



Boston Catholic Journal

www.boston-catholic-journal.com
editor@boston-catholic-journal.com

The Pink Rose Policy



Homosexuality, Policy, and Science in Obamagenda

Everyone, I think, will agree that “confusion” of any sort is bad. Confusion is a negative state that impairs the will. In the face of confusion we are not clear what to do, or indeed, what to think. Reasoning, which orders things to a coherent end, is debilitated in the face of confusion.

The synonyms for confusion are particularly revealing: disorder, bewilderment, disorientation, perplexity, the absence of certainty, indistinctness, and uncertainty. In medicine and psychiatry, confusion, whether in the individual being treated or in the diagnosis of a particular illness is always detrimental to the good of the patient. If it is confusion within the patient himself, it is the job of the physician to remedy the confusion so that the patient is no longer in a confused state. If it is confusion concerning the diagnosis, then the physician will be uncertain of the treatment necessary to alleviate the illness, and will be unable to proceed.

When one is confused about his location, he is considered lost. When one is confused about an array of instrumentation before him, whether it is the flight controls in the cockpit of a passenger jet, the menu of options in any given computer program, or the shifting mechanism in the manual transmission of an automobile, one is unable to do anything meaningful with them. Whatever the case may be, confusion is always detrimental to the individual and an impediment to a rational and coherent end. When I say that confusion impairs the will, I am simply stating the obvious fact that in the face of confusion we are left effectively paralyzed since we do not clearly apprehend anything with the clarity necessary to motivate the will. We struggle with the evident disorder before us, futilely attempting to cognitively order the confusion into some coherent state upon which the will can act with the authority of reason, which is to say, rationally. Absent the authority of reason we can only act — if, indeed, we can act at all — capriciously and toward no coherent and meaningful end.

Indeed, any attempt to formulate an argument that confusion is good must be stated clearly and without confusion — which, in its stating, would refute the argument itself. It would be self-contradictory. Are we agreed upon this? That is to say, that confusion in any of its manifestations is bad — in other words, detrimental to the good. I believe that any person who is not confused will agree.

A Rose by Any Other Name

We must say, then, that a situation in which a man is confused for a woman, or a woman confused for a man, is not an inherently good situation. Unable to predicate with certainty the gender of an individual is an inability to predicate what is most fundamental to the human species.

With the exception of *rare anomalies specifically understood as aberrations or abnormalities*, the sexual identity of an individual is radicated in biology most clearly articulated in physical anatomy. Even changing the apparent physical characteristics of gender does not make a male a female or a female a male, for at the most fundamental biological level, what are called allosomes (the “sex chromosome”) — the most elementary binary chromosomal differences, remain: females have two sets of X chromosomes, whereas males have one X and one Y chromosome.

However much the apparent gender is altered, tailored, surgically removed or implanted, enhanced or diminished by plastic surgery, the actual sexual identity is indelibly imprinted in the DNA of chromosomes. To the biologist and geneticist, the distinction will always remain scientifically distinguishable and upon a blind sampling will always reveal either male or female ... but not both. In a word, humans cannot be hermaphrodites, that is to say, they cannot possess a “complete, and functional set of both the male and female sexual organs ... [therefore] a true hermaphrodite cannot happen in humans.”¹

Why Gender is not an Option

A person may mimic a gender that is not their own: they may affect the gestures, purposely speak an octave higher or lower, and wear the clothing associated with the opposite gender, but this no more makes them the *other* gender than the reticulated costume assumed on Halloween makes one Spiderman. Any attempt to leap between two buildings 500 feet tall and 1000 feet apart will quickly — and finally — dispel this fantasy, no matter how clever or convincing the costume. One does not have Spiderman's DNA.

A government may underwrite this fantasy because of the clamor of a very influential, vocal and well-financed group of people who wish to be enrolled as Spidermen in the next Census survey. It may declare that it is their “right” to be legally defined as Spidermen simply on the basis that they wish to be so identified. What is more, it can legislate such a group of individuals as a “protected class” and so make any infringement upon their “rights” actionable in a court of law such that, say, a prospective employer may be heavily fined for refusing an applicant for a job on the basis that the individual deems himself a Spiderman and dresses as Spiderman during the interview. That a conflict exists between a scientifically verifiable reality and a preferred persona is of no consequence if the government's claim is based on “policy” independent of factual considerations.

An analogy may be helpful. In Nazi Germany it was policy (independent of contradictory and scientifically verifiable facts) that Aryans were a “protected class” and enjoyed prerogatives not accorded non-Aryans. Not only were they *presented* by the state as a unique and desirable class that had hitherto been deprived of their “rights”, but *promoted* by the state and accorded “reparations” in the way of undue influence and special status. It is also true that by this same policy, Jews and Slavs were even less than non-Aryans: they were non-persons. This particular fantasy had disastrous consequences.

Implementing Policy through Pseudo-Science

However much it flew in the face of biology and science, it became policy — and both biology and science were *trumped by the force of the state* to implement an *ideology* that was as ludicrous as it was frightfully tragic. It is interesting to note that in both cases (Spidermen and non-Aryans) a pseudo-science was invoked to legitimize policy. In Hitler's Germany, it was eugenics — *imported (few people realize) from America and whose most vocal and active proponent was Marguerite Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, the largest abortion provider in the world*). In America it is called Epigenetics ² (the pseudo-science of the putative but unproven existence of “gay genes”). The genetic assertions in both cases are disturbing. That both appeal to genetics is equally disturbing.

The Nazis sought the “*ubermensch*”, the nationally iconic blond haired, blue eyed thoroughbred in the genetically pure masculinized male and the genetically pure feminized female. Today’s epigeneticist, spurred on under the twin banners of *social correctness* and *liberal political policy*, attempts to legitimize homosexuality as a normal, if infrequent occurrence of genetic “epi-marks”. The Nazis had their scientists and doctors. The present liberal administration of Barack Obama has its — and both strangely arrive at extremely dubious, factitious, or completely fictitious findings that concur with “policy” ...

Under these two regimes there is little or no room for dissent from policy, and every form of dissent, either in the scientific or social community is quashed, discredited, penalized, punished, or extirpated. To keep ones license, tenure, or employment in any science is not simply to toe the line of prevailing policy, but if one wishes to advance, to both propagate and propagandize it. Truth is not the touchstone of sound science; *policy* is. If you doubt it, stray from the line. You will forfeit your name, your credentials, and your livelihood (stringent sanctions to be sure). If you are troublesome enough, you may even forfeit your life.

Not Here?

Exaggeration? Not here? Not in America? Think deeply about it. The most advanced, industrialized, civilized and academic nation of the last half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th was Germany. It was the land of the greatest minds, the great philosophers, scientists, inventors, academics, physicians and composers who influence us still in the 21st century. Within a mere 30 years the average German citizen scrupulously watched what he said, did, and even thought, lest it be at variance with “policy” — a policy that ultimately resolved itself in the *Final Solution*. It became a land of stitched mouths and Big Brother. One either followed “policy” ... or was the victim of it. There were no intermediate states. Germany had its dreaded RSHA, or *Reichssicherheitshauptamt* (Reich Security Main Office). We have the NSA.

Still you think we exaggerate? Will you pause at all when you write your next e-mail or send your next Twitter? Will you think of the (key)words you chose? Do you wonder if you are on a list because you are Catholic and Pro-Life (and, ergo, a possible enemy of the state and this administration according to recently released news)? Will you wonder if men in dark coats will come to your door in the middle of the night in an unmarked van — and if they do, when you will last be heard from given the draconian provisions of the “Patriot Act”? Do I wonder as I write this column? You bet!

Why? Because I question “policy”, especially as it is articulated through a *rainbow spectrum* that refracts a once clear light and scatters it into discrete columns of friends and foes. Because I follow, or try to follow, the teachings of my religion concerning the intrinsic evil of homosexuality ... rather than the “policy” of the “progressive” state that condemns my religion as antagonistic to its pro-homosexual policies.

St. Peter and the Apostles, without hesitation, clearly and concisely responded to the imminent threat posed by the rulers of Jerusalem against them, and as Catholics, we must now take their example to heart with an existential concern never greater since the Diocletian persecutions of nearly 2000 years ago at our beginnings:

"But Peter and the Apostles answering, said: We ought to obey God, rather than men." (Acts 5.29)

Whom then, will you obey? The “policy” of the state, or the Gospel of Jesus Christ? You cannot obey both, and in obeying the one you forfeit the other. Think it through and let God know.

¹ <http://www.madsci.org/posts/archives/2000-02/951254825.Dv.r.html>

² <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/668167>

Editor
Boston Catholic Journal



Copyright © 2004 - 2013 Boston Catholic Journal. All rights reserved.