Going off the deep end
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We have gone off the deep end ladies and gentlemen, is it sexist to say this now?

If that is the case, we might as well settle for comrades at this point. If we are capable of demolishing universal concepts of motherhood and fatherhood, then no concept is inviolable. The arguments advanced by those who have been managed to legally annihilate the universal, indubitable male-female dichotomy, and, by extension, the nuclear family on which every civilization is built. And we've done it with a smile.

It is clear, however, that those pushing this insidious agenda are following George Orwell's 1984 to the letter. The perversion of language hidden behind the sacred marriage equality act is a clear example of our ability to do this to each other when we think our cause is 'just'.

Still, the individual must also be held to account. We were so overcome by this romanticized, emancipatory idea of gay marriage that nobody seemed to bother with the details. And as you should all know by now, the devil is always in the detail. But let's see. The LGBTIQXYZ lobbyists and their masses of politically correct imps went out of their way to portray any reasoned objection to this bill as being "anti-gay" when, in fact, many simply sought to retain the universal, indubitable male-female dichotomy.

Indeed, there is so much that is wrong with this legislation, the reasoning and events surrounding it is so hard to even articulate the magnitude of the problem. But to start with, let me make this perfectly clear—no amount of laws, language games or thought polic­ing will change the fact of observable reality. And it's infinitely amusing that the Left's proclivity to rely on its own form of faith (which it so vehemently opp­oses wherever it goes) has sided in pushing the lie that men and women are interchangeable, and that anything that follows from this distinction is merely "a construct" or worse still, doesn't exist.

Speaking in an open interview at Harvard University (available on YouTube), psychology professor Dr. Jordan Peterson explained the technical claim at the bottom of the contradiction and convoluted legislations—that biological sex, gender identity and sex expression are three independent variables (i.e. that they have nothing to do with each other).

This is a false claim. The correlation between biological sex and gender identity exceeds 0.99. It's virtually impossible to find a case where a biological male identifies as a magnificent "Female lagender" (as in "Be equality") or a biological female who identifies as a magnificent "Male lagender," but there are hundreds of examples of biological male-female dichotomy and, by extension, any references that acknowledge it, such as "mother" and "father" have not only been eliminated from this law, but also repudiated by a variation of George Orwell's "Newspeak". This incorrect, I dare say deliberate perversion of language will obfuscate and replace basic definitions to such an extent that further breakdown in our society and the way it operates is highly likely. You might think that this is not such a big deal—that those who have no problem with abolishing the very fabric of our society. And for the most part, they have done it to the sound of thunderous applause.

The fact that such slippery tactics were used gives one reason to doubt the ability of those on their own position, because if they had a strong argument they would not resort to theistically inductive reasoning to come to absurd conclusions. This is why the Left's proclivity to rely on its own form of faith (which it so vehemently opposes wherever it goes) has sided in pushing the lie that men and women are interchangeable, and that everything that follows from this distinction is merely "a construct" or worse still, doesn't exist.

Almost everyone who is biologically male identifies as biologically male. Almost everyone who is biologically female dresses and acts as female, and is, in fact heterosexual. There are many imaginative explanations to this phenomenon—past generations? Should they be omitted from the record? Should we recognize "gender neutrality"? What of the sciences—biology, psychology and every respectable discipline in the decaying remnants of our universities that aren't up to speed with the latest politically correct waffle? Do we force them to acknowledge our ludicrous fantasies too?

Come to think of it, I'm not sure what's more disconcerting, the fact that the people's representatives, and by extension our community doesn't seem to have any problem with abolishing the very fabric of observable reality, or that it does exist, and that the law accepts this fact of human rights for the world to admire?

By introducing profoundly incorrect and self-contradictory terminology into our law, we have now set a precedent to make this change ubiquitous, which is quite insane when you consider the implications, some of which I touched on.

Make no mistake, we really have made history, so much so that we ought to dig deep into the repercussions of all this progress. Indeed, if men and women are interchangeable, and the new 80 plus genders (rapidly multiplying) are legally acknowledged, then what's to stop someone from marrying his cat or dog? What of imaginary beings or ourselves? Perhaps someone identifies as a magnificent "Fe­male lagender" (as in "Be equality") or a biological female who identifies as a magnificent "Male lagender," but there are hundreds of examples of biological male-female dichotomy and, by extension, any references that acknowledge it, such as "mother" and "father" have not only been eliminated from this law, but also repudiated by a variation of George Orwell's "Newspeak". This incorrect, I dare say deliberate perversion of language will obfuscate and replace basic definitions to such an extent that further breakdown in our society and the way it operates is highly likely. You might think that this is not such a big deal—that those who have no problem with abolishing the very fabric of our society. And for the most part, they have done it to the sound of thunderous applause.

The fact that such slippery tactics were used gives one reason to doubt the ability of those on their own position, because if they had a strong argument they would not resort to theistically inductive reasoning to come to absurd conclusions. This is why the Left's proclivity to rely on its own form of faith (which it so vehemently opposes wherever it goes) has sided in pushing the lie that men and women are interchangeable, and that everything that follows from this distinction is merely "a construct" or worse still, doesn't exist.
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