, or homosexuality, do not get a marriage right. If conformants do get the same right as the nonconformants, the result is de-motivation of conformance.

In a just society, no right is free. Even the right of inheritance is conditioned on the fulfillment of filial duty and piety, which takes hard work of one’s lifetime. Liberty right is granted only if one ‘pays’ by obeying the law. Right is the consideration that society grants to an individual, in bargain for the individual’s fulfillment of social duty. This is the social contract:

A LAW OF NATURE, (Lex Naturalis,) is a Precept, or generall Rule, found out by Reason, by which a man is forbidden to do, that, which is destructive of his life, or taketh away the means of preserving the same; and to omit, that, by which he thinketh it may be best preserved. For though they that speak of this subject, use to confound Jus, and Lex, Right and Law; yet they ought to be distinguished; because RIGHT, consisteth in liberty to do, or to forbeare; Whereas LAW, determineth, and bindeth to one of them: so that Law, and Right, differ as much, as Obligation, and Liberty; which in one and the same matter are inconsistent.

. . . .

Right is layd aside, either by simply Renouncing it; or by Transferring it to another. By Simply RENOUNCING; when he cares not to whom the benefit thereof redoundeth. By TRANSFERRING; when he intendeth the benefit thereof to some certain person, or persons. And when a man hath in either manner abandoned, or granted away his Right; then is he said to be OBLIGED, or BOUND, not to hinder those, to whom such Right is granted, or abandoned, from the benefit of it: and that he Ought, and it his DUTY, not to make voyd that voluntary act of his own: and that such hindrance is INJUSTICE, and INJURY, as being Sine Jure; the Right being before renounced, or transferred. So that Injury, or Injustice, in the controversies of the world, is somewhat like to that, which in the disputations of Scholers is called Absurdity. For as it is there

---

188 There were times when women were properties of men and a rich and powerful man could have multiple wives. The days are gone with the winds as the machines freed women. See supra, 4.282. Women got as competent as men, and women earned their right to stand shoulder to shoulder with men, by efforts toward advanced education and career development.

189 Contra John Rawls, A Theory of Justice 204 (1971) ("Now all the liberties of equal citizenship must be the same for each member of society."). Prof. Rawls deserves a credit to the extent that he asked the right question about rights, justice, and fairness. It’s just that he answered it wrong, not reaching the matter beyond the surface. Rawlsian justice is, in essence, the equality in result. If every citizen should be given the right to freedom because it is a fundamental, un-deprivable right, society should unlock all the prison cells, letting them out on the street.
called an Absurdity, to contradict what one maintained in the Beginning: so in the world, it is called Injustice, and Injury, voluntarily to undo that, which from the beginning he had voluntarily done. The way by which a man either simply Renounceth, or Transferreth his Right, is a Declaration, or Signification, by some voluntary and sufficient signe, or signes, that he doth so Renounce, or Transferre; or hath so Renounced, or Transferred the same, to him that accepteth it. And these Signes are either Words onely, or Actions onely; or (as it happeneth most often) both Words and Actions. And the same are the BONDS, by which men are bound, and obliged: Bonds, that have their strength, not from their own Nature, (for nothing is more easily broken then a mans word,) but from Feare of some evill consequence upon the rupture.\footnote{Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan (1651), available at http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3207/3207-h/3207-h.htm.}

For instance, society grants liberty right only to those who obey the law. A partial property right is deprived when one gets a speeding ticket. For a society to be fair and just, marriage right should deprived when one does not pay the price of conformity to the norm of marriage.

4.28421 Right and Duty

Right and duty are two sides of the same coin.\footnote{Wesley Newcomb Hohfeld, Some Fundamental Legal Conceptions As Applied in Judicial Reasoning, 23 Yale L.J. 16, 28-32 (1913)} A’s right on x is everyone else’s duty not to interfere with A’s use of x. Right and duty are the currencies of social contract. Society grants an individual a right in exchange for his duty fulfillment. A homeowner who fails to pay property tax faces tax deed foreclosure. Right is not given, but earned. This is the distributive justice of rights.\footnote{Contra John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (1971) 277 ("The purpose of these levies and regulations is . . . to correct the distriution of wealth and to prevent concentrations of power . . . . this would encourage the wide dispersal of property which is a necessary condition, it seems, if the fair value of equal liberties is to be maintained."). This sounds almost evangelical. But, was Jesus a communist? “Give your wealth to the poor and follow me.” Mark 10:21 (King James). Jesus didn’t say to the rich young man that he should be forced to give to the poor by the government. If so, the possibility of voluntary charity vanishes. Taxation of the rich and redistribution of the wealth would have disabled the rich young man to give, and he could not have followed Jesus even if he had wanted to. Communism is no more than the equalization of property rights, for which Rawls essentially advocates. Free money to the poor perpetualize their dependency, lassitude, and complacency. The hardship and inconvenience of poverty is what drives people to study hard and work harder. If a prison were to provide the comfort of a five-star hotel, everyone would commit crimes. Of course, not everyone has to study or work hard. For many, leisure is more important than financial prosperity, or enjoying the youth is more valuable than school work. There is nothing wrong with that choice. But you cannot get both leisure and wealth, because forgoing one is the price of getting the other. This is the fairness. One caveat is that labor and management is equal in indispensability— one cannot function without the other. See Paul’s analogy of society to human body. The quantitative balance between labor and management is the key to the stability of society. Thus, the career class variation is a necessary diversity. Nonetheless, upward class mobility is a highly desirable, almost an ideal trait of a society. Then, in an ideal America, who will fill the void in labor market? At some point, we need to let the foreigners in, and let those already in live legally. They want to be Americans. The first generation immigrants are happy just to be in this country, and do not mind laborious work. After all, America was built by immigrants: that’s what the Statue of Liberty stands for. Overpopulation? No problem. If one has ever looked down from an airplane, one knows how empty this country is. Las Vegas was built in the middle of a desert. There can be more.}
more property rights one possesses. On the other hand, if one neglects legal duties more and more, one loses rights of property (fines), freedom (imprisonment), and even life (capital sentence).

A day’s right is earned by a day’s duty fulfillment. A day’s right is **consumed** and expires by the end of the day. Yesterday’s work does not guarantee today’s compensation, as it is a past consideration already paid and accounted for. It does not matter one never murdered anyone in the past. If one fails the duty of respecting others’ lives, one’s right to live may expire that day\(^1\). One will no longer have right to live if one stops working and bringing food to the table. One’s right to safety expires the moment one fails to keep a reasonable distance on a highway and gets involved in an accident. One’s right to health is deprived once one stops balanced diet and daily exercise routine. Right is an exhaustible entity\(^2\). One’s

\(^1\) A retired senior has a right to live even if she isn’t earning a living now, because she has saved living in the past, by paying for social security taxes during her younger days. Does an infant have a right to live? Yes it does (this is why infanticide is a murder while abortion is not), for three accounts. First, it did not choose to be born- its life is imposed to it by its parents’ will. The parents have duty to feed the infant, and the infant has right to be fed (this is why child neglect is illegal). Second, the infant will not be able to murder anyone for a long while. Thus its life right will not expire during infancy. Third, life itself is a tremendous burden for an infant. That is why the baby cries and when it doesn’t assume the face of a boss in an armchair, ever demanding, ever commanding. An infant earns right to live daily by survival effort alone. That is why the right to live is given to it. An infant has a future interest on its life property, more specifically, a remainder contingent on his survival to adulthood (for a refresher on future interest, see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Future_interest](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Future_interest)). This is why destruction of one’s own child is a murder, i.e., a trespass on life property. How about youths? Their share of labor is house chores, obedience, consortium, and entertainment for their parents. These are the rights-earning activities of children. Childhood is not only the happiest hours of one’s life, but also gives the second happiest time to the child’s parents. Let us dig a little deeper into the nature of a child’s right. During bondage, the child reserves a contingent future interest in her life property. The interest is contingent on the normal maturation (without incapacitating incidence) and financial independence around the age 18. The child’s life property right vests in the child when she starts to earn living for herself. Until then, she is a dependent, a quasi-property of her parents. That explains why the legal severance between her and her parents is called emancipation. But even during the filial bondage, there is a line her parents cannot do to her as an ancient master could do to his slave. Parents may give her spanks, but not scars. A father may forbid his daughter from having sex with her boyfriend, but may not rape her himself. Why is that so? It is because the integrity of a child’s body and mind is her future interest of her life property. Her parents hold the present interest in her life property, but she, the child, holds the future interest. The parents cannot touch what is hers, because that would be a trespass on the child’s property interest. Why does a child have a future interest at all? It is because the filial bondage expires in 18 years. What if parents never intended to let go of their child? Pertetual filial bondage is against the law of the nature: every offspring animal declare independence upon maturity. Homo sapiens, ever retaining the biological aspect of the nature, is no exception. Alternatively, some argue that it is so because a right not to be raped is an inviolable, fundamental human right. See Amnesty International, *Rape and sexual violence: Human rights law and standards in the International Criminal Court* 10 (2011), available at [http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/JOR53/001/2011/en/7f5ea8f-c008-4caf-ab59-0f84605b61e0/ior530012011en.pdf](http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/JOR53/001/2011/en/7f5ea8f-c008-4caf-ab59-0f84605b61e0/ior530012011en.pdf). This ‘fundamental human right’ argument is too blunt, too one-size-fits-all, too cure-all, too lazy an answer for every conceivable complaint, both valid and invalid. The ‘fundamental rights’ argumentation may seem to work for the first few controversies, but because the mesh of the sieve is too coarse, it lets through all the invalid claims of rights. For instance, it allows progayists to argue that the right to be gay is a fundamental human right.

\(^2\) Inalienability is another matter. A life right (right to live) is both exhaustible and inalienable. An individual earns the right to live for a day by earning money for food and rent (such is the conversion of property right to life right), and by not murdering others. This way, he buys his own life. But he cannot sell his life. For example, he cannot sell his heart for money. Nor can he get paid for being killed. He cannot charge a retired hit man a fee for killing him, for the service of satiating the ex-assassin’s homicidal craving, a real target practice. Nor should he be allowed to pay someone to kill him, as aided suicide is immoral. See § supra 2.234 footnote. There is a duty to live, and a right to live. See id. There is no such a thing as right to die, because one’s life is not an individual’s sole possession, but a common property shared by multiple people (for a refresher on common property, see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tenants_in_common](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tenants_in_common)). See id; § infra 4.2844. This is why life right is
right to liberty is lost when one commits felony, and one should re-earn the right by serving the time in prison meritoriously.\(^{195}\)

4.2843 Rationality

Freud reduced every sensation to sexuality. By the same token, gayism reduces every same-gender relationship into homosexuality. Such reductionism is not only irrational, but also degenerative. If society approves and adopts gayism into a legitimacy, the result is the demotion of the moral standard of society to the level of gayists. Progayists start with affirmation of sodomy, where it is a matter of ‘sexual orientation.’ Then, progayists attempt to find historical legitimacy of gayism in pederasty. By doing that, progayists inadvertently affirm and approve pedophilia, as pederasty is quasi-homosexual pedophilia. Then they move to affirm adultery, which is a routine practice in male gay couples, by renaming it to ‘extradyadic relationship’ to mask the traditional blameworthiness. While traditional marriage starts with a vow of loyalty\(^{196}\), the majority of male gayists start their marriage with an infidelity agreement\(^{197}\). Then what is the point of marriage, if it defeats its very purpose? The point is to hide immorality of gayism under the guise of social legitimacy. If one say, ‘I promise to be your husband but I reserve a right to sleep with others,’ the promise is illusory for the lack of commitment and the marriage contract is void\(^{198}\).

inalienable: commonly owned property cannot be sold without the unanimous consent of all the co-owners, and no sane person except the suicidal man himself would approve his action to terminate or alienate his life to others. Again, life right is inalienable not because it is a ‘fundamental human right,’ but because one’s life is a common property, whose interest lies on people other than oneself. For the discussion on the folly of ‘fundamental human rights’ argumentation, see supra § 4.28421 footnote.\(^{195}\)

How about the right to trial (7th amendment) or counsel (6th amendment) or due process and equal protection (14th amendment)? Such right is given not because even a perpetrator has an innate right, but because of the possibility of his innocence. If he admits his guilt, or once he is proven guilty in the highest court, he no longer has a right to further trial because the possibility of innocence is precluded. A right to vote is earned by not committing felony. See Felony Disenfranchisement (last visited Feb. 16, 2014, 6:20 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Felony_disenfranchisement. Lastly, right to bear arms is earned by maturing to adulthood and not committing felony ever, as felons are barred from possessing guns. 18 USC 44.

“Till death do us part.” Law honors the conjugal allegiance of devotion and fidelity by making divorce cumbersome. If divorce is a frictionless process, marriage degenerates into temporal promiscuity, i.e., fornication, where one is free to have multiple partners over time, one after another. See Jesus’ critique on divorce, Mark 10:9 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=mark+10&version=KJV. Spatial promiscuity, i.e., adultery, is having multiple partners in a given time, by two-timing.\(^{197}\)

About 20% of straight couples have sex outside their relationships surreptitiously, i.e., ‘cheat.’ Elizabeth S. Allen & David C. Atkins, *The Association of Divorce and Extramarital Sex in a Representative U.S. Sample*, J. of Fam. Issues 1477, 1484 (2012). In Contrast, 70% of male gay couples have extradyadic sex, where 40% do it with permission and 30% without permission. Compare Kristen P. Mark et al., *Infidelity in Heterosexual Couples: Demographic, Interpersonal,and Personality-Related Predictors of Extradyadic Sex*, 40 Archives of Sexual Behav. 971, 971 (2011) with Torsten B. Neilands et al., *Development and Validation of the Sexual Agreement Investment Scale*, 47 J. Sex Res. 24, 31-32 (2010). The rest of male gay couples, the loyal ones who neither cheat nor ‘agree’ to cheat, end up in early break-ups. See Garrett Prestage et al., *Trends in Agreements Between Regular Partners Among Gay Men in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane, Australia*, 12 AIDS Behav. 513, 516 (2008).\(^{198}\)

Contra Kristoff Bonello & Malcolm C. Cross, *Gay Monogamy: I Love You But I Can’t Have Sex With Only You*, 57 J. Homosexuality 117, 125 (2010). Progayists argue that emotional monogamy is possible in a sexually non-monogamous relationship. The inner contradiction, the inconsistency between mind and body is dangerous to both mind and body. Can one be mentally loyal and physically disloyal? A mind that escapes body also escapes reality-
Gayists euphemizes infidelity as a sexual liberation in marriage, a new concept. It is not new, however. Adultery has a long history. What is new is its legitimization. No matter how one names it, adultery is an adultery, and it is prohibited by mores because it destroys family. Progayist neologism as in ‘sexual orientation’ or ‘extradyadic relationship’ does not change the essence of immorality, nor does it erase the harmful consequence there of. It only mask the culpability and anesthetize the moral pang, that is, the qualm, scruple, and conscience. Even if we assume that gayist population does not increase, social legitimization of gayism still harms the society by adjusting social standard to the level of gayist immorality. Without morality and vigilance to uphold its integrity, society cannot survive.

Progayist legislation is a social contract whose presumed condition is that gayism is harmless. The contract is void for two accounts. First, the premise of gayist harmlessness is a mutual mistake. Neither gayists nor society knew of the gayist harm due to its latency. Second, progayists have been fraudulent and unconscionable in negligently misrepresenting gayism as harmless. Rather than objectively probing the viability of gayism, progayist rushed to the conclusion, biasing and distorting all relevant historical and sociological researches to favor gayism, dismissing possibility of harm early on, from the very start.

4.2844 Privacy

It is given that no one has right to harm others. How about self-harm? Does everyone has a right

we call it dementia, paranoia, or schizophrenia. What happens to a person whose body cannot fly but whose mind can?


200 See Rest. Cont. 2d. 152.
to suicide\textsuperscript{201}? Is the use of narcotics\textsuperscript{202} a matter of privacy? A British philosopher answers as follows:

But though this be a state of liberty, yet it is not a state of licence: though man in that state have an uncontroulable liberty to dispose of his person or possessions, yet he has not liberty to destroy himself, or so much as any creature in his possession, but where some nobler use than its bare preservation calls for it. The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every one: and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions: for men being all the workmanship of one omnipotent, and infinitely wise maker; all the servants of one sovereign master, sent into the world by his order, and about his business; they are his property, whose workmanship they are, made to last during his, not one another's pleasure; and being furnished with like faculties, sharing all in one community of nature, there cannot be supposed any such subordination among us, that may authorize us to destroy one another, as if we were made for one another's uses, as the inferior ranks of creatures are for our's. Every one, as he is bound to preserve himself, and not to quit his station wilfully, so by the like reason, when his own preservation comes not in competition, ought he, as much as he can, to preserve the rest of mankind, and may not, unless it be to do justice on an offender, take away, or impair the life, or

\textsuperscript{201} Gayism not only stops self-improvement but leads to self-harm. This way, progayist legislation is tantamount to the social recognition of right to suicide. If gayism is like a suicide, progayism is aiding and abetting of the suicide. Gayists dig their own graves, and progayists help them in the digging. Gayism is a gender defeatism where one admits one's incompetence and unsuitability in the eyes of the opposite gender in the romance market. A gayist settles with the inferior state rather than aspiring to improve oneself. As time goes by, the harm of gayism will be more and more prominent, because gayist relationship is bound to failure by nature. If the theories in this paper is correct, social progayism will disappear by itself, or go extinct by natural selection, as the gayist harm will surface, the public will witness the harm, and stop supporting the ism. The discussion would stop here if we were talking about nature, where natural selection is realized at the expense of unfortunate individuals with unfavorable mutants. We are talking about human lives here. What makes us, humans, different from and superior to the rest of the species is that we, Homo sapiens, are in control of our fate. We don't have to go down because of some malignant mutants (gayism is not a physical but a metaphysical mutation, see supra § 4.23). If we recognize something as foreseeable harmful, we can preempt the harm. We can make social policy decisions to contain the harmful activity, and keep the damage to the minimum. That is the central point of this paper.

\textsuperscript{202} Almost all narcotics were invented in research and development laboratories. See, e.g., LSD (Jan. 26, 2014, 11:26 AM), \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lysergic_acid_diethylamide}; Heroin (Jan. 26, 2014, 11:27 AM), \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heroin}; Cocaine (Jan. 26, 2014, 11:29 AM), \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cocaine#Discovery}. Proprietary pharmaceutical know-how's were leaked outside so that they are manufactured and traded underground. Illegal narcotics, marijuana, and prescription drugs have temporally or geographically limited history of usage. In contrast, nicotine (in chewing tobacco, pipe, cigar, cigarette), caffeine (in coffee, tea, soda), and alcohol (in whisky, beer, wine) are psychoactive agent that has passed the test of time over multiple continents. These are the safest drugs that can assuage aggression, alleviate stress, with limited side effects. Of course, overdose and abuse of any drugs brings more harm than benefits, but these recreational drugs have accompanied the humanity for a long time, for a good reason. It is well known that Jesus was a social drinker. See John 2:6-10 (King James) (Jesus turns water into wine), available at \url{http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John+2&version=KJV}; Luke 22:20 (King James) (last supper), available at \url{http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=luke+22&version=KJV}. Lesser known is that Jehovah was a smoker. See Numbers 18:17 (King James) (“thou shalt sprinkle their blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by fire, for a sweet savour unto the LORD.”), available at \url{http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=numbers+18&version=KJV}. Back to the topic at hand, progayism is like a hallucinogen that numbs the natural mechanism of pain and moral compunction that warns against the gayist harm. Progayism generates the euphoria that makes gayists complacent and think that everything will be just fine. It also makes society think that gay is okay. See supra § 4.1341; infra § 6.3211.
what tends to the preservation of the life, the liberty, health, limb, or goods of another.

Adam was created a perfect man, his body and mind in full possession of their strength and reason, and so was capable, from the first instant of his being to provide for his own support and preservation, and govern his actions according to the dictates of the law of reason which God had implanted in him. From him the world is peopled with his descendants, who are all born infants, weak and helpless, without knowledge or understanding: but to supply the defects of this imperfect state, till the improvement of growth and age hath removed them, Adam and Eve, and after them all parents were, by the law of nature, under an obligation to preserve, nourish, and educate the children they had begotten; not as their own workmanship, but the workmanship of their own maker, the Almighty, to whom they were to be accountable for them.

The power, then, that parents have over their children, arises from that duty which is incumbent on them, to take care of their off-spring, during the imperfect state of childhood. To inform the mind, and govern the actions of their yet ignorant nonage, till reason shall take its place, and ease them of that trouble, is what the children want, and the parents are bound to: for God having given man an understanding to direct his actions, has allowed him a freedom of will, and liberty of acting, as properly belonging thereunto, within the bounds of that law he is under. But whilst he is in an estate, wherein he has not understanding of his own to direct his will, he is not to have any will of his own to follow: he that understands for him, must will for him too; he must prescribe to his will, and regulate his actions; but when he comes to the estate that made his father a freeman, the son is a freeman too.203

If an act is foreseeably harmful to the actor, the act should be deterred by means of certain right deprivation. This is the premise of justice system that underlies the penal codes of states. But the deterrence measure should not be so severe as to cause an unrecoverable damage. The deprivation of right should be temporary and limited in scope as a corrective measure, rather than permanent and categorical punishment. A gayist has the possibility of reverter and the right of reversion. If gayists voluntarily reinstate themselves to normalcy, i.e., their natural sexuality, the sanction on rights should be lifted. Individuals with past gayism should not be discriminated, as everyone makes mistakes and no one can change one’s past.206

204 Right deprivation is the universal deterrence method. At home, parents deprive a misbehaving child’s right to free movement by time-out or grounding. See Grounding (last visited Feb. 16, 2014, 6:25 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grounding_(punishment); Time Out (last visited Feb. 16, 2014, 6:24 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Time-out_(parenting). In society, the government, like parents at home, deters by depriving rights. There is no such a right so fundamental as to evade the right deprivation by the government’s police power. See infra § 5.41. If a man is about to kill woman in front of a police officer, and he doesn’t stop after the officer’s warning, all of his right is deprived: the right to jury trial, to live, vote, everything. He will be executed on the spot. Even if there was no police around, the victim could justifiably kill him as a self-defense, terminating every iota of his rights in this world. In a lesser impending cases, law-violators are deprived of property right (parking tickets, or other fines), or liberty right (imprisonment, community service, etc.).
205 The deprivation of marriage right from gayists is neither excessive nor insufficient, but exactly proper. None of the privileges that married people enjoy over the unmarried is of vital necessity- marriage, after all, is a luxury, not necessity. No one has to marry to survive.
206 See infra
Possibility of self-harm is a byproduct of freedom. Society is a tightly knitted fabric where no one lives in isolation, but everyone works to serve someone else. Because of the interconnection of individuals, self-harm leads to harm to surrounding individuals, and eventually to society. The people adjacent to an individual are equity stakeholders of the individual’s life. What he is now is attributable not to him alone, but him and everyone around him. He is only the fiduciary of investments of his parents, siblings, friends, and everyone else who ever loved him. The discretion he exercises over his life should never contradict the interest of the shareholders—the true success of his life that is shared by the society. No one chose to be born. Everyone owes one’s existence to one’s parents and the lone line of forebears that traces back to the dawn of human race. There is no self-made man. Every idea is a product of impressions. Everyone is a crystallization of influences. No one owns one’s life, but is only in charge of it. This is why suicide is immoral: it is an irresponsible discharge of duty in trust. Gayism, likewise.

4.2845 Phobia

Phobia is what progayism purports to promote, not demote. What progayism demotes is conscience. Not many decades ago, antigayism constituted majority in society. Progayists managed to reverse the trend by dint of incendiary politics of fear. Progayists weaponized the legal system and media. With court orders and boycott campaigns, progayists have shot down private businesses run by conscientious objectors, who refused to serve ceremonial accommodation, flowers, photography, cakes for gayist wedding.

The chilling effect of progayism is not limited to business but extends to academia. Dr. Regnerus published a cross-sectional study in Social Science Research, a highly esteemed journal in social science. The study concluded that there are measurable detriments on children of same-sex parents compared to opposite-sex parents. The result is what is known as the Regnerus Affair. 200 impassioned ‘scientists’ signed a letter to the chief editor of the journal, saying that the paper should not have been published. Some editorial board member of the journal made a political move by distancing himself from Dr. Regnerus. Psychology and psychiatry made the same political flip-flop decades ago, when they removed gayism from the list of psychosis as progayism was gaining populist momentum.

---

207 Unrestrained power leads to corruption. This explains why democratic regimes suffer more crimes and immorality than totalitarian regimes, which in turn suffer from more political corruptions than democratic ones.
208 cite web news
A progayist in Florida, whose standing to sue is dubious at least, sued the journal, demanding the court to order a public disclosure of private correspondence of an editor of the journal. Surprisingly, the court so ordered. Relentless progayists petitioned University of Texas, where Dr. Regnerus is a faculty, to investigate academic misconduct. The university complied, and the investigation panel found no evidence of foul play such as data manipulation. Since when does politics exercise censorship over science? The last time it happened was the middle age, when Galileo was brought to court and ordered to ‘admit’ that the sun revolves around the earth.

Science is not a democracy. Science is not a rule by majority because it concerns not objectivity that shifts in time and space, but an absolute truth. An epochal scientific discovery invariably starts with an extreme subjectivity, an idea in a man’s mind. Gregor Mendel, Dmitri Mendeleev, Georg Cantor, Charles Darwin, and Albert Einstein were either outsiders or outcasts to their contemporary academic circles when they germinated the ideas that changed the course of history.

Instinctual objection of gayism, the natural repulsion most people feel when they see the same-gendered pair kiss each other, is both biological and moral. Like natural aversion of incest, natural antigayism is prescription of evolution to prevent reproductive waste. The aversion of blood or snakes are biological response to avoid danger. People condemn murder because its propagation endangers not only society but also the survivability of homo sapiens. Instinction is an evolutionary device to promote the survival of individuals and species. Morality, is nothing but the set of this evolutionary, primordial instincts to avoid harm and accommodate benefits. Antigayism is a healthy instinct and also a moral integrity.

Progayist militants, including the contemporary ACLU, has branded antigayists as hate group, bigots, and homophobics. People who fears social excommunication have become passive progayists, who respond ‘yes’ when they are asked about gay marriage support. Employers and schools fear lawsuits, boycotts, and the new ‘stigma’ of antigayism, and now have succumb to the progayist demands. Only a few people stand the ground on the face of progayist social and legal bullyism. Are these people ‘afraid’ or ‘brave?’ Isn’t it the passive homophobics that are homo-phobics, who suppress moral and instinctual objection in the fear of progayists? Aren’t antigayists more aptly termed as homo-resistants or

-----------------
the opposite gender is not something that naturally comes to a person. The art of courtship, both in men and women, requires the finest finesse that can be achieved only through trial and error, cultivation and refinement.

212 The court probably regarded the email message as public property, as the journal is housed by a public school, and article publication is the journal’s official business matter. Nevertheless, the journal editor who wrote the email message did not possibly assume or conceive that one day, the message he was writing would be publicly disclosed, and to that extent, the correspondence is a matter of privacy. The progayist legally harassing the journal editor is sending a clear message to the social science community that an antigayist research publication will not go unanswered.


4.29 Resolution of the Dichotomy

4.291 Data in Agreement

When social science community is divided into progayist and antigayist camps, the tiebreaker would be through logical deduction based on data that both parties agree upon. Here are the facts:

1. In straight couples, females initiate most divorces\textsuperscript{217}.
2. In straight couples, males commit most infidelities\textsuperscript{218}.
3. Divorce rate for lesbian couples is twice that of male gay couples\textsuperscript{219}.
4. Most male gay couples commit adultery, mostly by infidelity agreement\textsuperscript{220}.
5. 63\% of new AIDS cases are by male gays\textsuperscript{221}.

Males are more prone to promiscuity than females. Putting two males together doubles probability of promiscuity. Females are more prone to divorce than males. Putting two females doubles the chance for divorce\textsuperscript{222}.

In origin, sex is a mode of reproduction where the act is induced by the mechanism of sexual pleasure. A gayist sex is a simulation of the real, biological sex. The degree of homosexual pleasure is inherently less than that of heterosexual sex because the homosexual act contradicts physiological configuration of both human anatomy and nervous system that have evolved over eons\textsuperscript{223}. Sexual

\textsuperscript{216} See Ann Womack, I Hope You Dance (MCA Nashville, 2000), available at \url{http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DmBSGJxQc4Q}.


\textsuperscript{218} David C. Atkins et al., \textit{Understanding Infidelity: Correlates in a National Random Sample}, 15 J. Fam. Psychol. 735, 743 (2001). Men cheat more than women due to the evolutionary principle of selfish gene. Male is a gene-giver. The more partner a male has, the more widely the male spreads his genes. Thus, there is evolutionary pressure favoring male promiscuity in sexually reproductive animals. In contrast, females are gene-receiver. The number of Her eggs are limited. No matter how many males she has sex with, only the first male in a 9 month period has the genetically contributive effect on the child, as fertilization blocks subsequent sperms. Thus, there is no evolutionary pressure on female promiscuity. See Selfish Gene (Jan. 7, 2014, 10:12 PM), \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gene-centered_view_of_evolution#Selfish-gene_theory}.


\textsuperscript{221} Gay males are overrepresented in AIDS epidemic, as they comprise only 2\% of population. CDC, \textit{HIV in the United States: At A Glance} (Jan. 3, 2014, 6:19 PM), \url{http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/statistics/basics/ataglance.html}.

\textsuperscript{222} See Margaret S. Schneider, \textit{The Relationships of Cohabitating Lesbian and Heterosexual Couples: a Comparison}, 10 Psychology of Women Quarterly 234, 236 (1986).

\textsuperscript{223} An interesting, albeit indirect, evidentiary data is that an absolute majority of bisexualists are not in homosexual, but in heterosexual relationships. Gregory M. Herek, \textit{Demographic, Psychological, and Social Characteristics of
dissatisfaction in gayism is an inevitable consequence of physiology. What is worse, gayist sex is unilateral in that only one partner can reach an orgasm in a given sexual episode. The other partner suffers from either anal pain (in male) or tantalization and rewardless labor (in female). The unilateralness of gay sex require gayists to have twice as many sexual episodes as straights in order to meet their sexual needs. Male gayists look outside the wedlock to compensate for the dissatisfaction and to make up for the increased need of sexual episodes. The result is promiscuity and AIDS. On the other hand, female gay couples stay dissatisfied. When there are two females in the wedlock, the chance of divorce increases even further.

In Britain, 14% of straight couples divorce by 7th anniversary\(^{224}\). The corresponding number for male gay couples is 3%, and that for female gay couples is 6%, making 4.5% divorce rate on average in gay marriage\(^{225}\). Considering that straight marriage has history of millennia, if not more, the figure 14% signifies an impressive stability. To compare an apple to an apple, we should compare the acceleration rates of divorces in gay couples and straight couples. Assume the history of straight marriage is ten thousand years and that of gay marriage is ten years. Then, the acceleration of divorce rate in straight marriage is 14% / 10,000 years = 0.0014% per year on average. The acceleration rate for gay divorce is 4.5% / 10 years = 0.45% per year. That is, gay divorce rate is increasing three-hundred-and-twenty-one times faster than straight divorce rate (0.45 / 0.0014 \(\approx\) 321).

4.3 Law of Economics

4.31 Market

Equating romance with market is an economic modelling. It may not be ‘the’ truth, but one way to look at it. A market is a physical or metaphysical space where buyers and sellers bargain for considerations by contracts. Romance is a market.

4.311 Supply and Demand


Let A, B, C, D, E, F, G be bachelorettes, and t, u, v, w, x, y, z be eligible bachelors. The bachelors evaluate the females based on intelligence, personality, and appearance. By and large, the judgment criteria is objective. By the quality scale from 1 to 3 averaged over the seven men’s evaluation, A scored 3; B, C scored 2; D, E, F, G scored 1\(^{226}\). As graphed in Fig.4.3.11a, only one woman, A, scored 3; two women scored 2, and four women scored 1. Only a few women are perfect in every way. This is the supply curve in the romance market\(^{227}\), where y-axis denotes quality score of women judged by men, and x-axis denotes the number of women for each quality score.

\[^{226}\] A complete picture of the Mating Score function is as follows:

\[^{227}\] In commodity market, the price is inversely proportional to the quantity demanded, as consumers prefer lower price (thus downward demand curve); and price is proportional to quantity supplied, as suppliers prefer higher price (thus upward supply curve). See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supply_and_demand. In romance market, a mate is neither a perishable nor replaceable commodity, but a life-time partner with unique quality. This is why the curves look the opposite to those of commodity supply and demand. To be more precise, the classical supply-demand curves assume price variation given equal quality of the product. Quality variation is expressed by shifting of the curves, which is to map the z-axis variation of the 3-dimensional supply-demand surfaces. In the romance curves above, this z-axis of quality variation is set as the y-axis.
Similarly, the seven ladies evaluate the seven men.  t scored 3; u, v scored 2; w, x, y, z scored 1.  The few top-notch women get most of men’s attentions and desires.  This is the demand curve of the romance market.  Four men (t, u, v, w) wanted the top girl (A).  Only t gets A.  Two men, x and y, wanted second-tier girls (B C).  x gets B and y gets C (B, C are higher quality than x, y, but B, C have no choice but accepting x, y, as they are the only suitors).  The last man, z, wants a third-tier girl.  z gets G.  Now, the three men (u, v, w) suffer from the shortage of quality women.  The three women (D, E, F) are the surplusage.  Since none of u, v, w thinks the rest of three women (D, E, F) a suitable mate, no more heterosexual mating occurs.  w and D decide to be celibates.  u and v decide to be a gay couple.  E and F decide to be a lesbian couple.  This is one explanation of the occurrence of homosexuality.

4.3.12 Accounting Perspective

Net income equals revenue minus expenses\(^{228}\).  A company can temporarily increase its net income by cutting expenses even though there is no increase in revenue\(^{229}\).  Such a short-term strategy may hoodwink careless investors who only look at the net income of the company but it is not a sustainable business operation.  Overcutting expense will eat away the company’s infrastructure.  It is like a bear who starts eating its arm to feed its stomach, or a man who takes the wooden panel of his house’s wall to burn it and warm his hand.  Or it is like the pair of u and v, or E and F in the previous section, who sacrifice their moral integrity to find consortium in the same sex.  What u, v, E, and F should have done is to find compatible matches (e.g., u and E, v and F); improve themselves to be more romantically marketable; or learn to live as celibates.  Contrary to popular belief, gayism is not progressive, but


degenerative. Gayism is not a step forward, but a fall downward. u, v, E and F suddenly declare
themselves to be gay by birth. That is a self-deception. It does hurt to face that they are not wanted (E, F)
or that they are not chosen (u, v). But without admitting one’s incompetency, one cannot make progress.
Lying to oneself that one is gay and there is nothing one can do about it, is an excuse to give up one one’s
potential, a refusal to make oneself better.

Let us take a close look at the thought process of u, v, E, and F. Both u and v wanted the prize
bride, A, but were rejected. Both u and v thought they deserved to have A. u and v resent not only A and
t, but feel vengeful about the entire scheme of heterosexual romance that abandoned them. Both E and F
thought they would have been satisfied with getting u or v as their respective mates, as u and v are of
higher quality than themselves. But u and v do not want E and F, as u and v want someone better than or
equal to themselves in quality. u and v came up with a new idea. Why not u pair with v? After all, u and
v belong to the same quality echelon. This way, they can avoid the demeaning fate of mating with E and
F, respectively, who belong to lower quality echelon than u and v. The only obstacle to the gay pairing of
u and v is the stigma of homosexuality. This is when progayissm comes in. For E and F, the situation is
similar. Both belong to the same quality echelon. Both need consortium. After u and v pair up, there is
no men left. So E and F pair up. While u and v are gay by choice, E and F are gay by necessity.

4.32 Opportunity Cost

An opportunity cost is the value of the second-best alternative. The opportunity cost signifies the
relativity of optimality. While w has an absolute ideal of a man, her reality is limited to a feasible and
affordable set of choices. Feasibility is defined by physical distance between w and her candidates.
Affordability is defined by w’s worth in the eyes of men- w can expect only men of her own caliber.
Now, if w chooses x, the opportunity cost is 8, the value of the highest alternative. If w chooses y or z,
the opportunity cost is 10, the value of x. Therefore, y and z are more ‘expensive’ than x in terms of
forgone opportunity. That is why a woman, even in the face of an almost perfect suitor, hesitates. She is
uncertain if an even better man might come along sooner or later.

4.321 Opportunity Cost of Commitment

Marriage precludes promiscuity. The opportunity cost is promiscuity, both temporal and
spatial\(^{230}\). In exchange for one woman, a man gives up the rest of women on the earth. Loyalty is the
price, also the forgone opportunity cost of a relationship. Once one is locked in a relationship, backing up
costs dearly. A superficial relationship suffers from diminishing return. Marry in a hurry, regret in
leisure. A deeper relationship overcomes diminishing return by reinventing itself. As the couple ages,
matures, and children are born, they age, grow up, marry, and grandchildren are born, the family
constantly renews itself. The reward of a relationship can be everlasting- the genetic heritage that he and
she leaves through their progeny has the potential of perpetuity. A child born of a mother and a father is
the fruit of their love, the treasure more precious than anything in the world. Plus, the love and comfort
of a family nourish, refresh, and replenish its members. The constant and stable the supply of consortium
in a family is what sustains the society. Marriage, albeit costly, has a definite return on investment.

\(^{230}\) See supra, 4.2843, footnote.
4.322 Opportunity Cost in Gayists

Gayists forgo heterosexual relationship. Gayism avoids the cost of judgmentality. A woman is hypercritical when choosing a man of life, whereas she exercise leniency when it comes to choosing her friends. The reason, not surprisingly, has an evolutionary origin. To her, the choice of ‘the’ man is no longer about herself, but involves the welfare of her progeny. Choosing the right one is her mission of monumental consequence. Gayism has no such problem. Gayism is nothing but friendship colored with sexuality. The blurred border between friendship and romance easily imports the lenient criteria in friend selection into the realm of homosexually romantic selection. The non-exclusive nature of friendship is easily imported into homosexual relationship as well, constituting another reason for the inherency of promiscuity in homosexuality.

The judgmentality in heterosexual mate selection has a huge impact on society. Human males who compete to win mirrors the nature where two bucks butt their heads for a doe. A man studies, works, and works out to prove and improve his competency, to raise his social stratum, and to raise the echelon of his mate along the way. Gayism emaciates such heterosexual engine toward competency by decoupling occupational motivation and sexual drive. A gayist male is not backed by the natural, intact evolutionary pressure to impress the opposite sex. The consequence is deprivation of opportunity for self-improvement, and relative disadvantage in motivation for competency.

A woman, on the other hand, dresses to impress. Human aesthetics is dictated by the mechanism of pleasure and aesthetic perception, which is nothing but a product of evolution. Gayism rids women of the biological motivation to be attractive by dissociating aesthetics from biology. Conversely, a woman who abhors to be judged by males, who dislike adorning activities, may be motivated to be a gayist. The result is the loss of opportunity to improve her appearance, which is a, if not ‘the,’ quintessential source of happiness and self-fulfillment in women. Of course, a heterosexual has to face the judgmentality of the opposite sex. Such may be painful but is a fair price to better oneself. No pain, no gain.

4.323 Opportunity Cost in Children

Children adopted or surrogated by gay parents forgo optimal parental environment of a father and

---

231 See supra, 4.121
234 supra, for suboptimality of gay parenting.
a mother. Tragically, the innocent ones did not even have a choice. Who pays and what justifies for the deprivation of opportunity for the children to be raised in a gender-balanced parental environment?

In a gay-parented household, at most one parent has genetic connection to a child. The lack of genetic mutuality introduced a host of problems. First, the child has no binding force to prevent divorce of gay parents. It is an easy divide: a man’s son goes with him and the other man gets his daughter. Second, there is a heightened foreseeable risk of sexual abuse in gay parenting. What’s stopping a man from putting his hand on the young boy, who lives under the same roof, who is trusting and dependent, who is a complete genetic stranger to the other ‘father’? Hasn’t he already gone far down the path of moral denial that preempts every traditional immorality from getting in the way of his new lifestyle?

Third, physical abuse is also likely to be pronounced in gay parenthood. Essentially, the half of gay parents are step parents, and stepparents are 40 times more likely to abuse their stepchildren than biological parents.

Fourth, both surrogation and adoption, which are the only mode of reproduction for gayists, have problems that are absent in natural parenting. Surrogation is unethical in that it reduces the maternal bonding to cash value. During the nine month of gestation and the painful delivery of a child, the birth mother develops a strong attachment to the child. How inhumane is it for society to separate the mother from the child by paying her a lump sum of money? Adoption has long been suspected to be suboptimal to natural parenting. Why do people want to have children? They want to leave a lasting legacy.

235 An indirect evidence for this proposition can be found in foster a family study, which found that sexual abuse is more than seven times more common in non-kin foster homes than kinship-placed counterparts. See Mary I. Benedict et al., *The Reported Health and Functioning of Children Maltreated While in Family Foster Care*, 20 Child Abuse & Neglect 561, 564-65 (1996). Will gayist parents less likely to be sexually abusive just because they are gay? Moral flexibility, or ‘moral innovation’ is the hallmark of gayism. Gayists already have redefined adultery as the removal of conjugal confinement and the preservation of inter-spousal boundary. See footnote 4.2843. How long will it take before gayists give pedophilia a new name, say, ‘the Renaissance of Classical Queerism,’ or ‘Neo-Pederasty’?

235

236 see supra section 4.2843.


237

238 There are sociological data that suggest that adopted children have more behavioural and mental problems than non-adopted children. See Barbara J. Gaddis, *Reported Parental Role Performance, Parental One-on-one Behavior, Parental Expectations, and Problems with Children in Adoptive and Nonadoptive Families*, at 73, 78 (1994) (published Ph.D. dissertation, Iowa State University) (more school-reported problems in the adopted); Jeffrey J. Haugaard, *Is adoption a risk factor for the development of adjustment problems?*, 18 Clinical Psychol. Rev. 47, 50 (1998) (more mental problems in the adopted);

238 Martha A. Rueter et al., *Family Interactions in Adoptive Compared to Nonadoptive Families*, 23 J. Fam. Psychol. 58, 62 (2009) (more conflicts with parents in the adopted); Susan D. Stewart,

People survive death by leaving children behind. The genetic connection between a parent and a child is not a sentimental, but a fundamental one. Absence thereof weakens parental bonding and devotion.

Now what happens when a child of parents decides to be gay? The millennia of ancestral lineage suddenly comes to a halt, if the gay child decides adoption. If he or she uses surrogation, now the gay child’s child has in him the genes of a total stranger, either a surrogate mother’s or a sperm donor’s. For each gay generation, 50% of ancestral genetic heritage is replaced by a stranger’s genome. With this geometric decrease rate, the 5th gay generation individual will have the genetic authenticity of only 6.25% (=1/16), where 93.75% of his or her genome will have come from strangers. Gayism brings not only disgrace to the family name, but also terminates it. One who appreciates where one comes from would not do such an ungrateful act.

4.33 Externality

4.331 Nature

Externality is a side effect of a transaction between two parties, exerted upon a third party. The splendor and fragrance of flowers, courtship airshow of scissortailed flycatchers, pompous plumage of a peacock, concert of crickets, are all nature’s ‘booty calls’ that please humans’ eyes and ears. Natural sexuality is, arguably, an entity with the most externality. The externality of sexuality is so great that it extends across the boundaries of species.

4.332 Art

Human sexuality is one of the three eternal themes of art, literature, and architecture. The other two are, of course, nature and divinity. Human artistic ingenuity is the most productive when it is coupled with the romantic inspiration between a man and a woman. Romance, in turn, is fueled by evolutionary pressure toward reproduction. Art is a transformative sublimation from physical desire to ethereal metaphysics. Romantic art is, therefore, an extension of biological predilection. Gayism snips this connection.

4.333 Human aesthetics

A man looks the best when he is masculine. James Dean, John Wayne, Clark Gable, Roger Moore, Humphrey Bogart are icons in the memory of cinema because they are manly men. Likewise, women are the most beautiful when they are feminine. Elizabeth Taylor, Vivien Leigh, Marilyn

238 Even in an openly-gay artist like Andy Warhol, the prime inspiration came from his residual heterosexuality. The best known works by Warhol are not portrayals of men, but of the feminine beauty of Marilyn Monroe and Farrah Fawcett.

240 See “The Spy Who Loved Me” Title Sequence, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PNA7DcVppEs

241 Picture a Miss Universe and a Miss Lesbian Universe. Who will win? Envisage a all-female choir and a all-lesbian choir. Who will make a euphony and who will make a cacophony? Why do they differ? Can the reader
Monroe, Lauren Bacall\textsuperscript{243}, Audrey Hepburn- is it conceivable that lesbians can match the pulchritude of these aphroditians?

4.334 Externality of Gayism

Contragendability acquires the gender trait of the opposite gender, while retaining one’s own gender characteristics intact. Gayist androgyny, in contrast, dilutes one’s own gender, resulting in the loss of natural gender traits while not quite getting the opposite gender trait either. Gender dilution is one of many negative externality of gayism. Another is pollution of friendship by insertion of sexuality into where it does not belong. The most serious of all is the degeneration of morality, demotion of social standard, and distortion of history, law, and academia. Gayism has only one direction of externality, the negativity. Gayism is destructive of gayists themselves and the society they are in. This is why gayism has been banned everywhere, every era. The contemporary social acceptance, if not reversed, is the beginning of the end, rather than the end of a beginning.

4.4 Law of Politics

4.41 Differential Politics

A party cannot rule without victory. There is no victory absent a fight. A fight is preconditioned on difference. Differ, fight, win, and rule are the four steps of differential politics.

4.411 Liberalism v. Conservatism

The far side of liberalism is no rule of law, the state of chaos where everyone is free to do anything\textsuperscript{244}. The other extreme is totalitarianism where there is no autonomy. Conservatism, therefore, is not antithesis of liberalism. Conservatism focuses on preservation of timeless values, the values that long passed the test of time. The set of values includes norms as well as freedom.

4.412 Democratic Party’s Adoption of Gayism

Differential politics begins by differentiating itself from the other party. It is no secret that Republicanism roots on old-fashioned Christian values. The choice of gayism as the new battleground is no brainer. It is no coincidence that the 21 states\textsuperscript{245} that implemented anti-discrimination law in LGBT

\textsuperscript{243} See Lauren Bacall’s Picture (Jan. 11, 2014, 12:17 PM), http://fc09.deviantart.net/fs18/i/2007/133/d/f/Lauren_Bacall_by_AuroraMist.jpg

\textsuperscript{244} Gayism is the beginning of a free society moving toward the undesirable extremity of liberalism where freedom is over-valued outside the boundary of morality. This explains why former totalitarian regimes like Russia, China, and a host of countries in Asia, Middle East, and Africa are faring better than western countries in deterring gayism: they did not lose sight of common sense that the West has long forgotten.

\textsuperscript{245} See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT_employment_discrimination_in_the_United_States#State_law. The state of Michigan deserves a special recognition here, as it is the few blue states that have not given to the progayist demand of state-level ENDA legislation.
employment, by and large overlap with the ‘blue states,’ and that four out of the five supreme court justices who ruled in favor of gay marriage were appointed by presidents of Democratic Party.

4.42 Public Choice Theory

The theory is a misnomer- it is better named ‘private choice theory.’ The theory is a disillusionment, demystification of democracy. An interest group with a motivation that exceeds that of the general public on a given issue exerts influence to legislature. The cost of a new law is diffused and distributed over the public while the sought-after benefit is concentrated on the interest group.

4.421 ENDA

The proposed Employment Non-Discrimination Act (“ENDA”) is not about fairness but about hegemony. Otherwise, why would progayists engage in legal bullyism against antigayists while they condemn bullyism against gayists? Progayists’ legislation effort is their attempt to lead the direction of social change. From the start and all the way through, gayism is the campaign of imitation. Gay sex mimics straight sex by gay sex where a rectum substitutes for a female genital and a wearable prosthetic replaces a male genital. Gayists imitate straight marriage with a gay marriage. Gayists, incapable of reproduction, adopt and surrogate children to mirror a straight family. Finally, two men call each other ‘husbands,’ and a woman calls the other woman ‘her wife.’ If one does not perceive this as absurdity, one is joining the absurdity. Progayist legislation solidifies the legitimacy of gayism and forces the public to accept gayism as the new normalcy. That is, progayist legislation is readjustment of social standard to the level of gayists. Gayists affirm the abusive nature of anal sex. Gayists affirm pederasty, which is a quasi-homosexual pedophilia. Gayists affirm adultery in the form of infidelity agreement. Then, is the new order of gayism a promotion or demotion of society? The degeneration of moral and rational standard of society is the diffused cost of progayist legislation. Will gayists ever stop the affirmation of the impossible? At least one progayist affirmed an STD. What’s next? Will they call AIDS the ‘liberation disease?’

5. Law of Society

Progayist argument hinges on two purported traits of gayism: immutability and harmlessness.

---

246 In other words, progayism is not about equality but about inequality in favor of the homosexual at the expense of the religious. Also, progayism is not about individual rights, but about the usurpation, the monopoly of individual rights against conscientious objectors.

247 See Bad Romance, Lady Gaga.

248 A gay male in Germany posted an online ad to find a male volunteer to be murdered and cannibalized, to quench his homosexual sado-masochistic fantasy. BBC News, Profile: Cannibal Armin Meiwes (Jan. 19, 2014, 9:14 PM), http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3443803.stm. His fantasy was shared by more than 200 people he met online. Id. More than 400 people responded. Eric W. Hickey, Serial Murderers and Their Victims 126 (2009). Five gay males paid visits to his house: four of them asked him to release them, and he did; one of them, he rejected himself. Id. In the end, another gay male volunteered and followed through the murder and cannibalism. Id. For details, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armin_Meiwes. Gayists live in an alternate universe with an altered reality. If society does not stop progayism but embrace it, the gayist universe will be the reality of society.
Legal progayists claim that antigayism is a discrimination because sexual orientation is inborn and unchangeable like gender and race. The immutability, if persuaded to the generic populous, is a powerful shield for gayists. Then, wouldn’t it be plausible that gayists intentionally guise their gayism as innate, in order to reap what they did not sow, all the legal protections that the victims of racism and sexism has obtained in the past half century? Academic progayists claim that gayism is acceptable because it causes no harm. Isn’t this a wishful thinking?

5.1 Constitution

5.11 Preamble- “We the People”

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The text provides the purposes of Constitution- the pursuit of ideal, ‘a more perfect union.’ Paternalism is the definitional characteristic of a government. A child may cry for a candy but her father knows better and refuses to give it to her. If he gives in to the demand, the child will get cavity, and will cry even more from pain. The father foresees it, and prevents it by denying her request. A mother chides her child with morbid curiosity to stick his pinky in the automatic pencil sharpener. She may yell at him, or get rid of the contraption from the house, but will never let him satiate his desire. Gayism, whether society grants its legitimacy or not, will harm the gayists. Liberty toward a certain act, if it is clear to jeopardize the general welfare and lead to an imperfection, should be restricted. That is why a government exist.

5.12 Article 1- Representatives

Senators and Congresspersons are the leaders of their constituencies. If they perceive themselves as mere representatives, they are not leaders but followers of the public. Then what is the purpose of leadership? This is the inherent limit of democracy- electorates are the superiors of elective officials, who can fire them in the next election. It is not a leader’s job to please people. A leader is not an entertainer. A leader is not to show what they want to see, or say what they want to hear. A leader is to do the hard right, not easy wrong.

5.13 Article 2- Presidency

A president is a person with national authority. He sets the tone in discussions. When he misjudges, the nation missteps. The incumbent president of this country exercised a phenomenal leadership in passing the health care bill despite popular objection. He also was correct in his stance on
pro-environment\textsuperscript{249} and pro-immigration\textsuperscript{250}. Nonetheless, eventually, the history will record his progayist policy agenda as a misstep. A big part of the reasons why the president support gayism is, probably, that he was raised by a single mother, never experienced a normal parenthood, and thus cannot appreciate the importance of having a mother and a father. True, the man made a grade as much as to become the president of this country. Nonetheless, unless he corrects his mistaken progayist view in time, the president’s contribution to gayify this nation and the world will overshadow any accomplishments during his presidency, eclipsing his legacy. This is the detriment of single-parenthood that he could not overcome, at least so far.

5.14 Article 3- Judiciary

The nine justices of the federal supreme court are people with jurisprudential expertise. The cases before the supreme court often necessitates not only legal but also moral judgment, which is inherently subjective. Subjectivity is never precluded in their interpretation of the constitution, either. Which of the two, progayism and antigayism, has more constitutional ground?

5.15 Amendments

5.151 Hypothetical

Let us construct a hypothetical in the context of the proposed ENDA. Assume Adam is a private employer of a company with more than fifteen employees in one of the states with state-level ENDA statutes\textsuperscript{251}. His venture is in jewelry business with no religious overtone. Adam is a Christian who believes gayism is a moral sin. One of his job applicants is Gary, who is gay. One of his employee is Leslie, who is a lesbian. May Adam, by Constitution alone, fire Leslie and refuse to hire Gary, just because they are gay? In order to avoid waste of time and unnecessary hardship to both sides, Adam writes “LGBT Needs Not Apply” in the job posting, and fires Leslie. Gary and Leslie sues Adam under ENDA.

5.152 First Amendment

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Adam’s antigayism is his religion, while Gary and Leslie’s gayism is their lifestyle. ENDA gives Adam two choices: either change his religious view on gayism, or close business. If this is not repugnant

\textsuperscript{249} People subconsciously apply Kantian generalizer to realize how important an environmental issue is. E.g., it may not hurt to kill a tree, but it is still wrong to do so, because we cannot breathe without trees. \textsuperscript{250} Native Americans let European immigrants stay and cohabit the continent. Why shouldn’t we now show the same magnanimity to Hispanics, Europeans, Asians, Africans, or Arabs? For immigration and labor issue, See supra § 4.28421 footnote. \textsuperscript{251} see wiki
to the Constitution, what is\(^\text{252}\)? If law should not endorse involuntary slavery, why should it enforce involuntary mastery? Arent gayists rent-seeking when they force Adam to pay tribute to their bacchanalian gay god\(^\text{253}\)? Isnt the government discriminate against a group with an particular religious view, so that everyone except them may practice private businesses? If Adam is forced to close down his business because he refuse to compromise his religion, isnt this an unconstitutional ‘taking’ without just compensation, in violation of the Fifth Amendment? Worse still, the governmental taking is not for the benefit of the public, but for sentimental contentment of the four percent of the population, the gayists.

ENDA skews bargaining power in favor of gayists: while Gary and Leslie can walk away and get jobs somewhere else, Adam faces business closure. Now Adam has no freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly. Adam did not infringe on Gary and Leslie’s putative right to be gay, but exercised his right not to associate with gays. It is Gary and Leslie who infringed Adam’s right of liberty by forcing him to be with them, work with them, and live with them in the half of his waking hours, 5 days a week, for the rest of his life. ENDA forces Adam to end his moral integrity, without which he cannot pursue true happiness. To obey the law, Adam should either evacuate himself from morality, or suffer moral compunction whenever he is with Gary and Leslie, whose gayism he cannot condone. The court orders Adam not to practice discriminatory hiring on LGBT.

5.153 Fifth Amendment

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Adam could not continue his business. His business office is his private property, but ENDA prioritize Gary and Leslie’s right to be there over the property right of Adam. In employment law, unless a contract specifies otherwise, the at-will doctrine governs hiring, quitting, and firing. While Gary and Leslie have liberty not to apply to Adam’s company, and freedom to leave at any time, Adam must hire them and not fire them for the fear of lawsuit. This is not a fair system. What ENDA ends is not discrimination, but fairness: ENDA creates a brand-new discrimination against antigayists. Antigayism is not a discrimination but moral judgment. ENDA ends this species of morality and crowns the immorality of gayism. Notice that Adam is not saying Gary should stop being gay, but demanding him to respect the moral rules that are indispensable to Adam, if Gary is to work in Adam’s company. Otherwise, the relationship will not work. Adam leaves the choice to Gary: “either follow my rule under my roof, or go

\(^{252}\) Adam is forced to change his religious view and forced to employ and live with gayists. Undoubtedly, the two-fold menace constitutes the tort of intentional infliction of emotional distress. At first blush, the ENDA issue seems to pose an impossible civil rights dilemma: the society should either discriminate against either Christian employers or gay employees. If one is to uphold the constitution, gays should be discriminated, because religion, not gayism, is the explicitly protected class by the constitution. A closer look, however, reveals that the issue is not difficult at all—antigayism is not a discrimination but a beneficial and necessary deterrence, and a just and fair moral opprobrium. All that one has to do to avoid antigayist sanction is to stop homosexual activities.

\(^{253}\) See infra.
somewhere else. On the other hand, ENDA’s policy is far more draconian: “Adam should either modify his religion or close down his business.” A business owner cannot live by his religion- ENDA is unconstitutional.

5.154 Ninth and Tenth Amendments

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

Gay marriage is never mentioned in the constitution, so the ninth and tenth amendments seem to reserve the gay marriage right to the states and the people. An obvious retort is, how come the framers never mentioned self-mutilation in the constitution? Is it because they intended reserve the mutilation right to the states and the people? Is it far-fetched to think that, to the seven men of the 18th century America, the idea of two men calling each other husbands was as exorbitant as the idea of right to self-mutilation? Should the right to self-mutilate be guaranteed as constitutional exercise of liberty as it causes no harm to others but oneself? The framers never intended to abrogate common sense, common wisdom, or common mores by the constitution. Such is the intention of progayists.

5.156 Thirteenth Amendment

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

---

254 Constitutional right to freedom of religion include both freedom to have religion and freedom not to have religion. The freedom disappears when law either forces or forbids a religion. Adam is not forcing Gary his religion, as Gary can walk away from Adam’s company. Rather, Adam is informing Gary the necessary common denominator for compatibility, without which the occupational relationship would not work. The autonomy of management philosophy is the hallmark of free capitalist society. It is what motivates talented individuals to be their own bosses, to have control over things, by starting, owning, and growing private businesses. ENDA deflates such American dreams in many. Currently, religious business owners may move out of 21 ENDA-friendly states to pursue both their religions and businesses. If federal ENDA passes into a law, which is the holy grail of progayists, the conscientious objectors should flee out of America in order to pursue the freedom of religion elsewhere. This is a deja-vu: the ancestors of this country came here to evade the religious persecutions in Europe. See Religion and the Founding of the American Republic, Library of Congress (Jan. 19, 2014, 2:19 PM), http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/religion/rel01.html. Nothing is more un-American than ENDA, gayism, and progayism. Nothing threatens more American values than progayism does.

255 Nor is a straight marriage mentioned anywhere in the constitution.

257 Three presidents (George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson), three authors of Federalist Papers (Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, James Madison), and a scientist (Benjamin Franklin). See Founding Fathers of the United States (Jan. 19, 2014, 6:39 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Founding_Fathers_of_the_United_States. Let us conduct a feel experiment (as opposed to a thought experiment). It would be sacrilegiously disrespectful to characterize the seven founding fathers as the seven homosexuals. Why is that so? It is because homosexual imputation is inherently demeaning, which means that deep down inside, everyone knows that homosexuality is a bad thing.

258 Gayism is a metaphysical self-mutilation of one's gender potential.
It would be absurd to suppose that the constitution endorses involuntary masterdom, while forbidding involuntary serfdom. Forced masterhood is what ENDA amounts to, as Adam has no choice but hiring Gary and Leslie\(^{259}\).

5.156 Kantian in Employment

What if every employer is allowed to and decides to fire or not hire gayists? A gayist will be given two choices: either stay gay and starve to death or stop being gay and get a job. Being a leisure activity, homosexuality is not essential for survival, while having a job is. To live, gayists will be forced to act straight, which is exactly the goal of antigayism. Soft love can never correct a misbehaving child. Only tough love, by being forceful, can break the child out of the inertia of bad habits. Gayism, likewise.

5.157 Fourteenth Amendment

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Note that the constitution never says that every U.S. citizen is given an equal liberty right\(^{260}\). Rather, it implies the possibility of deprivation of liberty right, if it is the outcome of the due process. According to the constitution, the equality rests on due process and legal protection. That is, the equalization should be applied to the judgment standard, not the result of the judgment. If judgment result were to be equalized, everyone would have equal liberty, because no one is more guilty than anyone. What results is the nullification of law: if violators and observants are treated equally, law has no force, no effect, no meaning as if it never existed. In fact, the situation is even worse than no law at all. A law that equalizes result is an anti-law that rewards the guilty and punishes the innocent\(^{261}\), because equality of result entails inequality in judgment criteria. For instance, if theft is not punishable, an apple thief gets rewarded with a free apple while an innocent apple grower gets punished by the loss. The system is, de facto, judging the thief more favorably than the grocer by doing nothing, by no enforcement. The perverse system of double standard is lenient to the immoral thief by granting a free apple, while harsh on the moral grower because he has no choice but honestly producing it, losing it, without compensation or remedy. Worse still, by condoning theft, the society is being an accessory to future thefts: non-deterrence paves the way to the crime hike.

By the same token, there are two problems in ENDA concerning the equality principle of the 14th amendment. First, ENDA proposes that gayists be treated equally with straights. Gayism is immoral because it is harmful\(^{262}\). Treating the immoral the same as the moral is an equality in result, and rewards

\(^{259}\) For Adam, working with Gary or Leslie would be a mental torture like being forced to listen to a song that he cannot stand.

\(^{260}\) contra rawls.

\(^{261}\) ENDA is an anti-law, because it rewards the immoral by declaring gayists as a class protectable under affirmative actions, while it punishes the moral, the innocent, the conscientious, and the religious.

\(^{262}\) see supra
the immorality. Second, ENDA prioritizes Gary’s right to be gay over Adam’s right to be Christian, by forbidding Adam’s religious objection to Gary’s gayism. This is an inequality. What makes gayism more valuable than religion? First of all, is there such a thing as right to be gay? Let us conduct an imaginative reconstruction. Did the framers of Constitution envision a day when a man marries another man and a woman calls another woman her wife? The answer would be on the negative, reasonably. America began as a Christian Nation, where Protestants in Europe crossed Atlantic Ocean to pursue the freedom of religion. This is not a nation of outlaws who fled from laws and mores. America is built on the moral principles of Christianity:

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

The declaration prescribes that all humans are created equal. The equality is in the beginning, not the end: the declaration never says all humans die equal. At birth, everyone has one and only right: the right to live. This is the null right. Since an infant at birth has done neither good nor bad, as it never had a chance to do any, it has neither earned nor lost any right yet. This fact that everyone starts with a blank slate is the reason why everyone has an equal right at birth. Between birth and death, people live differently. If a man harms a woman, he goes to jail while she goes to a hospital. They do not get an equal treatment. The equality advocated in the declaration is the equality in judgment, not in result. If the man and the woman are equally sent to home, the judgment is unequal, since it favors the man. If one violates a moral doctrine that serves to preserve society, one should be sanctioned so that such violation is deterred. That is why Adam should be allowed to exclude Gary and Leslie from his private property. Unfortunately, ENDA would end up ending Adam’s pursuit of both religion and happiness.

263 Not every activity is a matter of right. E.g., no one has a right to murder, but everyone has a duty not to murder. Generally speaking, right equals freedom, and duty equals unfreedom. To have a right to do something is to be free to do it. To have a duty not to do something is to be not free to do it.

264 see holy trinity

265 Declaration of Independence.

266 See § 4.28421.

267 Even the null right is not a fundamental (i.e., un-deprivable) right. Once an individual murders someone or many, his right to live expires with a capital sentence.

268 It is also true that nobody is born with an equal inheritance. However, the initial pecuniary endowment does not make a significant difference. Money has never been deemed a key to happiness. The key to the happiness is the achievement, the upward differential between the past state and the present state. If one starts low, one has plenty of room to move upward, rendering the chance of happiness more likely. The more possibilities to enhance oneself compensates for the relative discomfort in living condition for a person born in an indigent family. Plus, indigence is a condition that one gets used to over time, and it does not cause indefinite unhappiness. Likewise, wealth is something one gets accustomed to as well, and thus money cannot buy eternal happiness either. Both ease and hardship of life is relative to one’s previous life state. See Habituation (last visited Feb. 9, 2014, 12:27 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Habituation.
ENDA amounts to the creation of a right to trespass\textsuperscript{269}. Gary and Leslie now have a right to be in Adam’s private property just because they are gay. ENDA puts an end to Adam’s right of religion, speech, press, liberty, assembly, and property. What ENDA creates is not a protected, but a privileged class that can supersede the constitution at will\textsuperscript{270}. Didn’t the president, supreme court justices, senators and congresspersons solemnly swear to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution, with one hand on Bible, concluding with a prayer, “So help me, God”?\textsuperscript{271} ENDA is a constitutional outrage, if not the abrogation thereof. If one is to walk the talk, there is only one way to proceed.

5.1571 Constitutional Right and Gayism

Proposition 5.1571: An assignment of a constitutional right to an immoral activity relegates the Constitution to an immoral institution.

To not be gay is a moral duty, because being gay harms oneself and others. Therefore, to be gay cannot be constitutional right. If it is, we are interpreting the constitution to conflict with morality, rendering constitution an immoral institution. Progayism is like the disheveled uniting to advocate for constitutional right to smell, fighting for the employment nondiscrimination right for the stinkers, as neither being gay nor being smelly is illegal, but both are immoral. How demeaning it would be to the Constitution if it has to recognize the right to stink. This already happened, however. By Lawrence v. Texas, the SCOTUS declared that it is every man's constitutional right to insert his penis to another man's anus. By the DOMA decision, the SCOTUS declared that the Constitution gives a woman a right to call another woman a wife. The SCOTUS declared that the Constitution supports and approves a family where a child has two mothers instead of a mother and a father. The SCOTUS is disfiguring the Constitution rather than protecting it- what would the framers be saying to each other in heaven when they are observing a Justice who praise them as geniuses\textsuperscript{272} but destroying everything that they believed in? Here is a suggested answer: the same old\textsuperscript{273}.

\textsuperscript{269} Employment is not a right but a privilege. Only the ones chosen by the employer have right to work in the company, while the rejected have not such rights. Employment is not a freedom but a duty. An employee relinquishes his right of liberty the moment he comes to work. During the work hours, he no longer has right to watch TV, play video games, or bring a pet along unless his employer permits it. An employee does what an employer orders him to do. That is what he gets paid for. The property right (i.e., the salary) that the employee earns is the reward in exchange for the liberty right lost during the work hours. That is, the liberty right is sellable, and thus alienable- it happens every day, everywhere, to everyone. The property right, i.e., the money from salary, then converts into the life property right, as he purchases food and clothing, pay the rent, and live. Right is a fungible entity. An even more disturbing reality is that right is inheritable as well. The Declaration of Independence was correct in stating that “all men are created equal.” See supra § 5.157. Everyone indeed is born naked, crying, and wrinkly, covered with blood and amniotic fluids. However, nobody is born with equal future interest in property right.

\textsuperscript{270} Religion is constitutionally protected, while sexism and racism are constitutionally forbidden. Religion and gayism are not compatible because the former is moral and the latter is immoral. When the two clash, religion stands and gayism loses, if the nation is to abide by the constitution,


\textsuperscript{273} “This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me.” Matthews 15:8 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+15&version=KJV.
5.2 Statutes

5.21 Civil Rights Act of 1964

All persons shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations of any place of public accommodation, as defined in this section, without discrimination or segregation on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Of course, it is not socially desirable for gayists to be denied of housing, clothing, and food. This is especially true in that everyone makes a mistake and deserves a second chance. Nonetheless, gayists should be deprived of certain rights as long as they insist on gayism. Otherwise, gayism will not be deterred but spread, along with its harmful effects on society. Preservation of private employers’ right to not hire gayists will serve the deterrence purpose.

5.211 Protected Class

The Act’s protected classes overlap with those protected by the constitution: religion (1st amendment), race (15th amendment), sex (19th amendment), and age (26th amendment). Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 added age and disability to the set of statutorily protected classes. The commonality here is the immutability274. Progayist attempts to slip gayism into the protected classes by the immutability argument. The very fact that one is gay reveals the fact that sexual ‘orientation’ is mutable: by the physiological predisposition and the dictate of genetic programming, a sexual individual is heterosexual, because sexuality is the expression of the will of evolution to reproduce and perpetuate a species. One, somehow, mutates oneself to homosexual attraction. Is it a reversible process? Absolutely. The root of a behavioural propensity is in genes. As long as a man is a man in genes, he is attracted to women. All he is to do is stop denying his heterosexual reality. The predilection of the nature is an undeniable truth.

5.22 Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993

The Congress finds that—

(1) the framers of the Constitution, recognizing free exercise of religion as an unalienable right, secured its protection in the First Amendment to the Constitution;

(2) laws “neutral” toward religion may burden religious exercise as surely as laws intended to interfere with religious exercise;

(3) governments should not substantially burden religious exercise without compelling justification;

---

274 Religion is undoubtedly a mutable trait. There are two reasons why religion has a special position in the constitution. First, this country was founded by protestant fugitives who fled from religious prosecution in Europe order to pursue the freedom of religion. Religious freedom was the reason of the birth of America. See Holy Trinity (“America is a Christian nation”). Second, religion serves a vital social function of preserving and enforcing morality that law cannot (see supra 4.26). Does gayism has a value equivalent to that of religion?
(5) the compelling interest test as set forth in prior Federal court rulings is a workable test for striking sensible balances between religious liberty and competing prior governmental interests.

(b) Purposes
The purposes of this chapter are—

(2) to provide a claim or defense to persons whose religious exercise is substantially burdened by government.

Is the right to be gay a compelling interest of the government? Gayism harms gayists. It is the interest of government to discourage gayism. Do we need yet another legislation to re-restore the freedom of religion that progayist legal militants have savaged over the past decade?

5.23 Quantitative Analysis of Rights

The following rights point system assigns relative weights to rights according to the principle in the supremacy clause:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Constitutional Right:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Statutory Right:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Constitutional Right:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Statutory Right:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adam’s right to exercise religion: 3 (First Amendment)
Adam’s right to free speech: 3 (First Amendment)
Adam’s right to liberty to own and practice business: 3 (Fifth Amendment, ‘liberty protection’)
Adam’s right to equal law protection: 3 (Fourteenth Amendment)
Religious Freedom Restoration Act: 2

Adam’s total right weight: 17

Gary’s right to equal law protection: 3 (Fourteenth Amendment)
Civil Rights Act: 0 (LGBT is not protected class)
Gary’s right to not be gay-discriminated: 1 (State-level ENDA Statute)

---

275 42 U.S. Code § 2000bb
276 The quantification of rights and rights summation method is what judges and jurors do implicitly. By making the process explicitly, the trial system can be less error- and bias-prone and more transparent. It is acknowledged that the constitution is superior to statutes qualitatively rather than quantitatively, but the assignment of numeric values to them is nevertheless useful in recognizing the hierarchical structure of laws and comparing the relative significance of rights that the laws protect.
277 A constitutional law is superior to a statutory law, and a federal law is superior to a state law. We assign ‘+1’ for each superiority, and the reference point is a state statute, which we assign ‘1.’
278 Constitutional reiteration of liberty right in two separate amendments can be reasonably construed an relative emphasis of the value, and thus justifies added weight in the rights counting. While Adam’s business practice is beneficial, Gary and Leslie’s gayism is harmful. Constitutional protection of liberty does not extend to individually and socially harmful acts. This is why the freedom to be gay is not a constitutionally protected liberty.
According to law, Adam wins by 17 to 4. Nonetheless, Gary, Leslie, and other gayists and progayists managed to invert the antigayist status quo over the past couple of decades. The battle was between the freedom to be immoral (progayism) and the freedom to be moral (antigayism). In the 21 states, progayists won, and now Adam has no liberty of religion. Progayists assures Adam that he can still go to church and read bible. But if Adam is forbidden by law from abiding by the biblical morals, if he cannot walk the talk, he isn’t quite practicing his religion. Thus, the progayist assurance of freedom of religion is illusory.

The instability, injustice, and confusion introduced into the public councils, have, in truth, been the mortal diseases under which popular governments have everywhere perished . . . By a faction, I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adversed to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community. . . . Men of factious tempers, of local prejudices, or of sinister designs, may, by intrigue, by corruption, or by other means, first obtain the suffrages, and then betray the interests, of the people.279.

The effect of the progayist inversion of status quo is not confined to LGBT community. It is the start of a society with an inverted value system, where morality is penalized and immorality is prized.

5.3 Case Laws

5.31 Employment Law

In modern common law, there are very few cases, if any, where an employer of a non-religious private organization fired an employee or refused to hire an applicant solely because he or she is gay. Then, ENDA is a perfunctory solution to a non-existent problem. On the other hand, there are numerous cases where an employee gets fired precisely because he or she is an antigayist. When an employee experiences implicitly differential treatment because he or she is gay, the case winds up in court. When an employee gets fired explicitly because he or she is an antigayist, the case ends up in media.

Most, if not all, LGBT discrimination cases in employment setting involves hostile treatment of employers and colleagues on gayist employees280. Employers of non-religious companies don’t just fire gayists because they’re gay- it is a straw-man argument of progayists281. When differential treatment occurs, gayists become dysfunctional or delinquent at work, and either employers fire them or employees quit. This is the right thing to happen. Justice is served when the immoral are dissuaded by dint of comeuppance. If law interferes with such natural process of social correction, injustice will result, where the wrongdoers get away with the harm they cause and spread. Gayist employees typically argue that it is

280 Robertson v. Siouxland Cmty. Health Ctr., 938 F. Supp. 2d 831, 835 (N.D. Iowa 2013); Kalich v. AT & T Mobility, LLC, 679 F.3d 464, 469 (6th Cir. 2012)
unfair for them to be discriminated for who they are. Well, it is not who they are, but who they've become, and whom they can change. It is antigayist employers who should say that the natural and instinctive objection against gayism is who they are. Gayism is both acquired and mutable while antigayism is neither. If a worker stops washing and brings odor to workplace, lavation is no longer a matter of privacy. Showering is not prescribed by law, but it must be socially enforced by the mechanism of reprimand, shunning, and in certain cases, jokes and scorns. Granted, law cannot forbid people from being gay without infringing on autonomy. But if law deprives society of interpersonal process of correction, there will be no mechanism left to prevent moral stench in workplaces. If law is to permit an immoral act for the sake of autonomy, law should also permit citizen's moral sanction on the immoral actor. That is, if law permits gayism, law should also permit refusal of non-vital services and employment to gayists in private sector. The caveat is that violence against gayists should not be tolerated insofar as gayism should not be condoned. To do otherwise is replacement of an evil with another, resulting in a zero-sum. Antigayism is a moral doctrine, and it loses moral force if it resorts to immoral means. Nonetheless, antigayism should be pronounced to be effective. Silence does not mobilize inertia. Inaction is an acquiescence.

5.311 Menagerie of Law

In Washington, one of the 21 states that implemented ENDA in state level, ‘perceived homosexuality’ is not a protected class. That is, a straight man, if discriminated because he looks like a gay, cannot be protected under WLAD (Washington’s version of ENDA). Why? Because he was not ‘gay enough?’ Another curious case involved a straight woman who were discriminated by her gay employers because of her ‘heterosexual orientation.’ The employer won a summary judgment. One must be gay to get legal protection. This is another instance of gayist rampage and trample on constitution. Then how come it is so common to see constitutional trespass in progayism? It is because gayism and law are incompatible. Law originates from morality, whereas gayism was, is, and will be immorality. Law and gayism do not mix.

5.32 Family Law

5.321 Proposition 8

In 2008, Californians voted ‘yes’ to constitutionally ban gay marriage. We’re talking about California, the most progressive state in America, the state that houses San Francisco, the birthplace of...

---

282 An analogy can be found in international law, which lacks enforcement authority, but is effective nonetheless. The mere existence of international law deters nations from violating it, as a violation imposes the nation a reputational cost: no country wants to be known as an international outlaw. See Louis Henkin, How Nations Behave: Law and Foreign Policy 92-95 (2d ed. 1979). Most people abide by law because it is the law. Progayism aspires to erase antigayist morality from humanity. The result is, more and more people will violate that ex-rule, because it no longer is a rule.

283 Vital services would be that of food, clothing, housing, and public defense counsels.


286 Hollingsworth v. Perry, 570 U.S. ____ (2013) (Docket No. 12-144),
modern gayism. The voters did the right thing but judiciary screwed it up.

5.322 Menagerie of Family

Gayism is a sexual contortionism where gayists bend over backward to achieve what looks like a traditional marriage. D.M.T. ("D") and T.M.H. ("T") are lesbian couples. T had a doctor take out her egg, fertilize it with a donated sperm, then inseminate the fertilized egg into D’s womb. After the baby gets born, T is the biological mother and D is the birth mother. Why all this trouble when there is an obvious alternative? T and D ended up in divorce and the court case regards to the custody of the child.

5.33 Property Law

5.331 DOMA Case

A lesbian widow claims a spousal tax exemption on the estate of her decedent wife, asking the

---


288 D was infertile. Nonetheless, it would have cost less and been easier for both if the artificial insemination had involved only T, who was fertile. The couple went through the medical acrobatics just to achieve what a straight couple would have naturally achieved: a child whose birth is physically owed to both parents.

289 United States v. Windsor, 570 U.S. ___ (2013) (Docket No. 12-307). Taxation is a power reserved to the Congress, and the definition of marriage is a political question for the Congress, neither of which falls into the jurisdiction of SCOTUS. See U.S. Const. art. I, § 8 ("[t]he Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . . to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States); Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 170 (1803) ("[q]uestions, in their nature political . . . by the constitution and laws . . . can never be made in this [Supreme] [C]ourt [of the United States]"). Let us examine Justice Brennan’s six criteria for a controversy to be qualified as a political question, any one of which would deprive SCOTUS of the jurisdiction. Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186, 217 (1962).

1. "Textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department"
   - Article I § 8 of the Constitution explicitly grants the Congress the discretion of whom and how to tax. DOMA is the Congress’ exercise of discretion to define that marriage is between a man and a woman for regulatory purposes including taxation. See 1 U.S.C. § 7 (“In determining the meaning of any . . . regulation . . . of . . . agencies of the United States, the word [']marriage['] means only a legal union between one man and one woman”).

2. "A lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving it;"
   - The phenomenon of gay parenting has zero precedence in history, and thus empirical evidence of harmless or harmful effect of gay parenting on children cannot be positively determined by the court.

3. "The impossibility of deciding without an initial policy determination of a kind clearly for nonjudicial discretion"
   - The definition of marriage is a matter of public policy, the function that the Constitution entrusted the Congress with. See U.S. Const. art. I, § 8 (“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers”).

4. "The impossibility of a court’s undertaking independent resolution without expressing lack of the respect due coordinate branches of government"
   - The Congress defined the marriage as the one between a man and a woman in DOMA. The SCOTUS repealed not only a law enacted into the United States Code, but also disrespected the timeless tradition and the decree of the SGOTUS (Supreme God Of The UniverSe).

5. "An unusual need for unquestioning adherence to a political decision already made"
   - What is more unusually and unquestionably necessary than to prevent gayists from depriving a child of the opportunity to have a mother and a father?

6. "The potentiality of embarrassment from multifarious pronouncements by various departments on one question."
court to recognize gay marriage. The court held for the plaintiff, overturning DOMA (Defense of Marriage Act)\textsuperscript{290}. Justice Scalia acknowledges that there is disagreement in social science regarding whether gay parenting is harmless or harmful to children\textsuperscript{291}. The source of the disagreement, unfortunately, is not scientific but political. Sociologists in LGBT studies are either gayists themselves or friends and families of gayists. The ‘scientists’ are biased by nature, and thus their expertise must be impeached, and their research discredited, if the court is to be rational. Justice Kennedy mentions that there are 40,000 kids under gay parents in California alone.\textsuperscript{292} That is precisely why the harmfulness of gay parenting must be fully analyzed before gay marriage becomes the law - the stake is too high. Justice Kennedy then asks, “don’t you think the voice of these children should be heard?” Well, here is one, a testimony by a man raised by two mothers:

Quite simply, growing up with gay parents was very difficult, and not because of prejudice from neighbors. People in our community didn’t really know what was going on in the house. To most outside observers, I was a well-raised, high-achieving child, finishing high school with straight A's. Inside, however, I was confused. When your home life is so drastically different from everyone around you, in a fundamental way striking at basic physical relations, you grow up weird. I have no mental health disorders or biological conditions. I just grew up in a house so unusual that I was destined to exist as a social outcast. My peers learned all the unwritten rules of decorum and body language in their homes; they understood what was appropriate to say in certain settings and what wasn’t; they learned both traditionally masculine and traditionally feminine social mechanisms.

... In terms of sexuality, gays who grew up in traditional households benefited from at least seeing some kind of functional courtship rituals around them. I had no clue how to make myself attractive to girls. When I stepped outside of my mothers’ trailer, I was immediately tagged as an outcast because of my girlish mannerisms, funny clothes, lisp, and outlandishness. Not surprisingly, I left high school as a virgin, never having had a girlfriend, instead having gone to four proms as a wisecracking sidekick to girls who just wanted someone to chip in for a limousine. When I got to college, I set off everyone’s “gaydar” and the campus LGBT group quickly descended upon me to tell me it was 100-percent certain I must be a homosexual. When I came out as bisexual, they told everyone I was lying and just wasn’t ready to come out of the closet as gay yet. Frightened and traumatized by my mother’s death, I dropped out of college in 1990 and fell in with what can only be called the gay underworld. Terrible things happened to me there. It was not until I was twenty-eight that I suddenly found myself in a relationship with a woman, through coincidences that shocked everyone who knew me and surprised even myself. I call myself bisexual because it would

\textsuperscript{290}A law can be wrong. Being a legislator does not immunize the person against human fallibility (cite brown v ed). So is a justice subject to the human condition. If a law can be wrong, so can be its overturn. What is less likely to be wrong than a law, a legislator, a justice, is the common human morality preserved by different cultures over the entire human history, upheld by billions of people who had ever lived on the earth? Antigayist morality is a part of the universal objectivity that has withstood the test of time and space.

\textsuperscript{291}See http://www.npr.org/2013/03/26/175351429/audio-supreme-court-arguments-on-california-gay-marriage-ban.

\textsuperscript{292}See id.
take several novels to explain how I ended up “straight” after almost thirty years as a gay man. I 
don’t feel like dealing with gay activists skewering me the way they go on search-and-destroy 
missions against ex-gays, “closet cases,” or “homocons.”

. . . .

Forty-one years I’d lived, and nobody—least of all gay activists—had wanted me to speak honestly 
about the complicated gay threads of my life. If for no other reason than this, Mark Regnerus 
deserves tremendous credit—and the gay community ought to be crediting him rather than trying to 
silence him. Regnerus’s study identified 248 adult children of parents who had same-sex romantic 
relationships. Offered a chance to provide frank responses with the hindsight of adulthood, they 
gave reports unfavorable to the gay marriage equality agenda. Yet the results are backed up by an 
important thing in life called common sense: Growing up different from other people is difficult and 
the difficulties raise the risk that children will develop maladjustments or self-medicate with alcohol 
and other dangerous behaviors. Each of those 248 is a human story, no doubt with many complexities. 
Like my story, these 248 people’s stories deserve to be told. The gay movement is 
doing everything it can to make sure that nobody hears them. But I care more about the stories than 
the numbers (especially as an English professor), and Regnerus stumbled unwittingly on a narrative 
treasure chest. 293

Here is another one, a testimony by a woman raised by two fathers:

What is the most suitable environment for children to be born or adopted into? 16 The many 
personal, professional and social experiences with my father did not teach me respect for morality, 
authority, marriage and paternal love. I felt fearfully silenced as I was not allowed to talk about 
my dad, his male housemates, his lifestyle and encounters within the subcultures without being 
browbeaten and threatened by my father. While I lived at home, I had to live by his rules. Yes, I 
loved my dad. However, I felt abandoned and neglected as my needs were not met since my father 
would often leave suddenly to be with his partners for days. His partners were not really interested 
in me. I was outraged at the incidences of same-sex domestic abuse, sexual advances toward 
minors and loss of sexual partners as if people were only commodities. I sought comfort looking 
for my father’s love from boyfriends starting at 12 years old. From a young age, I was exposed to 
explicit sexual speech, self-indulgent lifestyles, varied GLBT subcultures and gay vacation spots. 
Sex looked gratuitous to me as a child. I was exposed to all-inclusive manifestations of sexuality 
including bathhouse sex, cross-dressing, sodomy, pornography, gay nudity, lesbianism, 
bisexuality, minor recruitment, voyeurism and exhibitionism. Sado-masochism was alluded to 
and aspects demonstrated. Alcohol and drugs were often contributing factors to lower inhibitions 
in my father’s relationships.

. . . .

Over two decades of direct exposure to these stressful experiences caused me insecurity, 
depression, suicidal thoughts, dread, anxiousness, low self-esteem, sleeplessness and sexuality 
confusion. My conscience and innocence were seriously damaged. I witnessed that every other 
family member suffered severely as well. It took me until I was into my 20s and 30s, after making 
major life choices, to begin to realize how being raised in this environment affected me. My 
healing encompassed facing reality, accepting long-term consequences, and offering forgiveness. 
Can you imagine being forced to tolerate unstable relationships and diverse sexual practices from 
a young age and how this affected my development? My gender identity, psychological well-being

http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2012/08/6065/?utm_source=RTA+Lopez+Two+Moms&utm_campaign=winsto 
gr&utm_medium=email
and peer relationships were affected. Unfortunately, it was not until my father, his sexual partners and my mother had died, was I free to speak publicly about my experiences. I believe same-sex marriage will dispose of unique values esteemed within marriage as recognized throughout history. Marriage needs to remain a societal foundation that constitutes, represents and defends the inherently procreative relationship between the husband and the wife for the welfare of their biological children.17 Children need consistent appropriate boundaries and secure expressions of emotional intimacy that are not sexualized in the home and community294.

Of course, the detriments that children under gay parents are, albeit substantial, not insurmountable. Children are resilient. It is adversity that makes a person stronger and more independent. Nonetheless, gayism exact unnecessary, unjustified cost to children, whose time and energy to overcome the gay-parenting detriment could have spent on other constructive venues. What a waste, all on behalf of the selfishism of gayists at the expense of lives of children. The tautological truth is that society will be doomed if it fails to prevent foreseeable harm to the youth who will make up the next generation. It will be a negligence.

5.3311 Coase Analysis of DOMA

Coase theorem says that in the end, a merchandise will fall into the hands of a buyer who appreciates it the most if transaction cost is not too high295. That is, initial distribution of a resource doesn't matter because the resource will end up in the hands of a person to whom the resource is the most valuable, as long as barriers to inter-party bargaining is not prohibitive. Is a beautiful woman more valuable to a busy, important, rich man than to another man who is relatively not as prosperous296, who happened to live in her neighborhood, which lowers the search cost? Arguably yes, because such a woman's feminine beauty may be better serving the society if it is used to soothe and reinvigorate the stress-out man, who serves a high and important function for the society. What if the woman happen to be a neighbor of a man who know a way around women but who is neither as diligent nor as prominent as the other man living in a town far away? Does this initial distributory condition matter? Yes, if the neighbor marries her.

We already established a relationship is a high-cost, ultra-high barrier transaction297. Marriage further raises the bar: once the woman marries the neighbor, the other man is prohibited from marrying her. Thus, unfortunately, the young urban bachelor is out of luck even if he appreciates her the most. Too bad for society, because if the woman and the yuppie had gotten married, they would have begotten posterity who would have been both beautiful and smart. DOMA expressed society's consideration of positive externality of a traditional marriage and negative externality of homosexual one. First, feminine sexuality is a resource better used by males because the heterosexual match-up begets posterity and preserves the society by ensuring continuance of next generation. Second, feminine sexuality is a resource better appreciated by and more valuable to males because heterosexual pleasure is bigger than homosexual one298.

296 See indecent proposal.
297 See § 4.12.
298 See supra § 2.232 (imitativeness of homosexual entails dissatisfaction).
To function well, one needs to discharge stress and sex can serve as a cathartic conduit thereof. Without such consortium support, one’s economic output will suffer. Homosexuality, especially when there is a social approval thereof, diminishes the pool of available mates in heterosexual relationship. Worse yet, the legitimacy of gay marriage makes such availability reduction permanent by prohibitively raising the barrier to resource re-distribution. That is to say, if two females become wife and wife, neither can become a wife of a husband. DOMA was a prescient legislation to prevent such repercussion.

The occurrence of gayism is due to the high transaction cost of heterosexual mating. How hard is it for a man to wind a woman’s heart? Women’s pickiness is well justified because the choice of a man is about not only herself, but also the future of her progeny. Even though a woman is the most valued by a man, the high transaction cost lets her fall to the arms of another woman, who cannot appreciate her nearly as much as a man can.

5.34 Media Cases

5.341 Legal Contortionism

In 2012, a progayist group conducted a ‘civil sting operation’ on Exxon Mobil. The progayists sent Exxon resumes of two fictitious job applicants, a gay and a straight. Exxon granted interview only to the straight applicant and the progayist sued Exxon for it. With what authority do progayists assume the police power? In the Constitution of the United States, there is the principle of standing to sue, where only a party tangible and concrete injury is entitled to sue. If injury is hypothetical, conjectural, or of general grievance, according to the Constitution, one has no right to sue. As mentioned earlier, the progayist who sued the journal that published the Regnerus paper lacks legal standing. The progayist may have disliked the paper, but such is not an actionable injury. As a matter of fact, the Regnerus paper has potential benefit to gayists. If gay parenting is indeed harmful to children as the paper demonstates, gayists can avoid inflicting harm to the innocent by not adopting or surrogating children. That is, if they even care about the well-being of the children. Dr. Regnerus did his job as sociologist, by stating the research result and warning potential gay parents. There is no injury here, let alone an actionable one.

5.342 Objection Overruled

299 http://www.metroweekly.com/poliglot/2013/05/exxonmobil-accused-of-lgbt-discrimination-in-legal.html; http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2013/05/22/exxon-mobil-anti-gay-bias/2350843/; http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/24/exxon-mobil-lgbt-discrimination_n_3328668.html. The progayist group ended up filing charges against Exxon. http://www.freedomtowork.org/?page_id=483. Since when has the court of law agreed hear a case that does not exist, to redress a fictional harm, winking at the activist group’s entrapment operation? How come nobody is stopping the progayists from wreaking havoc on our legal system? What are they afraid of? A litigation, public humiliation, excommunication, defamatory branding as a homophobe, a hater, a bigot? The country is headed for a wrong direction. Americans need to stand up for what America stands for.

300 article iii

301 Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. at 563.

302 supra
A court orders a baker to sell wedding cakes to gayist newly-weds\(^{303}\). Another baker is forced to close down his business after protests, boycotts, and threats from progayists\(^{304}\). An innkeeper close down a major part of the operation, the wedding accommodation business\(^{305}\). A court orders to a photographer to take pictures of gayist weddings\(^{306}\). A state prosecutor, and then again ACLU, chase after a florist who refuses to compromise her religious conviction\(^{307}\). A sports commentator gets fired for expressing his view on gayism\(^{308}\). A football coach gets suspended for uttering one word that gayists perceive as offensive\(^{309}\). A graduate student gets expelled because she refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of gay relationship of her clients\(^{310}\). A reality TV star also gets suspended for exercising his First Amendment right of free speech in a magazine interview\(^{311}\). A What is the most surprising is, we are not talking about some arcane communist country under a tyrannical dictator. We are talking about America, the land of the free, the home of the brave\(^{312}\).

5.4 The United Nations\(^{313}\) Charter

WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED

• to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought


\(^{312}\) star spangled baner.

untold sorrow to mankind, and
• to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and
• to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and
• to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

AND FOR THESE ENDS
• to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and
• to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and
• to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and
• to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

The reader knows how the preamble would be interpreted in the eyes of progayists. One needs to take off that tinted glasses to see the truth in full colors. Did the nations agree to lift sanction against the immoral? Or did they intend to eliminate racial injustice and ethnic violence such as apartheid or genocide? Is the United Nations’ ideal of equality in the spirit of communist idea of equality in result, where the immoral and the moral gets the same right, advantaging the immoral and thus encouraging immorality? Did the leaders of the nations have in mind the pictures of two married men or two married women? Why do we allow gayists to slip into the scene of human right advocacy? Do we think on our own, or do we regurgitate the rhetoric that progayists have force-feed us over the past couple of decades? If we do not doubt, do not question, do not cerebrate, does our existence have any meaning or purpose? If we cannot think on our own capacity, are we free? Does the gayism free people or enslave them? Is LGBT movement an advancement or derailment? A freedom from quarantine does not free one from illness. What happens to a society that tolerates people with a calamitous and contagious disease, so that they can live freely among the healthy rest?

5.41 ‘Fundamental Human Right’ Fallacy

The U.N.’s rhetoric of ‘fundamental human right’ is a political hypocrisy. If there exist certain rights so fundamental and equal to everyone or every nation, how come the U.N. discriminate based on political size of nations? For instance, the U.N. admitted China back in 1945, but has been refusing to

See infra § 5.41.
See U.N. Charter art. 1, para 3 (“fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion”). The official policy of Israel exemplifies an inverted morality counter to the charter: it recognizes LGBT rights, while denies Palestinians’ rights. See LGBT rights in Israel (Jan. 25, 2014, 10:52 AM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT_rights_in_Israel; Israel and the Apartheid Analogy (Jan. 25, 2014, 10:53 AM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Israel_and_the_apartheid_analogy. The country disparages antigayism as discrimination, but affirms racism by implementing apartheid-like system against an ethnic minority. It is a surprise and a disappointment that the nation that gave the humanity the words of God abandoned the moral tradition stated in third book of Torah. See Vayikra 18:22 (“You shall not lie down with a male, as with a woman: this is an abomination.”), available at http://www.chabad.org/library/bible_cdo/aid/9919.
See supra, cogito ergo sum.
For a more ‘fundamental’ discussion of the topic, see supra § 2.234.
admit Taiwan as many as fifteen times, even till today\textsuperscript{318}. Israel became a full U.N. member as early as 1949, but Palestine became recognized as late as 2012, and only as a non-member observer state\textsuperscript{319}. The fact that both Taiwan and Palestine are working hard to obtain the U.N. membership by joining WTO (Taiwan) and UNESCO (Palestine) attests to the assertion that a right is not fundamental but acquisitional\textsuperscript{320}. The five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council earned their right of permanency by winning the WW II, and by creating the U.N. themselves\textsuperscript{321}. Finally, the voting right of IMF is earned with financial contribution, i.e., purchased with money\textsuperscript{322}.

6. The Law of Religion

Everyone who sins is a slave of sin\textsuperscript{323}.
The truth will set you free\textsuperscript{324}.

Why every society has a religion? The answer is the universality of necessity of morality in sustainment, survival of society. Civilization, including arts, laws, and morality, owe their existence to religion. Religion is a reservoir, a sanctuary, a preserve, a depository of mores. In the dawn of civilization, religion and legal justice were of one system. Society evolved and speciation and specialization carved out law from the mother-bed of religion.

Human History has witness the darkness of the Middle Age\textsuperscript{325}; persecution of Galileo, crucifixion of Jesus, terrorism and sectional violence, all under the guise of religions. Such instances, however, attests to the frailty of human nature, not fallibility of religion itself. Religion does not erase human condition. One may believe that Jesus can defy gravity, but the belief cannot negate the fact that one is

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[318]{See (last visited Feb. 10, 2014, 8:01 PM), http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/pres01_e/pr244_e.htm; (last visited Feb. 10, 2014, 8:02 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Member_states_of_the_United_Nations#Bids_for_readmission_as_the_representative_of_Taiwan; (last visited Feb. 10, 2014, 8:03 PM), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/China_and_the_United_Nations#Efforts_to_reintroduce_the_ROC_to_the_UN.}
\footnotetext[325]{The corruption of religious leaders of the day is due to unrestricted power concentration in them, not the religion they were propagandizing.}
\end{footnotes}
still bound by gravity. No religion is a panacea to human vulnerability to immorality. Going to a church every Sunday does not make one a good person. What religion can provide is the exhortation, the reinforcement of timeless values in humans.

Now, what mores in religion should a society adopt as a policy? The decision should rest on rationality. Blind acceptance of religious doctrines can be as dangerous as unguided secularism.

6.1 Dualism of Asia

6.11 Dualistic Nature of the Universe

The heaven and the earth, the sun and the moon, the heaven and the earth, day and night, hot and cold, high and low, big and small, land and sea, good and evil, love and hatred, sleep and awake, work and rest, the king and servants, teachers and students, parents and children, employers and employees, a husband and a wife, a man and a woman, all constitute the positive and the negative, or yin and yang of the universe. According to eastern philosophers, the universe is the macrocosmos of a human, and a human is the microcosmos of the universe. Think of a family. There is the sun (father), the moon (mother), and the stars (children). In a family are found law, economics, politics, entertainment, and society.

Confucianism focuses on adherence to tradition, reverence to ancestors, family loyalty,
deontological compliance to virtues. The Saint of Asia advocates for the cultivation of moral character and social and interpersonal order, as opposed to chaos

Yen Yuan asked about perfect virtue. The Master said, 'To subdue one's self and return to propriety, is perfect virtue. If a man can for one day subdue himself and return to propriety, all under heaven will ascribe perfect virtue to him. Is the practice of perfect virtue from a man himself, or is it from others?' Yen Yuan said, 'I beg to ask the steps of that process.' The Master replied, 'Look not at what is contrary to propriety; listen not to what is contrary to propriety; speak not what is contrary to propriety; make no movement which is contrary to propriety.'

Taoism emphasizes the harmony between humans and nature:

The (state of) vacancy should be brought to the utmost degree, and that of stillness guarded with unwearying vigour. All things alike go through their processes of activity, and (then) we see them return (to their original state). When things (in the vegetable world) have displayed their luxuriant growth, we see each of them return to its root. This returning to their root is what we call the state of stillness; and that stillness may be called a reporting that they have fulfilled their appointed end.

The report of that fulfilment is the regular, unchanging rule. To know that unchanging rule is to be intelligent; not to know it leads to wild movements and evil issues. The knowledge of that unchanging rule produces a (grand) capacity and forbearance, and that capacity and forbearance lead to a community (of feeling with all things). From this community of feeling comes a kingliness of character; and he who is king-like goes on to be heaven-like. In that likeness to heaven he possesses the Tao. Possessed of the Tao, he endures long; and to the end of his bodily life, is exempt from all danger of decay.

Gayism is a radical departure from both tradition and nature. In eastern philosophy, gayism, even its possibility, does not exist.

The symbol of tai chi is the representation of the complementary nature of dualism. Tai chi is asymmetric by axis, but symmetric by origin.
A man and a woman complement each other because where a man is strong, a woman is weak and where the man is weak, the woman is strong. A man’s strength is a woman’s weakness, the man’s weakness is the woman’s strength. A man and a woman complete each other. This is the law of the dualistic universe. The human anatomy mirrors the taichi dualism. A man’s chest is the vestige of a female breast, and a woman’s clitoris is the vestige of a man’s phallus. In contrast, a man and another man constitutes a symmetry by axis, where the two cannot complement, but collide.

6.2 Christianity

Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.  

Today, religion is often associated with bigotry, whereby one imposes one’s will on others. Is

Matthew 3:2-10 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matt+3&version=KJV.

Progayism forces society to have the view that there is nothing wrong with gayism. If a public figure says, “homosexuality is wrong,” that person not only loses job, but also gets an excoriation treatment from media (see supra, 5.342, notes on duck dynasty). No views counter to gayism are tolerated in American culture. Progayists would never allow such heresy. How come the hyper-bigotry and ultra-intolerance of progayism gets overlooked by the media and by the public? Only the religious can be bigots: if one is gay, one is never a bigot, because a gay can never be wrong. The society is brainwashed. This is the evidence of the social harm of gayism that has already dumbed down the public sensibility. Russian officials announced that gays are welcome in 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi. See Putin says gays welcome at Sochi Games but must ‘leave children in peace’, Jan. 17, 2014 (last visited Jan. 28, 2014, 6:18 AM), http://www.foxnews.com/world/2014/01/17/putin-says-gays-welcome-to-sochi-games-but-must-leave-children-in-peace/. Meanwhile, progayists were rallying up the media drumbeat to boycott the Olympics for the antigayist laws of Russia. See Olympic Heat: Boycotting Sochi Would Be ‘Mean’, Swiss President Says amid Hype, Dec. 23, 2013 (last visited Jan. 28, 2014, 6:19 AM), http://rt.com/news/swiss-president-boycotting-sochi-682/. Let us think clear. Russia opposes gayism internally, but it welcomes gay visitors from foreign countries, despite their different viewpoint on the issue. This is the tolerance. Progayists not only refuse to participate in the event themselves, but also prevent others from visiting Russia, because Russia’s view is different from theirs. This
education a bigotry? When parents correct their misbehaving children, when teachers give unwanted
advices to their students, aren’t they imposing their wills? If education stops today to eliminate bigotry,
what will become of the next generation, the human race? If society should not adopt a moral just
because it has a religious origin, society should not reject the moral merely on the ground of its religious
origin either. The origin of a moral is irrelevant when society considers the moral for a policy. It is the
soundness of the moral that matters, which requires a careful, detached, and levelheaded analysis of the
moral. Let us begin.

6.21 Old Testament

6.211 Genesis

6.2111 The Mystery of the Tree

In the beginning, humans were not meant to die. Death was the punishment of the first law in the
universe:

And out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and
good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good
and evil.

... . . .
And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.
And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely
eat:
But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou
eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

Humans violated the divine mandate and were sentenced to death. The biblical deity devised a solution,
the reproduction. Had Adam and Eve not hearkened to the temptation of the deceiving creature, the two
would have been the humanity today. The death sentence came in later in their lives, but there were more
imminent penalties. Adam and Eve not only were expelled from the paradise, but also charged with daily
labor in Adam, and birth labor in Eve. Also, as Eve tempted Adam, Eve is further sanctioned with
subordination to the man. Was it that much of an offense to bite a fruit? What is this tree? Why is it
named as the tree of ‘knowledge’?

6.2112 Sex, Knowledge, and Judgmentality

The tree of knowledge symbolizes sex. A snake is probably the most sensual creature of all. A
snake is curvaceous, writhes in sinuous and rhythmic motion, and devours its prey raw. A human is free
to move around the world, follow his heart, pursue his dream, until he is locked fdowm in marriage. Once
a husband, he needs a steady job to feed his family. A woman becomes pregnant, and the pain of birth-
is the intolerance. Russia’s policymaking and legislative efforts are the nation’s lawful exercise of sovereignty.
Progayists say, “We are not ok with this.” Do they think of themselves as the rulers of the world?

Genesis 2:9-17 (King James), available at
http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=genesis%202&version=KJV.
giving is her share of toil. The scheme of penalty and marriage fits. But why is the tree named after knowledge? Isn’t knowledge a virtue? As explored previously, mating opens up the door of judgmentality. By eating the fruit, or by engaging in courtship, one exposes oneself to the judgment of the opposite sex. What used to be ok when one was single is no longer acceptable, presentable when one goes on a date. One must know what looks good and what looks bad. This is the knowledge that opened the eyes of Adam and Eve.

6.2113 Celibacy of Eden

Celibacy, then, was the first mode of life that predates marriage. Celibacy was the observance of the first law that forestalled the death penalty.

6.2114 Purpose of the Tree

If God did not want them to eat the fruit of the tree, why create the tree at all? The intent was the creation of free will. What ‘He’ wanted to see was the voluntary obedience of humans. He created the possibility of disobedience along with the forbidden tree. He gave Adam and Even the power, the free will to disobey, the first right of rejection.

6.2115 Gayism and the Tree

When a man and a woman mate, they pay the toll to pass the gate of judgmentality. They either improve themselves to be more competent or more beautiful, or they suffer the rejection. Either way, they pay. In gayism, there is no such a toll. Gayism is the shield from judgmentality itself. Gayists are deemed special. Nothing else matters. If one is gay, one is extraordinary, because being gay is an exceptional thing. Gayism is the panacea to the ailment of judgmentality. But, is it? Does a painkiller heal? A drug may numb the pain. But is the pain a vital sign of the body, without whose warning one cannot spot the injury in one’s body? Who suffers detriment if one hides from judgmentality and loses the chance of self-improvement? Isn’t it oneself?

6.2116 Original Sin

The pain of birth labor in a woman and the burden of supporting a family in a man are the payment arrear for sexual pleasure. Then why do celibates have to work? Even celibates are sinners. Everyone is a sinner by origin. Ignorance is one of the original sins. So are ineptitude and indigence.

338 supra
339 See St. Augustine, City of God (“the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the will’s free choice”), available at http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=2053&chapter=152751&layout=html&Itemid=27
340 Anyone new in a job or in a social situation finds herself to be improper and inadequate, because she is yet to learn how to comport herself in the custom new to her. She sometimes gets punished for her clumsiness, as if her ignorance and neophyte-ness is her fault. As for indigence, everyone has to work to earn money to bring food on the table, as if he is punished forever into a forced labor camp, an unending Sisyphean cycle. Contra Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica (original sin is not entirely a privation, but a immoral habit), available at
A human is born naked, dependent, covered in blood and amniotic fluids. He has to learn everything from how to use a toilet, to mathematics and science. As no one can be omniscient or omnipotent, one is an original sinner for life. Indigence may be atoned for via retirement.

For celibates, occupation has no constraint of a family. Celibates are mobile, agile, and independent. Marriage is stability, celibacy is mobility. The fulfillment of potential, the realization of dream, and the unending exploration of possibilities can be achieved through one’s occupational pursuit.

6.2117 Guilty Knowledge

Many contemporary intellects are progayists. How can we explain this phenomenon? To be blunt, they are half-smart enough to follow the ostensible logic of progayist arguments, but not smart enough to debunk their subterfuge. Progayist intellects are like Faust of German legend, who sold his soul to the devil in exchange for knowledge. All work and no play makes Jane a dull girl. Too much studying may result in gain of knowledge at the expense of commonsense. That is, studying past Pareto Optimum does not lead to net gain, but a zero-sum. The more book-smart one gets, the less street-smart one becomes, unless one balances life and work. Let us hear from the Genevan philosopher who famously said, “Return to the nature”:

One cannot reflect on morals without deriving pleasure from recalling the picture of the simplicity of the first ages. It is a lovely shore, adorned only by the hands of nature, toward which one is always turning one's eyes, and from which one feels, with regret, oneself growing more distant.

Go, you celebrated writings, which the ignorance and rustic nature of our fathers would have been incapable of, go down to our descendants with those even more dangerous writings which exude the corruption of morals in our century, and together carry into the centuries to come a faithful history of the progress and the advantages of our sciences and our arts.

But if the progress of the sciences and the arts has added nothing to our true happiness, if it has corrupted our morality, and if that moral corruption has damaged purity of taste, what will we think of that crowd of simple writers who have removed from the temple of the Muses the difficulties which safeguarded access to it and which nature had set up there as a test of strength for those who would be tempted to learn?

Where there is no effect, there is no cause to look for. But here the effect is certain, the depravity real, and our souls have become corrupted to the extent that our sciences and our arts have advanced towards perfection. Will someone say that this is a misfortune peculiar to our age? No, gentlemen. The evils brought about by our vain curiosity are as old as the world. The daily ebb and flow of the ocean's waters have not been more regularly subjected to the orbit of the star which gives us light during the night than the fate of morals and respectability has been to

http://www.newadvent.org/summa/2082.htm. If a sin is the result of a habit, which is by definition a secondary nature, the sin is not original, but imitative.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_opinion_of_same-sex_marriage_in_the_United_States#By_education

The thing is, in order to understand the falsehood of progayism, one’s better be both book-smart and street-smart.


"For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?“ Matthew 16:26 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+16&version=KJV.

See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pareto_efficiency
progress in the sciences and arts. We have seen virtue fly away to the extent that their lights have risen over our horizon, and the same phenomenon can be observed at all times and in all places.346

6.22 Idolatry

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me347.

Humans made gayism after the ‘likeness’ of the ‘God-made’ sexuality. These days, the god of gayism is so holy that a mere utterance of the word ‘fa*’ or ‘f****t’ gets one socially excommunicated or occupationally terminated. If one commits profanity against the bacchanalian god, one cannot maintain business348. The last book in the new testament describes what happens when idolatry dictates the way of commerce:

And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea. . . and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. . . . And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death, and his deadly wound was healed, and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, who is like unto the beast? Who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies. . . . And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. . . . He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity. . . . And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads. And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name349.

347 Exodus 20:4-5 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=exodus%2020&version=KJV.
348 supra
349 Revelation 13:1-17 (King James) (emphasis added), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=revelation%2013&version=KJV. The book also talks about a woman: “I will shew unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters. With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.
Here is wisdom. Let him who has understanding calculate the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man: his number is 666. States with ENDA statutes forces any business people to accept gayism as a new diversity, and pro-gayism as the new norm. Imagine ENDA law become a federal statute in America. From that day and on, unless one accepts the ism of the homosexual sex, i.e., the same-sex sex, one can neither hire nor fire, i.e., neither buy nor sell.

6.32 New Testament

6.321 Jesus

The question is, was Jesus gay? After all, he is the one who never got married, let John lean on his chest, and let Judas kiss his lips. Let us assume Jesus was gay. He said:

Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

Gayism is the direct violation of the antigayist law of Moses. Would he not have explicitly repealed the law, had that been his intention, on such a subject of significance?

There was this centurion whose young male servant got sick. He asked Jesus to heal him. But he stopped Jesus from visiting his home, but asked him to cure ‘telepathically.’ Was the roman military official hiding his gay lover from the eyes of the Jewish master of miracles? Had it been the case, Jesus would have perceived their relationship with his superhuman clairvoyance, and admonished him to stop sinning. That did not happen. Therefore, the centurion was not a patron of pederastic service.

349 And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.’ Revelation 17:1-5 (King James). Can the reader guess who this woman is? A hint: who claims the motherhood of gayism, whose costumes and makeups cannot be described except with the word, abomination? Revelation 13:18 (New King James) (emphasis added), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=revelation+13&version=NKJV.


352 Matthew 5:17-19 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%205&version=KJV.

353 Leviticus

354 Matthews 8:5-13 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%208&version=KJV.

6.3211 Celibacy of Jesus

Gayists regards celibacy as nonexistence and impossibility\(^{357}\), as they take lifetime singlehood as a positive evidence of homosexuality:

His disciples say unto him, if the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry. But he said unto them, all men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it\(^{358}\).

A eunuch does not equal to a gayist. A eunuch is an impotent man incapable of erection. A gayist is not a eunuch because a gayist is capable of sexual arousal, homosexually. Progayists’ usage of the above passage betrays their straw-grasping desperation to find moral justification of gayism. If there is an apple on the table and one sees an orange, one is hallucinating. This is the effect of the drug of gayism.

Celibacy is one of few elitism that Jesus approved of. Jesus himself, Adam Smith, Immanuel Kant, Arthur Schopenhauer, Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci were all celibates. God wanted Adam and Eve to be celibates\(^{359}\). Celibacy predates the institution of marriage. Paul agrees with Jesus in recognizing the superior status of celibacy to marriage:

But I speak this by permission, and not of commandment. For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn\(^{360}\) [with passion\(^{361}\)].

According to the world’s best-selling book of all time, celibacy is the best, marriage is second-best, fornication is bad, adultery is worse, gayism is the worst.

6.3212 Love

There are two kinds of love: tough love and soft love. The ‘Son of God’ is no exception:

But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues. And ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. . . . And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he

\(^{357}\) Generations of Buddhist monks and nuns, Catholic priests and nuns have practiced pious celibacism for millennia.
\(^{358}\) Matthew 19:10-12 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%2019&version=KJV.
\(^{359}\) 1 Corinthian 7:6-9 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1%20Corinthians%207&version=KJV.
\(^{360}\) See supra
that endureth to the end shall be saved. . . . Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man’s foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me.

Then said he unto the disciples, It is impossible but that offences will come: but woe unto him, through whom they come! It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones. Take heed to yourselves: if thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him.

Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire. Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.

Contrary to popular notions, an antigayist is not a hater but a lover. Antigayism does not kill, but heal. Gayists are not antigayists’ enemies, but clients, pro bono. Antigayism is an altruism and a philanthropy, a caring intervention. If a parent, a teacher, a friend do not correct their loved ones when they err, they are being indifferent, apathetic, and neglectful. It is society’s duty to discipline the misbehaving. When Jesus spake of “Love thy neighbor,” he did not qualify it to the soft kind. One who became a progayist out of compassion to gayist friends or families must learn the correctional tough love. It is human nature to sympathize with an underdog, but it also takes guts to chide a child:

364 Thus is the principle of righteous severance. Jesus is not encouraging self-inflicted mutilation of limbs, but self-motivated amputation of bad habits or disconnection from guilty parties. Likewise, when he told his disciples to eat his flesh and drink his blood, he did not mean to endorse cannibalism. See John 6:48-58 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John+6&version=KJV.
365 Matthews 18:8-10 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=matthew%2018&version=KJV.
366 No doctor can treat a patient with hostility. Rather, she should make the patient understand what the problem is (diagnosis), and what happens if it goes untreated (prognosis). Doctor’s enemy is not the patient but the disease.
368 Apparently, a pastor and a father loved his son more than he loves his ‘Lord.’ See (Jan. 6, 2014, 7:05 PM), http://www.latimes.com/nation/nationnow/la-na-nn-methodist-pastor-defrocked-gay-marriage-20131219,0,882642.story#axzz2pfMy71Ej; (Jan. 6, 2014, 7:06 PM), http://nypost.com/2013/12/19/pastor-defrocked-after-performing-gay-sons-wedding/. The media rave about the pastor’s bravery. Antigayism is an unpopular cause. These days, it is the progayism that occupies the mainstream. Is it brave to jump on the bandwagon, to join the crowd, to blend into the mass? Is there such a thing as ‘a sung’ hero?
He who spares his rod hates his son, but he who loves him disciplines him promptly. Do not withhold correction from a child, for if you beat him with a rod, he will not die. You shall beat him with a rod, and deliver his soul from hell.

6.322 Paul

Are antigayists cherry-picking the bible? The old testament forbids both pork eating and gayism. Then why are we allowed to eat pork but disallowed to be gay? There are two distinctions to be made. First, the ban on pork diet was repealed in the new testament, the ban on gayism was reaffirmed:

[Repealed] You may not, however, eat the following animals that have split hooves or that chew the cud, but not both. . . . The pig has evenly split hooves but does not chew the cud, so it is unclean. You may not eat the meat of these animals or even touch their carcasses.

Eat anything sold in the meat market without raising questions of conscience, for, “The earth is the Lord’s, and everything in it.”

[Reaffirmed] You shall not lie with a male as with a woman. It is an abomination.

For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient.

Second, while pork-eating was a misdemeanor offense, gayism was a felony punishable by death:

If a man lies with a male as he lies with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination. They shall surely be put to death. Their blood shall be upon them.

Perhaps, it is the death penalty of gayism that was repealed in the new testament, in analogy to adultery, which used to be a capital crime:

---

374 1 Romans 26-28 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=romans%201&version=KJV.
The man who commits adultery with another man’s wife, he who commits adultery with his neighbor’s wife, the adulterer and the adulteress, shall surely be put to death.\textsuperscript{376}

When people brought an adulteress to Jesus, he forbade them from stoning her to death.\textsuperscript{377} Nonetheless, Jesus told her not to sin again. Here, what Jesus repealed is the death sentence, not the prohibition of adultery. Jesus did not condemn, nor did he condone.

Paul continues with an exhortation to fight the danger of imagination:

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh. For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

Gayism is an image, an artifice, a fictitious construction of sexuality that does not exist. Prophets of the old days warned along the same line:

Then shalt thou say unto them, Because your fathers have forsaken me, saith the Lord, and have walked after other gods, and have served them, and have worshipped them, and have forsaken me, and have not kept my law. And ye have done worse than your fathers; for, behold, ye walk every one after the imagination of his evil heart, that they may not hearken unto me.\textsuperscript{378}

And I brought you into a plentiful country, to eat the fruit thereof and the goodness thereof; but when ye entered, ye defiled my land, and made mine heritage an abomination. The priests said not, Where is the Lord? and they that handle the law knew me not: the pastors also transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied by Baal, and walked after things that do not profit\textsuperscript{379}.

They did not destroy the nations, concerning whom the Lord commanded them. But were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works. And they served their idols: which were a snare unto them. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan: and the land was polluted with blood. Thus were they defiled with their own works, and went a whoring with their own inventions\textsuperscript{380}.

And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate. And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries: but the people that do know their

\textsuperscript{376} Leviticus 20:10 (New King James), \textit{available at} http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Leviticus%2020&version=NKJV.
\textsuperscript{377} John 8:3-11 (King James), \textit{available at} http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=john%208&version=KJV.
\textsuperscript{378} Jeremiah 16:11-12 (King James), \textit{available at} http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Jeremiah%2016&version=KJV.
\textsuperscript{379} Jeremiah 2:7-8 (King James), \textit{available at} http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Jeremiah%202&version=KJV.
\textsuperscript{380} Psalms 106:34-39 (King James), \textit{available at} http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Psalms%20106&version=KJV. Gay parenting is precisely the sacrificial burning of children in order to solidify the progayist cause, to prove that the gay lifestyle works.
God shall be strong, and do exploits\(^{381}\).

Literal language bans gayism while liberal interpretation may allow it. Does the principle of “love thy neibors,” “judge ye not lest ye be judged,\(^{382}\)” and “Forgive as many as 490 time\(^{383}\),” allow thieves and murderers to roam on the streets unaccounted? If one interprets bible as permissive of gayism, one is not being liberal, but being obliterating. Intolerance of evil is not a vice but a virtue- it is called uprightness, righteousness, integrity, and probity.

Jesus’ bar on judgmentality does not mean you should not discern what is right and wrong. One is to judge in rem, not in personam. If one cannot judge immorality that people commit, how can one act morally at all? Assume x is a tailgater. x despises y because y is a litterer. This is what Jesus forbade. What makes tailgating less of an offense than littering? Because x never litters? y never tailgates either. x is committing double standard of judgment: he regards his own offense less serious than y’s\(^{384}\). The next question is, who should we forgive? Only the repenting. If one does not know whether he is sinning, we should teach him. If one does not repent or refuse to repent, we should penalize him. If one does repent and pledges never to offend again, yes, we forgive him.

7 Conclusion

7.1 Dialectic

Hegelian dialectic is eclectic\(^{385}\). Dialectical process reaches the synthesis by taking the best parts and discarding the bad parts from both thesis and antithesis:

- **Thesis**: Society should *deter gayism* by any means.
- **Antithesis**: Society should *protect gayists* by legitimizing gayism.
- **Synthesis**: Society should *deter gayism* in order to *protect gayists*.

The thesis corresponds to the past antigayism which subjected gayists to illegality and bullyism. The antithesis is the contemporary progayist movement that attempts to institutionalize gayism by recognition of gay rights. The synthesis is the new engine of change to come- moral antigayism. Moral antigayism aims to dissuade gay individuals from gayism for their own sake, to prevent them from harming themselves. The healing process\(^{386}\) is to be done by inclusion, not exclusion. Disownership of a

\(^{381}\) Daniel 11:31-32 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=daniel%2011&version=KJV.

\(^{382}\) Matthews 7:1 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%207&version=KJV.

\(^{383}\) See Matthews 18:22 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%2018&version=KJV.

\(^{384}\) Matthews 7:3-5 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%207&version=KJV.


\(^{386}\) The process can be termed as *degayification*. The confession of guilt is the first step of repentance, like the admission of ignorance is the precondition of acquisition of knowledge. Unless gayists admit that they lied to themselves and to the world, they will never get out of the gayist road to perdition. Gayists will never achieve a peace of mind if they insist on gayism. The torment, unless they atone in time, shall not end.
misbehaving child does not solve but worsen the problem.

7.2 Fourth Rule of Property

Let F be a factory, C be a citizen. F pollutes, C protests. There are four possibilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>winner/remedy</th>
<th>Injunction</th>
<th>damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1. F cannot pollute</td>
<td>2. F can pollute only if F pays C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3. F can pollute even if C protests</td>
<td>4. C can stop F from polluting only by paying F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let G be a gayist, M be a moral citizen. The following four rules summarizes the evolution of gayism and antigayism in human history:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>winner/remedy</th>
<th>Injunction</th>
<th>damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1. G cannot be openly gay</td>
<td>2. G can be openly gay only if G forgoes dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3. G can be openly gay</td>
<td>4. M can stop G from being gay only by paying G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age 1 is the pre-modern days when sodomy was illegal. Age 2 is the modern times when gayism was kept in closet. Age 3 is the post-modern contemporary era of progayist society. Age 4 is the next and final stage of gayism. Moral citizens of society will pay gayists by resistance, self-sacrifice, and exortation and edification. Some gayists will repent and be redeemed, while others will perish with obstinence, making an example for the future generation.

7.3 Final Analogy

The author concludes the discourse with a soliloquy of a moral antigayist:

The first and foremost victim of Gayism is the gayists themselves. Gay relationship just doesn't work. Same sexes do not complement but collide. sexual dissatisfaction is inherent in Gayism

---


387 Gayism is a moral pollution to the ambient conscience of society that harms the ethical health of the public at large.

389 “[O]ne has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. . . . An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law. . . . An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law. . . . Any law that degrades human personality is unjust.” Martin Luther King, Jr., Letter from a Birmingham Jail (1963), available at [http://www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html](http://www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html); “When I despair, I remember that all through history the way of truth and love has always won. There have been tyrants and murderers and for a time they seem invincible, but in the end, they always fall — think of it, always.” Mahatma Gandhi.
because gay sex is imitative, not genuine. Gayist dissatisfaction leads to adultery, std, and dissolution of relationship. The second victim is the children who are deprived of their chance to have normal parents. The third victim is the society whose rational and moral standard is degenerated to the level of gayism. Progayist self-preservationism has distorted history, politicized science, annulled the constitution, profaned religion, and relegated mores.

Transsexualism is an unauthorized product modification, male homosexuality is an operator error, female homosexuality is a patent infringement by unlicensed mimicry of male genitals. Every gayist is given a reproductively functional package, free of design defects. Otherwise, they won't be sexual at all. A gayist is a user who misuses the product counter to the purpose of the product and the usage intended by the designer: evolution, nature, or God, depending on perspectives.

Alice is in matrix. She lives in an alternative universe where men and women are not judged. Is she ready to take the red pill and face the harsh reality, or would she take the blue pill and live in delusion of gayist happiness? Gayism is like the seed of evil aliens planted in ancient times, dormant for millennia, and now emerged and surfaced to conquer the humanity. The machinery ambitious of world-dominion emerges from underground, aggrandizes itself, plunders the civilization, and takes humanity as hostage. Gayism is like the visitors from outer space, who came in peace, but hide their true nature of reptilian predation. The champagne bubble of progayist legal victory will subside and the society will witness the true nature of gayism. The generalized gayist world is where humans are no longer born, but manufactured. The dreadful vision of dystopia will come true if a man can no longer attracted to a woman and fertilization can only be achieved in vitro. Shutting off the inhibitory function of antigayism in the bogus claim of human rights violation will unlock the door to immorality, releasing all the demons that have been kept down for eons. The gray gay world where a man is no longer a man and a woman is neither a woman nor a man, is this the future of humanity? Or is it yet another gay joke? Isn't life too precious to be a joke? Can we let this happen? If we treat one's life as a joke, one's life will become a joke.

To save the world from taking the wrong turn, we need to rewind the history a few decades and restart from where we erred. We need to go back to the past and re-grasp the old-fashioned values that were lost in time. There is no fate but what we make. Progayism is a moral terrorism and a rampage over constitution. We

---

390 The three classes of victims represent the three D’s of the gayist harm: Dissatisfaction (unilateral, simulative, abusive/tantalizing sex), Deprivation (child’s forgone opportunity to have a mother and a father), and Degeneration (society’s moral standard lowered to that of gayists). On the other hand, the three S’s of the untenability of progayist arguments are: Superficialness (vapid and inane analogy to sexism and racism), Surreptitiousness (deceptive assertion of innateness and immutability), and Slanderousness (blasphemous imputation fallacy).

391 'V'

392 Matrix. In a hypothetical future where everyone is gay and where in-vitro fertilization and gestation technologies are available, there will be no more surrogacy or artificial insemination that still involve the pain of birth delivery. Further assume that a new technology enables to fertilize a sperm with another sperm, or an egg with another egg, making gay parents fully inherit their genes to a child. The manufacture of human beings, is this what we desire?

393 See Ghostbusters (an EPA agent shuts off ghost containment facility, accusing ghostbusters of violating environmental regulations).

394 (cite superman 1, reversing the rotation of the earth)

395 (cite back to the future 1).

396 Terminator 2.
must stop it, right here, right now. Gayism is bound to go down in the history as a mistake. Do not bet on a losing team. Society will learn the truth of the gayist harm one way or the other. But it is up to the society whether it will accept the wisdom of our ancestors and rational logic behind antigayism, or learn it the hard way by wait-and-see approach, after which lives will have been sacrificed, irreversibly and unnecessarily.

Gayists, stop the wrong thinking and act right. Homocidal act starts with homocidal thoughts. Every one is free to think, to choose, and to act, but no one is free from the consequences thereof. One should control one’s thoughts for one’s own sake. Gayists should re-learn what they should enjoy, and what they should not enjoy. A habitual tailgater starts with reckless impatience, then gets used to the vain-glorious idea of thrill and domination. A serial murderer starts with a morbid homocidal curiosity, which matures into the joy of killing. They should learn the joy of saving lives. Let them work in hospice services for terminal cancer patients.

Some say that gayism has redefined the institution of marriage forever. That is a conclusion a moment too soon. Not every change lasts, as not every mutation survives past a generation. Gayism does not have a definitional power in history: the days of gayism are numbered. The antigayist tradition shall be restored. Eventually, the humanity will come to senses. It always has.

I will concede that if gayism is harmless, society is justified to illegalize antigayism as discrimination. Were gayism not harmful, why would it have been tabooed everywhere, every era? Antigayism is not a peculiarity of a religion, or a whim of a particular culture. There must be

397 Make the reversion decision today. Here is a free and handy reversion therapy: watch an internet footage of a man and a woman. Indulge in the love of heterosexuality, the one and only sexuality of the nature, the gift of God the Almighty! See Prince, The Party Man, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8qHXrmesxbY; Cake, Short Skirt/Long Jacket, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X5KmB8Laemg; Usher, OMG, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1RnPB76mijl; Simply Red, Sunrise, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PE3g2zeBVQ; Groove Armada (Fatboy Slim mix), I See You Baby, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mgCIUReZUuw; Weezer, Beverly Hills, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HL_WwOly7mY; A-ha, Take on me, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=djY11Xbce914; Fountains of Wayne, Stacy’s Mom, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dZLfasMPOU4; Madonna, Beautiful Stranger, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mD5phTXGN_0; Madonna, Open Your Heart, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=snsTmi9N9Gs; Madonna, Crazy for You, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DHuizXREZ0E. It will work, sure and easy. They will be surprised to find themselves more readily aroused by heterosexual imagery than homosexual one. It is okay. You don’t have to be gay. It is right that you’re straight. Are the videos too immoral? Rest assured: art is a fiction, a fiction is where immorality sublimates into beauty. No dream is guilty as long as it stays in a dream.

398 “[I]t has been given to the Gentiles. They will trample on the holy city for 42 months.” Revelation 11:2 (New International Version), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=revelation+11&version=NIV. “And the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee: for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived. And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth.” Revelation 18:23-24 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Revelation+18&version=KJV.

399 See The Beatles, We can work it out.
a reason for the universal and timeless ban against gayism. Neither gayists nor progayists are evil people. They are hostages of delusion, however. They are doing what they think is right. It’s just that they are wrong. Unfortunately, consequence does not distinguish ignorance from malevolence. One who takes poison by mistake, and the one who is poisoned, the same harm results. A child dies if his parents feed him poison thinking it is a medicine, no matter how strongly they believe it is a medicine. Justice of consequential truth is blind: it neither mitigates the repercussion, nor exculpates the ignorant.

Gayism is not an alternative. It’s a dead end. Celibacy is the one and only legitimate lifestyle to traditional marriage. Give your celibacy a chance. If a relationship with an opposite sex does not seem to a worthwhile investment, maybe it isn’t. To many post-modern minds, marriage is an unnecessary burden. Secular celibacism is a viable option.

Perhaps there is a reason for all this. The debate of gayism has offered us a singular opportunity to revisit science, to think about philosophy, to delve deeper into the true nature of human existence, and to appreciate the virtue of heterosexuality and the potential of celibacy as an alternative secular lifestyle. This is the teleological raison d’être of gayism - the problem demands a solution that we could not have reached without going back to the basic and rethink what we knew, or thought to have known, about rights, duty, history, society, science, religion, and morality.

Gayists question the validity of traditional mores and launched a journey to find out themselves, whether gay conjugation is a viable option. Doubt is a virtue. A runaway child may learn about the world outside and have time to think who he was, who he is, what he will be. At times, one needs to get away from it all and be on one’s own. Everyone understands that. But at some point, he should return to his

400 “Lot . . . said to his people, ‘Do you commit such immorality as no one has preceded you with from among the worlds? Indeed, you approach men with desire, instead of women. Rather, you are a transgressing people.’” Quran 7:80-81, available at http://quran.com/7/80-84.

401 Would gayists not stop an infant who is crawling toward a cliff? Of course they would. This is exactly why moral people are antigayists - they cannot just watch the misguided fall into the danger of gayism. Parents never rebuke their children out of hatred. Children may hate their parents when rebuked, but they will realize the necessity and thank their parents later in life.

402 Even the people who crucified Jesus thought they were doing the right thing, and that is why they did what they did. See Luke 23:34 (King James), available at http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Luke%2023&version=KJV

403 The sooner people quitclaim on homosexuality and the advocacy therefor, the less detriment they will incur from the gayist and progayist harm.


405 A child is a deontologist, who obeys the rule given by his parents because he believes it is the right thing to do so in itself. An adolescent is an existentialist, who questions why the rule is as it is, and wonders what if it is wrong. An adult is either a pragmatist, who follows the rule because it is convenient to do so, or a rationalist, who understands the rationale behind the rule, then follows it.
parents. It is time now\textsuperscript{406}.