

A Thought on Gay Rights and "Gay Pride" – Tedla M. Worede, Facebook Post, July 3, 2016

<https://www.facebook.com/tedlanegest.worede/posts/1749377141952472>

I would differentiate fighting against the oppression of gays from endorsing gay "pride." It's one thing to support gay people's human rights and fight against their subjugation by heteronormative societies -- note that homonormative societies don't exist beyond communities within societies, which implies that all societies are "heteronormative" and the hetero versus homo bifurcation, as to societies, doesn't exactly make sense for this reason, which is why "gay pride" makes sense in the psychology of the masses -- in ascertaining, not only their liberty to live as they choose without harm and societal persecution, but also facilitating their ability to contribute in society by their various talents and education without regard to their sexual orientation, as well as creating healthy and solicitous attitudes between homo and hetero communities. But the endorsement which holds that homosexuality is a norm which ought to be an object of indoctrination conveying same-sex marriage to kindergarten children in the intent of creating an alternate view of "family" in their minds, and strives to make people change their views by an appeal to objectivity on the premise that it's been validated by science as -- beyond the support of gay human rights -- worth promoting in society as an admirable lifestyle to be proud of (know, the main objective of gay "pride" is to convey that homosexuality is nothing to be ashamed of, and actually something to be proud of, because being gay is not a choice, and you shouldn't be ashamed of something you are without your choosing. This raises a number of questions. Are there behaviors which society condemns by law today that people are without their choosing? What makes a behavior shameful, and should any behavior be shameful? If so, by what objective standards of ethic do we know that it is shameful or not? And many more; but this leads us to consider what the nature of choice is, and to what extent, if at all, a person has free will in being and choosing what they are [also have epigenetics in mind]. How do we know that discernible objectivity in regards to the human makeup, for instance, does not in any way proceed from will? Could we be more than we seem we are? or, could our psychical gravitation by our will have any import in the observational aspect of our objective appearance? Considering that our genes can be influenced by our psychical states. There's a lot to consider)... I'm just saying there's a clear distinction, and most people may not be thoughtful enough to not collapse the two into each other and view people as having to fit in only being anti-gay and pro-gay. In my opinion, gay rights issues have been used to reinforce gay "pride" issues, and people who agree with gay rights issues but not with gay "pride" issues are seen as evil bigots who impede society from progressing. Whereas, science has no answers for questions which pertain to the field of philosophical Ethic, and any such conclusion simply on the premise of scientific observation disregards a myriad of problems concerning the ethical objectivity of hetero and homo behavior, interaction, etcetera, in society and implications that follow.

Selam // AmdaMikael