

Debate & Analysis

Going off the deep end

Christopher Attard

We have gone off the deep end ladies and gentlemen, or 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 safe, including those shared by most westerners about human rights and basic human dignity and decency. Indeed, we have managed to legally annihilate the basic 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 though, that those pushing this insidious agenda are following George Orwell's 1984 to the letter. The perversion of language hidden behind the so-called "marriage equality" act is a clear example of our ability to deceive each other when we think our cause is "just".

Still, the individual must also be held to account. We were so obsessed with the romanticised, emancipatory idea of gay marriage that nobody seemed to bother with the details. And as we should all know by now, the devil is always in the detail. But you see, the LGBTQXYZ lobbyists and their masses of politically correct minions went out of their way to portray any reasonable opposition to this bill as being "anti-gay", when in fact, many simply wanted to retain the concepts of motherhood and fatherhood, and by extension, the universal, indisputable male-female dichotomy.

Indeed, there is so much that is wrong with this legislation, the reasoning and events surrounding it that it's 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 fundamentals 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 when it suits it) has aided 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 these contradictory and convoluted legislations - that biological sex, gender identity, gender expression, and sexual proclivity vary independently (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 perfect - it's the very definition of non-independent."

"Almost everyone who is biologically male identifies as biologically male. Almost everyone who identifies as biologically male dresses and acts male. And almost everybody who is biologically male, who identifies as male, who dresses as male, is in fact heterosexual. Those things are incredibly

tightly linked, but the technical claim in the legislation is that they vary independently - wrong."

Clearly, our current and very recent laws, which chalk up gender identity to subjective personal whim, are farcically incorrect. In addition, they undermine the very nature-nurture debate that is still underway in academic circles (whose absence from the discussion hasn't gone unnoticed), in which the most prominent, albeit temporary conclusion is that biological, cultural and social factors are at play when it comes to sexual and gender differences.

Despite this, our champions of equality and justice, in their characteristic pretence of moral superiority, took their incorrect conclusions a step further and went ahead with imposing "gender neutral" terminology on the rest of society. So notwithstanding the fact that there is no such thing as gender neutrality, we now have language imposition inscribed into our legislation that denies the existence of the male-female dichotomy by exclusion.

This wilful departure from reality has now landed us in the absurd position where on one hand we recognise men and women as distinct - partly through the silly idea for gender quotas - and on the other hand we claim that men and women are interchangeable and don't really exist as identifiably distinct beings.

What's more, as a result of this legal confusion, a man or woman can choose on a mere whim to identify as the opposite sex, or anything they dream up at any given moment - even a fabulous unicorn.

Since those who have tried to point out sensible objections have been totally dismissed by the party machines and the media - all of which seem to have merged into one on most issues - I will attempt another explanation on the implications of the so-called "gay marriage" law.

Put simply, the indisputable, scientifically uncontroversial 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 superseded 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 attempting to shed light on the quasi-religious motivations propelling these events are over-exaggerated, but you would be mistaken. This is very serious.

Consider this; are we to change our national anthem to "l-persuna li tatna isimha" and so on and so forth? Should we now address one another as comrade lest somebody take offence for assuming their gender? What about our literature, our history and art concerning the trials and tribulations of

66

Almost everyone who is biologically male identifies as biologically male. Almost everyone who identifies as biologically male dresses and acts male. And almost everybody who is biologically male, who identifies as male, who dresses as male, is in fact heterosexual. Those things are incredibly tightly linked, but the technical claim in the legislation is that they vary independently - wrong.

99

past generations? Should they be omitted too as they do not recognise "gender neutrality"? What of the sciences - the study of 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 fundamental truths of human existence, or that it does so thinking it is the beacon 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 deeper into the repercussions of all this progress. Indeed, if men and women are interchangeable, and the new 80 plus genders (and rapidly multiplying) are legally acknowledged, then what's to stop someone from marrying his cat or dog? What of imaginary beings or ourselves even? Perhaps someone identifies as a magnificent "Felisgender" (as it's called), what's to stop that person from pursuing this route to its logical conclusion? Clearly, not only does the law accept this prospect, but there also exists an army of politically correct puppets who will presumably rush to defend the Felisgendered - seeing how they promoted and encouraged the legal framework now enshrined in law. I dare say this newspeak might also see our basic intuitions overturned,

where I shall be the one sneered at for not accepting the normality of human-feline relationships!

The takeaway from all this is that we should not allow individuals with the intellectual sophistication of a banana to weigh in on the content and character of our laws. Nor should we allow our propensity for empathy and compassion with our fellow human override our ability to state the obvious, but more importantly to speak the truth.

And the truth is that reason and evidence did not bring us here, as I explained in my previous articles titled "the oppression Olympics". Instead of facts, we were presented with a political and ideologically motivated agenda that played on our compassion to the extent that those who pointed out the facts were quickly lambasted or shamed out of the discussion.

Under the guise of gay marriage "equality", ideologues, naïve activists and unscrupulous opportunist politicians have slithered in yet another law that undermines 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 their confidence in their own position, because if they had a strong argument then why not assert it loudly and clearly for all to hear. Why slide "gender neutral" terminology into a separate issue concerning gay marriage if not to ride the wave of its widespread acceptance? The answer is simple. There is no argument to be made for omitting universal male-female realities and replacing them with incorrect babble.

Now I take the position that there is no point trying to reason someone out of a position into which he has not reasoned himself. I also know that those possessed by their ideology will not let facts get in the way of their low-resolution agenda, even if you showed them that they are merely pawns in a much larger game that does not benefit anyone in the long run - not even those they purport to be standing up for.

But alas, it is done. We have embarked on a social experiment that overtly denies reality, and grows more authoritarian with each passing moment, forcing us to pretend that everyone is literally the same, and that if we don't acknowledge this then we are somehow bigoted.

Given that this is already a form of compelled speech, perhaps next time the scientifically illiterate ignoramuses - well represented in our parliament and on social media - will introduce forced gender pronouns as Canada has just done with Bill C-16? Now that we have openly declared war on reality, I wouldn't be surprised.

Future generations will look back at what we did and they will be amazed at how we threw away truth and reason when we were so rich.