

# **NO TO SODOM**

**Avi Sion**, Ph. D.

© AVI SION, 2008.

PROTECTED BY INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTIONS.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

NO PART OF THIS BOOK MAY BE REPRODUCED IN ANY MANNER  
WHATSOEVER, OR STORED IN A RETRIEVAL SYSTEM OR TRANSMITTED,  
WITHOUT EXPRESS PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR-PUBLISHER,  
EXCEPT IN CASE OF BRIEF QUOTATIONS WITH DUE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

Published 2008.

By Avi Sion in Geneva, Switzerland.

## **Abstract**

*No to Sodom* is an essay against homosexuality, using biological, psychological, spiritual, ethical and political arguments.

This book is drawn from the author's larger work *Logical and Spiritual Reflections*.



## Contents

1.	Picking up the gauntlet	7
2.	Homosexuals defined	11
3.	Homosexual tendencies	17
4.	The biological role of sex	21
5.	Non-reproductive sex	25
6.	Deviance and suffering	31
7.	Some probable causes	35
8.	Changing rationalizations	41
9.	It is freely chosen	45
10.	Sensuality and perversion	51
11.	Spiritual impurity	57
12.	The essence of sodomy	63
13.	A social revolution	69
14.	The defenders & promoters of it	75
15.	Some legal issues	81
16.	A call for recovery	87
Annex		
	Rabbis must ban homosexuals from Judaism	93
Supplement		
	Philosophy of Law	105



# 1. Picking up the gauntlet

This is an essay against homosexuality.

Frankly, the subject of homosexuality is very distasteful to me. I would prefer to ignore it altogether, so as not to be mentally tainted by it and not to be in any way associated with it in other people's minds. Homosexuality existed in the world around me when I was younger, but it was something one hardly ever came across. But nowadays, the media keep pounding the subject into our minds, so that hardly a day passes without it being brought to our reluctant attention.

It is as if the homosexuals are not content with being homosexuals, but additionally want to force their presence on the rest of us. They are ethically and politically aggressive, demanding that everyone else consider them and treat them as normal. Nay, more: they even want us all to follow their way, and our children to be educated to do so.

Just recently, in the city of Geneva, Switzerland, the erstwhile capital of Calvinist morality, a shocking advertising campaign was launched, ostensibly to encourage homosexuals to use condoms<sup>1</sup>. Large posters showing nude males playing hockey and nude females<sup>2</sup> sword fighting were posted all over the city. A supposed implication of this campaign is that many sportspeople engage in homosexual acts in the changing rooms (whether this is common or not, I do not know), and it would seem socially responsible for the public health authorities to remind them to take precautions to avoid diseases.

But what of the education of the children who see such posters? What of the sensibilities of purer souls, who would never even think of such acts were they not told about them? One can only suppose that such campaigns are only superficially to do with public health or targeted at homosexuals. In view of the advertisers' indifference to the value of sexual innocence, it must be assumed that the real motive of such campaigns is to *promote* homosexuality.

---

<sup>1</sup> Geneva, by the way, organizes a yearly fest called the "Lake Parade", during which some half a million people (including a large number of apparent homosexuals) dance for hours on end – in many cases hopped up on drugs – to the deafening sounds of "techno music".

<sup>2</sup> What they have to do with condoms, I am not sure. Perhaps they are bisexuals.



This philosopher has therefore decided to analyze the subject of homosexuality<sup>3</sup> – so that such people not get away with their sexual revolution. They think they’ve got it made, ethically and politically; but no, they can surely be refuted and defeated. They can be challenged, not just emotionally, but also by rational means.

Our primary task is to try to understand the psychology of homosexuals, so as to objectively explain why they are as they are, and moreover why they ought *not* to be as they are (and how they might change). We have to show convincingly that such behavior is abnormal and harmful, for the individuals concerned and for society as a whole. We must also consider the arguments of those who defend homosexuality, and show the fallacies they involve.

We must also look at the propaganda, social, political and legal means used by the proponents of this movement in pursuit of their goal of legitimatization. And to complete the analysis, we must consider what can be done to oppose these recent tendencies in our society.

Homosexuality has in a matter of only a generation passed from banned activity to widespread social phenomenon, even fashion. This is surprising and appalling; yet we encourage ourselves with the thought that social change can move equally fast in the opposite direction.

---

<sup>3</sup> I would have preferred not to get my hands dirty dealing with this subject, but then it occurred to me that “you can’t clean up a place without raising dust”.



## 2. Homosexuals defined

Let us first clarify and define some terms. Forgive the explicit language sometimes used here.

Concerning the terms “sex” and “gender”: they mean the same thing, of course – they both refer to the distinction between males and females. But the more colloquial term “sex” can sometimes, in the context of a discussion like the present one, be confused with reference to the sex act – so the term “gender” (which was till recently only used by grammarians) seems often preferable.

Males and females are distinguishable physically, mentally and behaviorally. They have markedly different anatomies (sex organs, hormones, shapes and sizes, facial appearances) and genetic makeup (sex chromosomes), somewhat different feelings, thoughts, attitudes and characters, and somewhat different behavior patterns. There may also be spiritual differences between the sexes (and maybe even sexual differences between souls).

Thus, gender is a complex of many factors, some of which are clear-cut, while others are more difficult to define precisely. Still, it is quite amazing how quickly we are, in the vast majority of cases, able to “tell” a man from a woman at a glance (although sometimes we are uncertain or wrong in our initial assessment).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Note, though it happens extremely rarely, that there are borderline cases not easy to classify. For instance, people who have both male and female sex organs (hermaphrodites). According to what I have read, these people are usually predominantly male or female, whether due to their genetic makeup, their hormonal balance, their psychology or other factors (or combinations of factors). Such people do admittedly (very occasionally) present a difficult problem for sexual ethics; but in view of the many parameters involved, this problem can only conceivably be solved on a case-by-case basis (i.e. by casuistry, using *ad hoc* insights of wisdom).

Another difficulty occurring in exceptional cases is the discrepancy between genotype and phenotype, i.e. between a person’s genetic sexual identity (XX or XY) and their sexual morphology (male or female sexual organ). Is a genetic male with a female sex organ to be counted as female, as superficially apparent, or as “really” male? Likewise, what is a genetic female with male sex organ to be counted as? Hard to say. Note that such disorders are fatalities, mostly due to genetic defects; also, such people lack reproductive ability. The moot question here from an ethical standpoint is: should sex between a normal man and a “dubious” female, or between a normal woman and a “dubious” male, be considered as homosexual or heterosexual? A humane answer would seem to be: act according to outer bodily appearances; but many scrupulous heterosexuals would probably prefer to preempt such ambiguities by asking their partners to take a genetic test.

Broadly speaking, heterosexuality refers to sexual relations between people of different sexes – i.e. a man and a woman, while homosexuality means sexual relations between two (or more) people of the same gender – i.e. between two males or two females.

Heterosexuality and homosexuality are distinguished with reference to the “sexual relations” they involve. However, since sexual relations are occasional, how shall we define “a heterosexual” or “a homosexual”? Because our discussion here is focused on homosexuality rather than heterosexuality, we must propose the following.

A heterosexual is someone who, occasionally engaging in sex, always does so *exclusively* with a member of the opposite gender (i.e. never with one of the same gender). A homosexual is someone who occasionally has sex with someone of the same gender (whether or not he or she also occasionally has sex with someone of the opposite sex).

Thus, under our definitions, a bisexual, a male or female who has sexual relations occasionally with men and occasionally with women, or with both at once, is a homosexual. That is, whether someone only turns to the same gender for sex (an exclusive homosexual) or sometimes also turns to the opposite sex (a bisexual) – such an individual is, for all intents and purposes here, to be termed “a homosexual”.

These distinctions are important to note, because apologists of homosexuality often cunningly use bisexuality to blur

differences with heterosexuality in peoples' minds. Vague terminology is used to confuse issues.

It is clear that a person can be called homosexual only if he or she engages in sex with someone of the same gender *knowingly and willingly*. If he or she did not know the sex partner to be a transvestite or transsexual<sup>5</sup>, or if the sex act occurred under coercion or before being mature enough to understand what is happening, then he or she is obviously not a homosexual, but simply a victim of homosexual trickery or rape.

The question may be asked: is a person who has engaged in homosexual activities (once or more) in the past (recent or distant) to be called a homosexual? The logical answer would be: yes – unless or until that person has sincerely regretted past deeds and resolved never to repeat them. For an unrepentant past homosexual is surely more susceptible to homosexuality than a non-homosexual. Only a repentant past homosexual may properly be called an ex-homosexual.

Some people, of course, are neither heterosexual nor homosexual. They may have no sexual relations at all

---

<sup>5</sup> When referring to transsexuality, we must distinguish two sorts. If someone is born with an 'intersex' condition, like a hermaphrodite or someone whose sexual genotype and phenotype are at odds, it would seem biologically and medically ethical to legally allow them to have corrective physical treatment. But this is very different from someone normally constituted who *willfully* changes sex; for in such case, there is no conceivable biological or hygienic justification for surgery.

(through voluntary abstinence or without choice, for whatever reasons). Some heterosexuals, homosexuals and people without sex partners sometimes engage in activities resembling sex by themselves, i.e. alone (masturbation)<sup>6</sup>.

This brings us to the next question: what is meant in the above definitions by “sexual relations” or “having sex”? The primary intent here is to refer to *physical acts or events* producing sexual sensations in one or more of the people involved.

Is a mere hand caressing someone’s arm, or a kiss on someone’s cheek, or a gentle hug – to be termed a “sex act”? The answer is, obviously, sometimes: yes. It is yes in cases where such conceivably non-sexual acts arouse sexual sensations, however vague, in at least one of the persons concerned. Even a seductive smile, a tone of voice or a perfume can be considered a sexually charged phenomenon, in this perspective. When judging the nature of volitional actions, we must especially focus on their *intent*. A smile or caress without sexual intent is obviously not comparable to one with sexual undertone. But such cases would be the minimal degree in a wide continuum of possibilities.

---

<sup>6</sup> Some people go so far as to have sex with members of other species of animal (bestiality or ‘zoophilia’). Fortunately, this seems to be extremely rare – but there have been times and places where it was more common (and it may yet again spread, judging by current Internet trends). In the present context, we may view this as a farfetched sort of masturbation (although it is much more than that, of course).

At the other extreme of this continuum, there are a host of sex acts involving active use *of the sex organ(s)* of the person(s) involved. That is, when a sex organ is actually touched by some part of the partner's body. And between these two extremes, there are an infinite number of possible acts or events, of greater or lesser sexual implication.

This infinity of varieties of sexual activities and of degrees of sexuality should not, however, divert our attention from the central defining issue: whether the physical act or phenomenon concerned, whether "lightly" or "coarsely" performed, produces or does not produce *sexual sensations*.

A phenomenological remark is worth making here, concerning the varying quality of sexual sensations. Every sex act arouses a particular sort of sexual sensations – these sensations are evidently not all one and the same. The sensations aroused within heterosexual sex differ from each other, and no doubt from most of those of homosexual sex or of masturbation. This means that homosexuals are not attracted to just any sexual sensation, but specifically to the peculiar sensations that homosexual acts, perceptions or imaginings arouse in them.



### **3. Homosexual tendencies**

As we all know, sexual sensations are not only produced by various physical contacts, movements, pressures, temperatures, sights, sounds, smells and tastes – they can be aroused by mere thoughts. Physical deeds and words are the tip of the iceberg of sexuality. Mental imaginings and desires can equally well produce sexual sensations.

Indeed, most (though not all) sexual sensations ostensibly caused by physical phenomena are due to intermediate thoughts. It is usually the thoughts that generate the sexual sensations, by attaching sexual value to the physical phenomena (e.g. a kiss or an odor). In this context, note that the physical phenomena of pornography (magazines, videos) do not cause sexual sensations directly, but by way of stimulation of thoughts and actions that in turn cause sexual sensations.

The question therefore arises: how are we to classify people who are in practice heterosexual or without sex partner, and

yet whose thoughts – i.e. whose mental sexual fantasies and desires – are directed (occasionally or exclusively) at people of the same gender? The simple answer is: insofar as such people experience actual sexual sensations directed at people of the same gender, their “sexual orientation” may be considered as homosexual to that extent.

Note well that it is not the content of thoughts that determines sexual orientation. For instance, we are here (writing or reading the present essay) thinking about homosexuality, but if such mental consideration produces no sexual response in us, we are not being homosexual. If, on the other hand, at the very thought of homosexuality, feelings of desire or physical pleasure are experienced by someone, there is a problem.

Even then, such feelings may only be due to the mind’s inherent trickery, its impulse to flirt with contradiction. The fear of having homosexual responses may by itself cause sexual sensations, as the subject’s attention is warily drawn to the bodily location of sexual sensations in search of possible such sensations. In other words, self-doubt may generate test sensations resembling those feared.

Nevertheless, aside from such fleeting distortions of reality, a person may indeed have evident and enduring sexual sensations in the presence of some persons of the same gender, even without ever having engaged in homosexual acts. Such a person may correctly be said to have *homosexual tendencies*, as distinct from being a practicing homosexual.

It would be unfair to class this person as a homosexual, period, since he or she does not actually engage in homosexual acts. However, a further distinction must be drawn between two sorts of people with homosexual tendencies: those who *resist* these tendencies and those who *indulge* them.

Clearly, someone with apparent homosexual tendencies whose volition is not influenced by them in imagination or action, is not comparable to someone who mentally flirts with these tendencies even though without actually putting them in practice. In the first case, the one experiencing apparent homosexual lust regards it as involuntary, and does not identify with it, but on the contrary seeks to be rid of it. While in the second case, the lust is tolerated and even positively enjoyed, so that it is effectively voluntary<sup>7</sup>.

Although the two have similar bodily feelings with homosexual orientation, and both abstain from corresponding physical actions, the one remains mentally detached, whereas the other is mentally complicit. A moral distinction between them is clearly justified: the former is effectively innocent, the latter effectively guilty, of blame for the visceral responses. Of course, these bodily inclinations may be due to past thoughts, words or deeds with a homosexual taint – but

---

<sup>7</sup> The feelings are not translated into action merely out of lack of opportunity, or perhaps just timidity (fear of social disapproval), not out of any moral rejection.

in one case, the past is mitigated by the present, whereas in the other it is aggravated.

This is said in passing, so as to help people with apparent homosexual tendencies who wish to be rid of them. The method recommended is the same as for any psychological quirk – develop frank awareness of the sensations felt; then, awareness of their eventual sources in unchecked thought, word and deed; then, gradually, through more mindful thoughts, words and deeds, bring your psyche and body under control. This is essentially a meditative method – and therefore a natural, deep, powerful and lasting therapy.

In this context, I would like to draw attention to the intellectual dishonesty of advocates of homosexuality. They deliberately use generic terms like “same-sex attraction”, ranging from outright sodomy to vague homosexual feelings not so far put into action, in order to *fudge* the great psychological and moral differences that exist across this broad range. The aim and effect of such neutral sounding vocabulary is to make active homosexuality seem as innocuous as mere homosexual tendency, or the latter as committed as the former. Additionally, it sends a message to the uncommitted that, since they are already equivalent anyway, they might as well put their desires into action.

## 4. The biological role of sex

Advocates of homosexuality claim it is something “natural”, pointing out that some bonono monkeys do it<sup>8</sup>. Is that a valid argument? Are these people bonono monkeys? Or are bonono monkeys their spiritual guides? Do they mean that because some bonono monkeys are pedophiles, humans should be so too<sup>9</sup>? Closer to home: could we argue that because some

---

<sup>8</sup> They also point to hermaphroditic snails. But in this case, the physiological differences with humans are so pronounced, the argument is not even worth considering. These “same sex” snails are naturally designed to reproduce together, whereas human homosexuals are not. It is as absurd as arguing that men may or ought to scatter their seed on the ground, since trees do it! Whereas tree seeds can grow from the ground into new trees, it is not the case with human sperm.

<sup>9</sup> Incidentally, it is worth pointing out that the practice of homosexuality by some bonono monkeys does not imply that such practice is natural and normal even for that species of anthropoid. For, granting that these animals are a higher species (and they are genetically, anatomically and on the evolutionary scale, very close relatives of humans), we can safely say that they have a high degree of volition (almost as high as humans, except that their

people murder, we should all do so? Obviously not! Ethics is never based on what people (or animals lower than them) actually do or don't do; it is about what they as rational volitional beings preferably should or shouldn't do.

Since the issue of homosexuality is one concerning sex, we should begin our analysis of the subject by considering the biological role of sex. Heterosexual sexual activity is primarily intended for *reproduction*, so as to perpetuate the species. This is evident and undeniable when we consider our anatomy and behavior. Man penetrates woman; he ejaculates sperm that (usually) fertilizes her egg; this eventually gives birth to a new human being.

If the sex act was just for pleasure, comfort or love, we might have had the same sort of sex organs, but they would not have been instrumental in transmitting genetic material. These features of our reproductive system would have been absent. Gene transmission is evidently the main function of our sex organs, and any alleged additional value of sex – as a

---

cognitive powers are evidently less rational). In that case, it is appropriate to speak of bonono monkeys as making some free choices, and therefore as being subject to non-verbal considerations of good and bad. The phenomenological given of homosexuality in that species does not tell us whether or not bonono monkeys are conscious of “doing wrong” when they engage in such acts (or whether other members of their species might or not find it objectionable). Thus, the argument put forward in defense of such acts among humans, with reference to the behavior of some monkeys, is just a smoke screen to evade the issue.

means to erotic pleasure, comfort or love – can only be incidental.

Another important biological observation to make is that we have a strong *instinct or drive* to engage in sex. That is to say, we commonly experience strong feelings in our sex organ, and elsewhere in our body and mind, which influence us to pursue sex. The matter is not left open to our occasional free choice for the fun of it; no, our body and mind are programmed to push us to engage in sex often or even as often as possible.

We can easily see why such a conatus would exist. Its biological function is to encourage actual, frequent coitus, followed by reproduction, so that the species has a maximum chance of continued existence.

The physical pleasure of sex must be viewed in this context; it is intended to entice and incite us to sex. Without the reward of pleasure, we would be less likely to engage in sex; and if it promised us only pain, we would avoid it altogether. The same reasoning can be applied to other motives commonly given for sexual pursuits: that it is psychologically comforting or provides an opportunity for bonding (i.e. love) between human beings. These are mental and even spiritual pleasures, which likewise encourage and reward us for sex.

Moreover, it is biologically valuable for couples to stick together after their sexual encounters, because this ensures that the children they eventually give birth to are taken care of, i.e. this maximizes the chances of survival of the species.

From such biological considerations, we can easily conclude that the sexual orientation programmed into us by nature is necessarily heterosexual. Our normal, natural tendency is heterosexual, whether we are a man or a woman. This is clear from the anatomy of our sex organs and our emotional drives, and from the scientific explanation of their biological role.

Note that this conclusion is not solely based on statistics, i.e. on enumerating what proportion of humans are heterosexual, although statistics can also be appealed to, to confirm that most people have this orientation.



## 5. Non-reproductive sex

No one denies that homosexuals exist – but their existence in the population does not by itself prove such behavior to be natural or normal. The proponents of homosexuality sometimes present statistics (some claiming that as many as 15-20% of the population are openly or secretly homosexual) – but such an argument has no value in proving normalcy or naturalness.

Human beings have freewill – so their behavior is subject to ‘ethical’ evaluation, and cannot be taken as a deterministic ‘given’ (like the behavior of inanimate matter, plant life, or lower forms of animal life).

Aware of this weakness of the statistical argument, the proponents of homosexuality next argue that, while it is true that sexuality originally arose for reproductive and species-survival purposes, human beings, as higher animals endowed with freewill, can voluntarily bypass the reproductive aspect of sex, and focus exclusively on the adjacent sensual or

emotional aspects (which we may label hedonistic or eudemonistic).

Just as our culture accepts that heterosexual sex need not be aimed at reproduction, so likewise homosexual sex (which is never for reproduction) is – they say – legitimate. In this perspective, the distinction between male and female is irrelevant, and any combination of partners would seem acceptable.

Moreover, they argue, such non-reproductive sexual pursuits still have biological value, insofar as they facilitate the lives of people, making them more pleasant, comfortable or loving. They ask: What is wrong with that? So long as no one is hurt, what objections can moralists raise?

Indeed, they go on, so long as homosexuals are content, they can be useful members of society. They point to homosexuals who have made their mark on history: Alexander the Great, Leonardo da Vinci, and so on. And there are many current examples of homosexuals who are (at least apparently) “well-adjusted” socially.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Of course, this tells us nothing, since external success is not proof of inner balance and peace. How did Alexander or Leonardo feel and behave inside after awhile? Moreover, how did they feel about their life of homosexuality just before they died – proud and gay, or ashamed and aggrieved? If moral judgments are based on partial data, they are likely to be skewed; it is important to try to consider the total picture over time, to properly assess conditions.

Such arguments must and can be answered. The first fallacy to note is the implied moral equivalency between non-reproductive heterosexual sex and homosexual sex.

As we saw above, the sensual and emotional aspects of sex are biologically justified with reference to reproduction and survival of offspring. Nature has programmed sexual desire into us, to urge us to reproduce and to stay on with our mate so as to nurture the offspring of such reproduction.

This heterosexual desire is legitimate even when it is not consciously aimed at reproduction, or even when it is consciously intended to avoid reproduction (e.g. by use of condoms or pills), because it can always (and very often does, if only accidentally, but more often through growing attachment) lead to reproduction and subsequent family life.

On the other hand, homosexual sensual and emotional pursuits have no such justification, since they are inherently sterile and non-cohesive. They are ego pursuits without redeeming feature comparable to heterosexual sexual activities. Their only goal is physical or emotional gratification; they are radically divorced from any biological basis.

This is why it is correct to say that homosexuality is not a *natural* sexual orientation – but one inherently *deviant*, i.e. one that has lost track of its original goal, and become diverted into incidental objects (i.e. people of the same sex). It is as if we gave a monkey a pen to write with, and he used

it instead to scratch his behind. Homosexual sex is in fact a parody of sex, a sort of disoriented role-play.

The above discourse should not be interpreted as an injunction of heterosexual sex at every opportunity<sup>11</sup> in order to make as many babies as possible. This may indeed be seen as Nature's program; but remember that Nature relies on probabilities to achieve its ends. The point intended is only that, to at all discuss sex, we have to first comprehend the natural significance of it. Without such prior analysis, it is impossible to grasp why homosexuality is unnatural and even against nature.

It is true that nowadays it is possible – or in the very near future, it will be possible – for homosexuals to have children through various medical interventions. But here certain ethical questions have to be asked, like: Has the psychology and happiness of eventual children of such unnatural unions been seriously considered? Can one imagine a worse fate? What is the long-term viability of such artificial 'families'; what kind of twisted human beings would they produce? Have not all human beings the right to be born in natural

---

<sup>11</sup> With a single partner or every available partner, of the opposite gender. In fact, Nature would seem to prefer humans to stick to one partner (or one at a time), as this tends to ensure offspring are taken care of. But even if many sexual partnerships are made over a person's lifetime, it does not follow that total promiscuity is desirable. Our natures make us somewhat selective, so that some partners seem more attractive than others. This is admittedly often sheer vanity, but it is also often an instinctive choice of the best genetic combination for one's line.

circumstances, and raised with a reasonable chance of a normal life?

Similar questions can of course be asked with regard to adoption of children by homosexual couples. It is surely criminal to disregard the rights and interests of unborn children or orphans, just out of a desire to be tolerant towards homosexuals and to treat homosexuals as 'ordinary' human beings. The selfishness of those holding such opinions, their willingness to sacrifice children just so as to play the ego-role of tolerance and humanity, has to be pondered on.



## 6. Deviance and suffering

Secondly, since homosexuals have similar instead of complementary sex organs, the nature of their sexual activity is not exactly comparable to that of heterosexuals. Admittedly, some of the activities of the two groups resemble each other: e.g. mutual masturbation, oral sex and anal sex, are possible in either mode. But these are precisely the activities that are *not* biologically justified!

When a man loses his sperm through such extraneous activities, whether his partner is male or female, he not only fails to engage in ordinary coitus (theoretically capable of reproduction), but he moreover physically incapacitates himself for reproduction (at least temporarily, through loss of erection and sperm). Therefore, such activities are to be avoided on biological grounds.

Furthermore – and this is equally applicable to a woman – by diverting natural desire towards unnatural objects, a heterosexual or homosexual gradually (by habituation)

psychologically incapacitates himself or herself for the demanding task of straight heterosexual sex and living. Even if a man or woman is initially bisexual in outlook, homosexual behavior surely takes its toll and eventually cuts him or her off from heterosexual activity.

It could of course be argued that homosexuals are doing the rest of humanity a favor by *not* reproducing. In view of the world population explosion, with all its nefarious consequences on our economic and social wellbeing, and its ongoing destruction of the environment, it may be regarded as a public service not to reproduce. Perhaps that is the idea of the public health officials who encourage such practices; but is that idea kind?

It could also be argued that, by failing to reproduce, homosexuals voluntarily place themselves outside the category of those fit to survive (as in the Darwinian “survival of the fittest”). That is, their sexual disorientation can be viewed biologically as an expression of some inherent unfitness for this world – which causes them to be “naturally selected” *out* of it.

Let us move on, now, to a more psychological analysis, and raise a third objection to the argumentum of the proponents of homosexuality. They claim that homosexuality makes some people happy – or at least “gay” (i.e. jolly with pleasure, characterized by *joie de vivre*). If this were true, it might constitute a biological argument for homosexuality,



aside from reproduction. But is it true? It can very much be doubted<sup>12</sup>.

It may seem true for some people in the short run, but all tends to indicate that such appearances are deceptive and that sooner or later painful consequences will be felt by the individual concerned. For most homosexuals, the negative consequences are evidently not long in coming. And even when the homosexual maintains a brave, “gay” face (for purposes of self-justification) on the outside, he or she well knows the pain and suffering going on within.

This is true even in today’s Western society, which permits and defends homosexuality, and not just in more traditional societies, which forbid and persecute it. For it should not be thought that the private unhappiness of the homosexual comes from social rejection; rather it comes from the fact that homosexuality goes against the grain. Being psychologically, as well as physically, unnatural, it is bound to lead to suffering (i.e. to more suffering than heterosexuality entails).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> My own observation of homosexuals, male and female, which I have by chance met over the years, has left me with an impression that they are very immature, in some basic, tragic way; and a sense of some deep rot about them, as if their world is a very sad, grey place indeed. All their outer cheer seems to me a nervous veneer. Given an opportunity to be themselves in public, they show their profound rudeness and vulgarity (not surprisingly, considering their impure thoughts and deeds).

<sup>13</sup> Even if homosexual youths might in a first phase appear clean-cut and normal, they will in due course naturally suffer

The use of the word “gay” (and for that matter “pride”) is clearly just an advertising ploy, a show of bravado (a pretense). It is a pity that the English language has, since this word was kidnapped by homosexuals, lost a valuable word (which has become impossible to use without evoking the new, homosexual connotation). Linguists are well aware of how words are often used with the exact opposite of their original meaning<sup>14</sup>.

---

shame and guilt, and other negative effects of their aberrant thoughts and deeds. This is a law of nature – equally applicable to heterosexual youths who opt for a licentious lifestyle. A person’s way of life even eventually gets written on his or her face and body language: *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is excellent testimony to that common observation by a famous homosexual (Oscar Wilde).

<sup>14</sup> For example, the verb ‘to sanction’ may mean to permit or to punish. Note that not only the word “gay” has been hijacked, but also the word “pride”. The latter word is, of course, intended to convey that homosexuals are “proud” of what they are (rather than ashamed, as others consider they should be). But the phrase “gay pride”, applied to street demonstrations by homosexuals, uses the term “pride” in the sense found in “lions pride” (meaning a social group of lions, the kings of the jungle). The latter, too, is a word-theft that forever diverts and sullies the original sense.

## 7. Some probable causes

Underlying homosexuality is a basic failure to relate correctly to the commonplace challenge of sex. Long before an “identity problem” arises, the homosexual is simply *a failed heterosexual*. That is, everyone (each according to his or her gender, of course) is naturally endowed with the same phenomenal feelings (those which drive sexuality), but some people fail to correctly identify the actual orientation of these feelings, or fail to persist in trying to fulfill their manifest demands.

Some people become homosexuals because they were sexually abused as children or adolescents, by older kids or by adults. They feel permanently soiled and incapacitated by these early experiences, and are always ashamed or afraid to face members of the opposite sex as a result. For example, a woman might have been a victim of heterosexual rape as a child, and from then on feared and loathed men, and only felt comfortable with other women. Or again, a man may in his

childhood have been abused by a homosexual, and thereafter felt too ashamed of his past misfortune to face women confidently.

Some children and adolescents have premature sexual experiences among themselves, which happen to be homosexual (i.e. could perchance have been heterosexual, had those opportunities presented themselves instead). These kids' sexual drives are just dawning, and they have no idea what they are all about. They experiment among themselves, especially nowadays when adults make little effort to shield them from bad influences like pornography. In some cases, such children do as adults become homosexual, having become used to or acquired a taste for that particular sort of sexual encounter<sup>15</sup>.

(It is very important to note this observation, for therapeutic purposes: at the root of the self-identification of many homosexuals with their homosexuality lies an *obsessive attachment* to some

---

<sup>15</sup> Some take such childish explorations even more literally and become pedophiles, forever trying to recapture their sharp childhood sexual feelings. Of course, not all pedophiles are homosexuals. But it is no accident that the old (less "politically correct") word for homosexual was "pederast" (from a Greek word meaning 'lover of boys'). Of course, not all homosexuals are male – the yearning to revert to childhood is often found in females, too. Note that pedophilia is not limited to dirty old men or women – pedophiles are often quite young, in their twenties or thirties. In the latter cases, of course, we cannot talk of a return to childhood, but must rather call it arrested development: they never left childhood, i.e. their mental age did not follow their physical age.

early sexual experiences, which they erroneously mentally associate with sexual desire and satisfaction in general. They think such attachment is indicative of some sort of natural predilection of theirs, but it is simply an acquired and eliminable inclination. The problem involved is not constitutional, but merely a psychological limitation, a lack of intelligence.)

But this scenario is not the main avenue. A person may begin their quest for a heterosexual partner quite naturally; but, meeting failure after failure in this quest, he or she may end up going in the opposite direction, in the way of a consolation prize or substitute. This may begin tentatively at first – then become a habit and predilection. This sometimes occurs at an older age, even after a lifetime of heterosexuality, when all attractiveness is lost.

It does not matter much where and how the dread of the opposite sex is acquired. It may be due to repeated rejection (for whatever reason, e.g. physical or psychological unattractiveness), or the cause may lie in some parental failure of love or education (causing shyness or inadequacy)<sup>16</sup>. Whatever the cause, the biological challenge

---

<sup>16</sup> Some observers suggest that homosexuality, whether male or female, is often due to the father being overly passive or absent, and the mother being too old or domineering. But it must be stressed that such “environmental” causes cannot be regarded as *determining* homosexuality. Since homosexuals are human beings, they have freewill. Environmental factors (like family problems or social context) can only *strongly influence* behavior, but the victim is still free to resist the pressure of these influences

of making oneself able to find a (suitable) partner for reproduction has not been adequately met, and that's that. Since the underlying sexual urge, or libido, remains active, even uncontrollably so, the sorry loser looks for another outlet.

Some losers in the mating game opt for masturbation; others for sainthood through abstinence (chastity, celibacy). Some become rapists; some become great artists or sports champions. And some choose homosexuality.

There are of course many other specific ways homosexuality might be adopted. Some people go this route as a life strategy – thinking that they can more easily make their way in life through homosexual seduction, i.e. through same-sex prostitution for economic or social benefits. Another, perhaps most pernicious, road to homosexuality – commonly found today due to the currently popular ideology that it is okay, that it is natural and normal – is to do it willfully, in the way of experiment, for the alleged fun of it. Some people no doubt simply unconsciously drift into it, under the unquestioned influence of their peers or the media.

It is wrong to expect that no negative psychological and existential consequences will ensue from such choices, simply because they were freely made, with a “good

---

and go his or her own way. There is no excuse, no genuine justification, in the reference to such external factors. However powerful their psychological impact, human dignity remains possible.

conscience” as it were. For it is not the way one enters into such behavior that is its danger, but the inherent nature of the behavior itself. Even if one does not fear it, its dangers remain operative.

One aspect of the homosexual relation that should be noticed is the relation of domination versus submission it often involves, at some level or other, consciously or not, whether the partners are male or female. Such uneven partnerships do admittedly occur in heterosexual relations, too, although male-female combinations are usually complementary. But in the case of homosexual relations, the imbalance is more radical and inevitable, and a “pecking order” is part and parcel of social coexistence between two men or two women.

In homosexuality, because of the anatomical similarity of the partners, one of them must effectively “change sex” (if only behaviorally), to form a “yin-yang” balance. Among males, one of the men must become effeminate, woman-like; among females, one of the women must become masculine, man-like, “butch”. This abject personality change is detrimental to both partners, making them both contradict their true sexual and human identity. They all become something less than male or female, and thus something no longer quite human.

In other words, it is not some sort of original sexual identity problem that leads to homosexuality; rather, it is homosexuality that generates profound sexual identity problems. Such transformations and doubts are bound to cause deep and lasting suffering in the people concerned.

They simply cannot be expected to be without effect and painless.



## 8. Changing rationalizations

Our society's view of homosexuality has gone through numerous changes in the last few decades. At one time, homosexuality was frowned upon on religious grounds, because of the Biblical interdiction of it. Homosexuals were an object of contempt and mockery; people found them disgusting and avoided them as much as possible.

Then came the "sexual liberation" of the late 1960's and early 1970's, when the hippies opted for sexual promiscuity – which though usually heterosexual, sometimes included homosexual encounters.

Around this time, apologists for homosexuality began arguing that it should be regarded as a *mental* "sickness", caused by adverse family and social circumstances, and thus compassionately excused. Opponents of homosexuality at first tended to accept this semantic shift, viewing the epithet of sickness as an appropriate insult of sorts, a secular replacement for the religious idea of sinfulness. After all,

who would want to be considered mentally deranged (even in the way of a victim)?

Realizing this negative connotation, apologists for homosexuality began proposing that it is normal, in the sense that some people are so programmed by Nature, i.e. some people maybe have these peculiar genes, constituting a sort of third gender (or third and fourth genders, if we distinguish male and female homosexuals). They sought in this way to legitimize homosexuality as neither a sin nor a psychological affliction, but something natural though relatively uncommon.

However, no “homosexual genes” have ever been found (though some researchers have momentarily gained media attention by claiming to have found such distinctive genes). And if you think about it – such genes are hardly conceivable and very improbable according to the theory of evolution. For homosexuality is by definition non-reproductive; therefore, if such a gene ever arose by a spontaneous mutation, it would soon enough be naturally selected out of existence!

Fanciful notions of “a woman’s soul in a man’s body” or “a man’s soul in a woman’s body” were floated by the poets, implying that souls have a gender and that these can somehow enter the wrong kind of body.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> More generally, a new ideal of humanity was floated, a sort of androgynous, bisexual unisex creature. Men were told to realize the woman within them and become less macho; and women were told to realize the man within them and become more macho.

The science-minded suggested that sex hormones might on occasion override the gender determination of the sex chromosomes, ignoring the fact that all cells of a given human contain the same sex chromosomes, so that even if hormonal imbalances produce some unusual visible sexual characteristics, the underlying gender is still genetically engraved (so that no hormonal treatment or surgical sex change can hide the real sex).<sup>18</sup>

The scientists also pointed to hermaphrodites, and similar gender aberrations, some of which are due to unusual hormonal conditions, others to genetic abnormalities. Thus, there are people who have both a penis and a vagina; or again, there are people with a YY sex chromosome combination (or even rarer combinations like XYY, XXX or XXXX), instead of the usual XX of females or XY of males.

However, such cases are extremely rare, and their existence cannot be construed as a scientific explanation of homosexuality, since such people are not necessarily

---

Unisex haircuts and clothing became fashionable. Men (generally depicted as brutes) were encouraged to become more sensitive, talkative and weepy; while women (generally depicted as victims) were advised to get tough and fight back. This general assault on “sex roles” was of course justified in some cases and to some extent, insofar as its purpose was social, economic and legal equality between men and women; but it also served as a ploy in the more specific battle for homosexuality.

<sup>18</sup> In any case, no significant differences in hormone balance between homosexuals and heterosexuals have been found in general – meaning that such proposed physical cause is not an adequate explanation.

homosexual, and the large majority of homosexuals certainly cannot be classed in this category of physical abnormality.

All such “scientific” talk was of course only meant to hoodwink us common folk into believing that homosexuality is somehow not open to moral judgment. The object of the apologists was to have their cake and eat it too; i.e. to present homosexuality due to unusual *physical* problems, and thus, though an abnormality, something quite natural – implying that we should feel pity and consideration towards homosexuals (as we would to any physically handicapped person).

But this position left homosexuals a bit less than “gay”, implying them to be (gulp) victims, if not of Society, at least of Nature. It did not fully legitimize them, but still left them in the position of second-class citizens. At this point, an ethical offensive began, declaring homosexuality a free choice by fully adult, responsible and respectable human beings – a choice as legitimate and even worthwhile as plain old heterosexuality.

Everyone can decide for himself or herself, they argued, and who are *you* to judge? Various media and politicians pitched in, and the laws of nations were changed. Even constitutions were amended, and a “human right” to sexual “difference” was declared instituted and enforced. Active administrative measures were adopted to ensure homosexuals were treated as equal citizens; people were forbidden to ostracize them.

## **9. It is freely chosen**

I say: fine. This latest approach is actually a good development, because it takes us full circle and acknowledges what the religious traditions originally implied: namely, that homosexuality is freely chosen conduct. That is, homosexuals are not forced into it by any physical or mental force beyond their power to resist; they could choose otherwise. They freely choose to be what they are and do what they do, and are therefore morally responsible for their condition and their behavior.

The claims to mental or physical sickness or anomaly have all effectively been swept aside, and we are back to square one, with only a single change: now, the current ethical and political “authorities” support homosexuality, whereas their predecessors opposed it. Before, homosexuals were regarded as free agents who chose a wrong path; now, they are regarded a free agents who choose a neutral (if not a

positively recommended) path. The evaluation differs; but all agree on the fact of free choice.

The good thing is that the various transitional lies and excuses in defense of homosexuality, which we have reviewed above, have at last been abandoned, and the “ethical position” of the apologists is now clearly and honestly displayed. Now, having brushed aside a host of logically irrelevant issues, we can all return to the central issue, which is: is this behavior, which all admit is freely chosen, *moral, immoral or amoral?*

Now, morality is not a matter of decree, whether by religious authorities, moral philosophers, physicians, psychiatrists, sexologists, journalists, or legislators. It cannot be arbitrarily imposed, but has to be argued for convincingly.

In this light, it should immediately be noted that the posture adopted by the proponents of homosexuality is logically *arbitrary* – they have no arguments (that I have heard of, anyway) that rationally demonstrate that homosexuality is moral or at least not immoral. Their only argument is a relativistic, even nihilistic, one – a claim that there is no such thing as morality, or that no such thing is knowable through reason. They say, effectively: mind your own business – these are consenting adults<sup>19</sup>!

---

<sup>19</sup> Speaking of consenting adults, consider the following sordid story gleaned on TV news (I think I have the details right). Some months ago, in Germany, a man was tried and convicted for cannibalism. He had met another man on the Internet, and they

But an *ipse dixit* objection to their anti-moralistic discourse is logically inevitable. By condemning moral judgment as such, they engage in an act of moral judgment<sup>20</sup>. Another weakness of their dismissive argument is that they apply it *very selectively*, as convenient to their own ends. They certainly consider their political and media defense of homosexuals as moral, since they react with a semblance of “righteous indignation” when anyone (like the present author, in the present essay) doubts or opposes their theoretical and practical initiatives in this regard.

Their position is thus internally inconsistent; it is formally self-contradictory.

Moreover, there are many other fields of human activity where these same people readily recognize the power of reason to decide pros and cons with regard to human behavior – only in this exceptional case (*viz.* homosexuality), and perhaps a few more cases with similar revolutionary tendencies, is reason considered (by them) as incapable of judging and advising, and all discussion or doubt is verboten (*i.e.* immoral in their view). This is just attempted intimidation and intellectual thuggery on their part.

---

mutually agreed that, after some homosexual sex, he would kill and eat the other man, which is exactly what happened, apparently in good conscience. The fact of consent obviously does not make an act ethically justifiable.

<sup>20</sup> “Mind your own business” has the logical form of an ethical imperative – while claiming to be over and above all ethical imperatives.

The critics of homosexuality, on the other hand, appeal to people's intelligence and good sense. We have above already presented some arguments against homosexuality, which may be characterized as ethical, namely the analysis of the biological role and justification of sex, which hopefully carried considerable conviction. Two more sets of argument still need to be highlighted: one set based on more psychological and spiritual considerations, and another set based on more social and political considerations.

An important aspect of free choice to note here is the following. To say that something is freely chosen is to mean that, however strong the internal and external forces and temptations impinging on the person concerned, he or she has the volitional power to resist them. Will cannot be both free and causally determined; negative influences make the task of positive will more difficult, but they cannot literally overwhelm it.

Moreover, if a person *believes* he or she has no power of resistance to some impulse, his or her power of resistance is proportionately diminished. To act decisively, one has to believe the action concerned to be possible or useful. The beliefs one has *influence* one's will to act; one's beliefs are among the forces that affect (though do not determine) one's course of action.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Regarding influences on volition, see my earlier book *Volition and Allied Causal Concepts*, chapters 5-6.



It follows that the philosophers, psychologists and other advocates, who (in one way or another) tell homosexuals they cannot resist their homosexual impulses or change their ways (this is of course untrue – a lie), are in fact influencing them to yield to these impulses and continue in their ways. That is, they are making it more difficult for people with homosexual tendencies to remain straight or for homosexuals to overcome their current preferences.

Thus, the proponents of homosexuality are effectively *inciting* people to homosexuality; they exacerbate their problems. Inversely, the opponents of homosexuality are helping actual or potential homosexuals to make considered choices, by reminding them that – as human beings graced with freewill – they are potential masters or mistresses of their own sexual conduct. Ask yourself: which of the two is really kinder to you – someone who pushes you to weakness or someone who gives you strength?



## 10. Sensuality and perversion

Ethical discourse in general is not logically possible without admission that it concerns beings with powers of cognition, volition and valuation<sup>22</sup>. Without these powers, there is nothing to discuss, no utility in discussing anything, no one to do or understand the discussion or put its conclusions into action. In other words, we must start by recognizing here that we are talking about human beings, who have a rational faculty and freewill. If human beings were machines or subject to fate, there would be no debate.

Furthermore, ethics cannot be limited to physical and (in a narrow sense) mental considerations, but must extend to spiritual considerations. To have powers of cognition, volition and valuation is to have a soul, i.e. a spiritual life. Human beings have a soul (also called a spirit), whose

---

<sup>22</sup> Regarding the logical preconditions of ethical discourse, see my earlier book *Volition and Allied Causal Concepts*, chapters 17-18.

interests (i.e. benefit or harm) must also be taken into consideration, together with the interests of their bodies and minds. To ignore or disregard these considerations is to display a failure to understand the very foundations of ethics.

Thus, ethics – the science of what we (people) may or should do or not do – has to develop with awareness of all aspects of human nature and human existence – not only physiological (including genetic) factors and psychological factors (including familial, social and cultural influences), but equally spiritual factors (the perceptions and conceptions, the exercises of will and the value judgments of the individual person within the body and mind).

All these different factors must be considered and weighed in the balance. To refuse to recognize one domain or the other is ignorance, stupidity, intellectual confusion or dishonesty – it is not a scientifically legitimate posture.

We have already (in the above discussion) dealt with some of the more obvious issues; here, we shall focus on some relevant spiritual issues. Here, we need to stress two attitudes, two postures and tendencies of the soul, which are spiritually damaging or destructive. These aberrations are not found exclusively in homosexuality, but are perhaps found in it more intensely than usual.

The first aspect is excessive *sensuality*, i.e. a mental obsession with sexual sensations<sup>23</sup>. The spiritual effect of this attitude is that it keeps one tied to lower instincts, even when they have no demonstrable physiological or psychological value.

If a man or woman has no sexual partner of the opposite sex, or has given up hope of finding one (due to some handicap, old age or whatever reason), then logically that person ought to devote himself or herself to more spiritual pursuits. Artificially sustaining sexual desire and pleasure through masturbation, or other deviant means such as homosexuality, serves no useful purpose.

It is a sort of idiotic attachment to a phantom of the original, natural orientation of desire, which is inscribed in our instincts for purposes of reproduction. It is like imagining one has an arm or leg when it has been cut off. All it does is accentuate and perpetuate pain and suffering.

In the case of homosexuality, specifically, such sensuality is further complicated by the fact that the partners involved are of the same sex. This implies that all sorts of man-man or woman-woman physical and mental interactions are involved, which are not inscribed in our nature (which, as we have already explained, is geared for heterosexual relations). The homosexual has to deal with essentially artificial harmful

---

<sup>23</sup> For more detail on the psychology of sensuality, see my earlier book *Meditations*, chapters 21-22.

situations. This wrongheaded situation surely takes its toll, at a spiritual level.

Why is sensuality a spiritual affliction? It consists in attaching disproportionate value to passing sensations – in vainly clinging to something as impermanent and insubstantial as smoke. Such a policy is bound to be destructive in some way or other. It is bad enough in the case of heterosexuals, but becomes suicidal in the case of homosexuals, since their existential situation is more complicated by its unnaturalness.<sup>24</sup>

This brings us to the second aspect: *perversion* or perversity of spirit. This term is not a hollow insult, but an identifiable trait. What it refers to, generally, is valuing something *because* it ought to be disvalued – i.e. not in spite of its being judged to be in some way negatively charged, but precisely because it is disallowed, forbidden, bad, evil, dangerous, harmful, unattractive, ugly, weird, kinky, ambivalent, queer, dirty, disgusting, repulsive, abhorrent, cruel, illegal, criminal, etc. It is a twisted disposition or preference for the opposite of what reason, after appropriate pondering of the issues involved, recommends.

---

<sup>24</sup> It is hard enough for human beings to contend with the difficulties nature sets in their paths; it is silly to add to these obstacles artificial difficulties that are easily dispensed with. Wisdom would recommend avoiding such extraneous problems altogether.

With regard to sexual desire, specifically, this perverseness is expressed in the way of desiring sexual objects or acts that are out of the ordinary in some distorted way. For examples: an interest in sodomy or a pleasure getting dressed to look like someone of the opposite sex. Some people feel quite indifferent or blasé towards ordinary sexual objects or acts, and are only attracted to things or people that have an air of rot or corruption about them. This attitude is surely an expression of spiritual impurity, and is bound to generate more of it<sup>25</sup>.

The error of reasoning inherent in perversion is the imagination that there might be *some extra, hidden pleasure or other value* in what is morally forbidden.<sup>26</sup> Sexual perversion is thus an exacerbated form of sensuality – a search for *extraordinary* sexual excitement. To the pervert, ordinary pleasures are “not enough”. There is always a lust for more – not only quantitatively more, but also progressively more and more weird.

This is an existential problem, as it can lead a person into physical problems (e.g. Aids and other diseases), psychological problems (e.g. personality and identity

---

<sup>25</sup> Consider for instance the story of cannibalism given in an earlier footnote. This is of course an extreme example; admittedly, not all homosexuals are cannibals. But it goes to show how weird people can get, who allow themselves to develop unnatural desires.

<sup>26</sup> This is well illustrated, for instance, in the Biblical story of Eve being tempted by the serpent to eat the forbidden fruit, by subtle descriptions of how “delightful” it is (Exodus 3:1-7).

derangement, lack of self-esteem) and social problems (e.g. social conflicts and ostracism). But such impure thought is especially a spiritual problem, since it is based on delusion, i.e. on a fundamental error of understanding. It is thus bound to lead one astray from inner peace, balance and clarity.

Once one develops and follows such inclinations, there is no limit to how far down one can slip. The descent may at first seem controlled, but eventually it becomes uncontrollable. Having repeatedly identified with stray physical or mental impulses, the soul has made its faculties of cognition, volition and valuation mere instruments in the service of such impulses, and becomes less and less able to reassert authority over them in the service of higher values.



## 11. Spiritual impurity

All the arguments proposed in the present essay are only incidentally addressed to practicing homosexuals. It is very unlikely that these people will be moved by reason to revise their ways. It is very doubtful that even if they did “straighten up and fly right” they would “save their souls” from the abyss that they have condemned them to. They have probably indelibly sullied themselves.

The soul is indeed eternally pure. We cannot say it is literally stained, since it cannot be *mixed with* non-spiritual substances (i.e. mind or matter), and the spiritual substance is universally one and always the same.

However, we could say the soul is irretrievably *weighed down by* negative mental and physical accretions that stick to its surface, as it were. But perhaps the most accurate description of spiritual impurity would be that the soul is so deluded by past misbehavior that *its consciousness* becomes

obscured and can no longer find its way back to clarity and understanding.

Homosexuality would seem to have such a “once and for all” negative effect, without possible redemption. This does not mean homosexuals should not try to improve their conduct. They may still, through such effort, hope to somewhat better their spiritual lot, and partly redeem themselves (or at least, not to worsen their lot and fall further still). Even a little redemption is better than none.

No, this essay is not addressed to practicing homosexuals, but to virgin youths and other still-innocent souls, who under the influence of an increasingly corrupt culture may be considering taking up this misbehavior for whatever motive. It is also addressed to moral philosophers, religious leaders, medical professionals, educators, opinion makers and legislators – to enjoin them to think and act in a responsible manner.

It used to be, once upon a time, that most people had great faith in the Jewish Bible, or similarly authoritative texts in other religious traditions. It sufficed for the Torah to command “*Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind; it is abomination*” (Lev. 18:22)<sup>27</sup>, and most Jews

---

<sup>27</sup> A related interdiction is that against transvestism, in Deut. 22:5; such practices, by men or women, are also labeled “abomination”, probably because they reflect and produce mental confusion with regard to objects of sexual interest, eventually leading some people to homosexual responses and practices. As regards transsexuality (which is a hot topic nowadays, when sex

complied. This was not just fear of eventual Divine retribution, or because such behavior was legally very severely punishable<sup>28</sup>. It was out of a deep-seated love for ordinary dignity and decency, for a certain model of humanity<sup>29</sup>.

Some people still today have this clear vision of what it means to be a human being. Such people do not need convincing. This essay is not addressed to them, but to those

---

change surgery seems to be easy and popular), it would appear forbidden by Judaism (and similar traditions), primarily because (in normal cases) it constitutes voluntary mutilation of natural reproductive capabilities. To this biological reason, we might add that the sexual activities of (willful) transsexuals are either effectively homosexual (since anatomical changes are superficial and do not affect the genetic makeup of individuals, so that an “ex-male” is still a male, and ditto for females) or effectively transvestite (so that if an “ex-man” has sex with a woman, or vice-versa, it is not homosexuality, but ‘dressing up’ not only with the wrong clothes but even with false body parts).

<sup>28</sup> It is also written: “And if a man lie with mankind, as with womankind, both of them have committed abomination; they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them” (Lev. 20:13). The crime of sodomy was taken so seriously, death was prescribed for it.

<sup>29</sup> If there is anything in any holy book that convinces me that it is God-inspired, that it comes *from the deepest well of truth and goodness in the human spirit*, it is the inclusion in it of laws against such lewdness. Of course, tradition *per se* is not proof; but then, nor is modernity. We could say, naturalistically, that our ancestors have learned certain lessons of life through bitter experience, and passed them on to us in the form of religious, spiritual or wisdom teachings. These teachings do not impose improbable truths on us, but rather remind us of what deep inside we already instinctively know to be true.

who have lost their bearings. If they have no faith in religious traditions, perchance some rational arguments will convince them. If they are envisaging indulging in homosexuality, perchance these arguments will help them check their impulse. If they have already engaged in homosexual acts, perhaps these arguments will make them cease and desist.

Some will of course rebelliously continue on their path and indeed arrogantly reassert their “right” to it. That is their problem; they will surely eventually suffer the consequences of their choice one way or another. Their willfulness, their insolence, their shamelessness, their impudence, their immodesty, will lead them astray – “sure as hell”. They have no fears or regrets, now; but one day, “their teeth will clatter and they will gnash their tongues”. Wait and see what they will think and feel at the time of their death.

Human nature is such that we are all capable of the most sublime virtue and spirituality, or the ultimate depths of depravity and vice. This is what it means to have freedom of the will, the power of choice. It means that the whole range of possible human conduct is *potential* to each and every individual. There is nothing wrong with having a natural potential for vice or evil – what matters ethically is whether such potential is ever *actualized* or not. Indeed, the respectability of the virtuous and good is that they had the opposite potential in them, and chose this demanding path.

Fortunately for humanity, there are and will likely always be good, decent people around, who know the honor of being

human. The statistical distribution of good and evil in the world is probably in the traditional bell shape, though its spread may vary. We should not be misled, by the popularity of ugly or evil acts (at a given historical time, in a given society), into believing that human nature is inherently like that. This would just be an excuse or pretext for joining the ranks of those who lack dignity.

Humans are really, sadly, capable of great depravity. People who habitually entirely surrender to their every passing sexual impulse, eventually become crazy and desire “sex” with just about anything that crosses their path. A man will desire to penetrate almost anything, and a woman will desire to be penetrated by almost anything. They can lose all sense of dignity or decency, and have sex with dead bodies or animals – or other people of the same sex.



## 12. The essence of sodomy

Sensuality normally refers to desire for or pursuit of sexual pleasure. One form sensuality generally takes is to get sexual pleasure from the thought or experience of the pleasure one's partner is getting. This is a positive, and relatively normal, form of sensuality – it is the vicarious experience of pleasure. Instead of just getting pleasure, one is *getting it by giving it*. Since it is essentially benevolent, it is commonly considered a form of “making love”.

But it should be noted that there is a negative parallel to this – getting sexual pleasure *from the pain* one's partner is subjected to. In this case, one is getting pleasure by giving pain. This is called **sadism**. Being essentially malevolent, it must be considered as a form of hatred; it is biologically abnormal, being motivated by destruction of other human beings. This is true, even in cases where the partner experiencing pain is a willing victim, i.e. in cases of

**masochism.** Here, self-hatred and self-destructiveness are clearly involved – two obviously unhealthy dispositions.

The sadist and masochist have in common the perverse idea that pleasure is to be obtained from pain – the other's pain or one's own. In addition to such cruelty, they have in common self-contempt and self-hatred, except that: whereas the masochist directly expresses these emotions by self-victimization, the sadist expresses these emotions vicariously, by producing them in some victim instead of self.

In this perspective, it should be noted that the sex act most associated with male homosexuality, viz. sodomy, is essentially a sadist act. This is true even in cases where the man being subjected to anal intercourse is a willing partner and considers the act pleasurable (sodomasochism). Why so? Because this act is intrinsically *humiliating* to a man<sup>30</sup> – i.e. it unavoidably involves the psychological damage and pain of loss of manliness and loss of self-esteem.

A man who wishes to penetrate another man is thus essentially a sadist, and a man who wishes to be penetrated by another is essentially a masochist. The sadism involved is of course most evident in cases of homosexual pedophilia or male adult rape; but it is equally manifest (and so is masochism) in cases of consensual sex between adults. In all

---

<sup>30</sup> This is something every man still able to see within himself knows to be true. Even if some men's minds have become so obscure they can no longer see this truth, it is true.



cases, such behavior (if voluntary) is psychologically unhealthy.

The sodomite aggresses the masculinity of his partner (or victim), and thus expresses some hatred of that maleness, and therefore (being male himself) some self-hatred. In thus abusing his sex partner, he reveals his own inner doubt and conflict. On the other side, the willing recipient of sodomy, allowing his male nature to be downtrodden, reveals his own self-contempt. Moreover, by allowing or encouraging another man to so behave, he causes that other harm.

Thus, both participants in voluntary sodomy are guilty of misusing their partner's body, and revealing and exacerbating their own serious psychological problems. There is no way that the act of sodomy can be considered a mentally healthy choice. It is inevitably damaging to both the men involved.

Similar judgments can be made concerning other sex acts between men, and sex acts between women, to varying degrees. Apart from their immodesty, all such acts are characterized by mutual misuse of the two partners' gender, implying both hatred of the other and self-hatred. They are all therefore forms of sadomasochism, although again to varying degrees.

It is worth noting in this context the deeper motives of homosexuals who organize or participate in public parades. Observe in such demonstrations: the exhibitionism, the provocative displays, the transvestism and suggestive facial expressions. The primary intent is clearly not (as it is

claimed) political, a wish to be acknowledged as human beings. Rather, one sees a will to shock ordinary sensibilities, a determination to lower people's standards.

One gets the distinct impression that what homosexuals really want is to smear other people with their impurity. They wish others to be dragged willy-nilly into their warped vision of human sexuality. Nothing should be allowed to remain pure, untainted by their shit. Notice, in particular, the efforts made by homosexuals to parade in the streets of Jerusalem, and other places considered holy by many. They have no consideration for other people's values.<sup>31</sup>

Homosexuals need to ask themselves what the purpose of life is, for they have clearly lost all sense of direction. Is human life a desperate pursuit of queer sensations, irrespective of what the side effects of such pursuit might be? No: there is much more to life than that – namely, a wide-ranging personal and social responsibility for spiritual development.

They have to step well back from their current ways and ask themselves: What kind of entities do they want themselves and others to be? What kind of world are they busy making in their image and likeness, pulled along by their darkest impulses? People get mentally caught up in the whirlwind of

---

<sup>31</sup> Even God Himself must, in their view, be forced to love them as they are. It is not enough for them that they ignore the presence of God (Who is everywhere to some degree) in the privacy of their homes; they want to shamelessly flaunt their impurities to His face in the public arena too, and even in the most holy places (where His presence is strongest).

their lives, and lose track of their original purity and ideals. They cannot recover these precious native virtues and values without a determined effort.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> People can make smart-aleck quips in response to such questions, but surely somewhere deep within they know what's what.



## **13. A social revolution**

As already indicated, there has in the last few decades been a radical upheaval in social and political attitudes towards homosexuality. What was, still some fifty years ago, generally condemned, was gradually legitimized; until today, when homosexuality seems to be not only tolerated, but even promoted.

The laws, and even constitutions, of most Western nations have been changed to grant homosexuals every right to practice their form of sexuality freely. There are laws that force employers to employ (or keep in their employ) homosexuals, however distasteful the life of other employees (who are captive audiences) may be made thereby.

Many religious institutions, including the Jewish Reform movement and the Anglican Church, have effectively legitimized sodomy, in direct denial of their own Scriptures, by admitting “gay” rabbis or priests.

We have now reached the point where homosexuality advocates in the U.S. are trying to get schools to teach children about homosexuality. On the surface, the intention seems to be to remove all stigma from homosexuality, letting people so inclined do as they will. But *de facto*, the social machine is producing more and more homosexuals. The measures taken ostensibly “in defense of” homosexuality result in more of it than there would otherwise be – which means that they positively *spread* homosexuality.

Tragically, the propaganda and legal efforts of the proponents of homosexuality in the past generation or two have been largely successful. Very many of today’s youths have been brought up to believe that defending homosexuals is a good deed. Even if many of them remain heterosexual, their tolerance level of homosexuality has clearly increased. The border between decency and indecency has gradually been shifted, so that people previously regarded as moral deviants have now become acceptable, in large segments of public opinion, the media and political forums.

The social change began as a trickle, and has lately become a tsunami. What was a rare phenomenon is fast becoming widespread. At first, there were appeals to tolerance of difference; lately, we witness the media flooded daily with reminders of homosexuality as if their goal is to make it the new social norm. Business interests can smell a lucrative thing when they see it, and have started to flaunt homosexuality in their advertising, further corrupting youth.

What was through much of our history considered manifest wrong has suddenly been declared a “human right” by some of the people in power, and inscribed as such in law books. The word “right” here used is intentionally equivocal – superficially, referring to a political and legal condition; but additionally, suggesting that it is something morally acceptable and even good.

Future historians will shake their heads in wonder and disbelief, in the aftermath of this policy, when the destructive effects of this modern plague become apparent.

Such radical social changes have of course not occurred suddenly and by chance, but only gradually and through the intentional active involvement of very many people. This was “the gay/lesbian liberation movement”.

First, more and more people, let loose by the general “sexual liberation movement” of the late Sixties and early Seventies, became homosexuals<sup>33</sup>. Then, many of these people took to the streets, in mass demonstrations called “gay prides”. These parades shocked a large part of the public, but also served to enlist many new adherents, either to the practice of homosexuality or at least to its cause.

First, people were told to be *kind* to homosexuals, to feel pity for their difficulties and not add to them. Then, people were

---

<sup>33</sup> This may have occurred through a culture of unchecked heterosexual promiscuity, which in due course made way for orgies (often drug-induced), during which sexual lusts and contacts between people of the same sex could and sometimes did arise.

told to be *tolerant* towards them, to accept that they have a right to make their own choice even if others disagree with that choice. Now, people are effectively told to *shut up* – homosexuality is considered a settled issue, not open to any doubt or discussion. A new faith and dogma has been established; it is forbidden to oppose homosexuality or even make it an issue any more. It is a *fait accompli*, a done thing.

The subject is loudly declared closed, and it is heavily hinted that attempted objections may result in legal proceedings. The spin-doctors having applied the “civil liberties” notion to homosexuality, any contrary notion is made to seem illegal. Freedoms of speech and of political opposition, which are defended in all other domains as fundamental to democracy, are considered null and void when the issue of homosexuality is raised. Under a cloak of “liberalism”, a new dictatorship has emerged.

Verbal expressions of disapproval of homosexuals are indignantly reprovved and savagely repressed by people in positions of authority (editorialists, politicians, educators, and so forth), as if criticism of such behavior is simply inconceivable.

In this matter, exceptionally, very little moral or political discussion is tolerated by our democracies – a totalitarianism of the “politically correct” has been instituted. It is implied that just to voice disapproval of this class of people is to insult them, to belittle their human dignity. We must thus



remain silent as to the indignity they bring upon themselves, and the whole human species, by their behavior.

The matter is compared to racism or anti-Semitism<sup>34</sup>, as if a genetic subset of humankind or some new spiritual path would be under attack. That this comparison to Homos might seem like an insult to many Blacks or Jews is not considered<sup>35</sup>. It is pointed out that Hitler tried to kill off homosexuals, as well as Jews and Gypsies – the implication being that our moral standards are to be set by way of the contradiction of Hitler's<sup>36</sup>.

Some of these arguments were formulated by homosexual activists who happened to be (sorry to say) Jewish or Black. These people cunningly<sup>37</sup> took over the language and arguments used in defense of Jewish and Black rights, and transposed them to homosexual "rights". The latter group

---

<sup>34</sup> In French, the terms Negrophobia and 'Judeophobia' are also commonly used. Note that a comparison is also sometimes made to xenophobia – the rejection of 'foreigners' – on the ground that antipathy to homosexuals is merely psychological intolerance of 'difference'; this is of course just more balderdash.

<sup>35</sup> Consider in particular whether any of the victims of the Holocaust would have appreciated the comparison, which is none too flattering for them.

<sup>36</sup> The absurdity of such thinking can be seen if we apply the same logic to other categories of behavior. E.g. does the fact that Hitler had some murderers executed imply that we should henceforth legalize murder? Clearly, the antitheses of Hitler's peculiar mix of value judgments cannot be used as universal norms.

<sup>37</sup> And without respect for the sacred memory of victims of the Holocaust, and other such persecutions and pogroms.

was thus effectively presented to the public as just another ethnic or religious minority. They asked only to be treated fairly and without discrimination, as if what they were doing together was morally and socially totally irrelevant.

## **14. The defenders and promoters of homosexuality**

The many people who try to object to this imposed moral and social revolution are silenced by intimidation or ridicule – they are made to feel like reactionaries or retards. They are personally attacked, in order to neutralize their criticism. It is insinuated that their public opposition to homosexuality might be due to their having subconscious homosexual tendencies, which they want to deny to themselves or hide from others.

The advocates of homosexuality, on the other hand, are implied to be sexually pure, or at least honest. No one seems to question the sexual inclinations, sanity or integrity of the legislators who are forcing it down people's throats (excuse the pun). One may well wonder how these politicians were enlisted to this unjust cause – some were no doubt complicit (themselves already immoral), but surely many were amoral

mercenaries (who would do anything for votes) or moral cowards (fearing popular rejection or ridicule).

Many homosexuals were, of course, themselves intellectuals, who had or acquired positions of some importance in the media, in academia, in politics, and throughout society. These people made their weight felt over time, and succeeded in changing society as they wished. Not all advocates of homosexuality were themselves practicing homosexuals or even people with homosexual tendencies, but a large portion must have been. People do not normally pursue public goals without a personal axe to grind of some sort.

I have seen an American university professor, lecturing on psychology at Geneva University, shamelessly manipulating a lecture hall full of eager students with false facts and statistics, or tendentious reading of facts and statistics, to convince them of the naturalness, normality or at least great frequency of homosexuality. I have read a “dear Abby” type newspaper column, where a youth struggling with emotions or feelings he could not fathom was effectively advised by the columnist to become a homosexual.

Slowly, slowly, through such pinpointed verbal interventions from positions of authority, society was turned around (literally).

Some advocates of homosexuality are, of course, themselves homosexuals; some have homosexual tendencies they would perhaps like to actualize. Some advocates do not advertise their homosexual orientation, or even conceal it, while others

frankly admit it<sup>38</sup>. It is understandable that such people would want to legitimize their own behavior or lusts. Also, by defending homosexuality, they become personally more attractive within their peer group; and by promoting it, they produce new potential partners.

But what of the defenders of homosexuality who are not themselves homosexual in orientation. What is the motive of these people? The motive a person claims to have whether sincerely or dishonestly may not be the true, functioning motive. Are these people selflessly pursuing justice, as they pretend to be doing – or are they trying to establish a world in which their own petty sexual or other impurities are not frowned upon?

Moreover, whatever a person's alleged motive, what counts are the real consequences of his or her actions. Are these people being kind, as they imagine themselves – or are they in fact senselessly causing harm to the very people they claim to defend? It must be said that there is no justice or kindness

---

<sup>38</sup> I heard recently on TV that Alfred Kinsey, who pioneered experimental "sexology" in the 1950's, was himself a homosexual. As I recall, this fact was not advertised when I read about his work in the media during the 70's. This relevant fact was cunningly concealed at the time. He was made to appear an objective, scientific researcher. Among his "findings" was a claim that (as I recall offhand) 15-20% of the U.S. population had had homosexual experiences, i.e. were either exclusive homosexuals or bisexuals. Certainly, the credibility, and power to change society, of such claims would have been much reduced if Kinsey's personal inclinations were publicly known.

in encouraging someone to do himself or herself some harm, or even in not discouraging such behavior.

On the surface, it may seem like a helpful and friendly thing to do, so that the person on a self-destructive path at least does not feel bad about it and goes “gaily” to his or her fate. But it is evidently more benevolent to urgently forewarn the endangered person, and even help him or her escape the danger. The mere fact of not intervening cannot be considered good, nor can the mere fact of intervening be considered bad. The motive and (more importantly) the consequences have to be looked at, before any judgment can be made.

Heterosexuals have varying attitudes towards homosexuals. Some heterosexuals easily tolerate homosexuals<sup>39</sup>. If the latter are of the same gender, perhaps the reason is they are not competitors with them for the favors of members of the opposite gender. If the homosexuals are of the opposite gender, their homosexuality is not necessarily repulsive to some heterosexuals; it might even be felt as an added attraction or challenge.

Some heterosexuals find homosexuals intolerable, perhaps because they do not want to be drawn in to the repugnant or depressive world of homosexuals. Such people are labeled (by the advocates of homosexuality) “homophobes”. This is

---

<sup>39</sup> To various degrees: sometimes, with a touch of contempt; sometimes, with an amused smile; sometimes, with concerned friendliness.

intended to imply that opposition to homosexuality is somehow sick, based on irrational fear or hate, reprehensible. It is presented as a mere emotional reaction, as if no rational dissent is conceivable. Some homophobes are indeed moved to verbal abuse or violent repression<sup>40</sup>; but most are critical in a more civilized way.

If this loaded term is to be used for all opponents of homosexuality, then all its proponents should be called “homophiles”. Homophobes ought not let homophiles make them feel ashamed of their rejection of homosexuality; it is a healthy posture, of which they can feel proud. Homophiles may well accuse homophobes of prejudice and inhumanity, but they (the homophiles) are not shining moral examples or pure spiritual guides. Their coarseness of spirit is such that they love what is bad and hate what is good; they are merely apologists for immoral practices.

---

<sup>40</sup> And needless to say, such uncivil behavior is not what is being advocated here.





## 15. Some legal issues

From a law philosophy viewpoint, a right to practice homosexuality is very doubtful. It is conceivable that there is a right of consenting adults to behave as they will in private; certainly, such a right can be claimed for heterosexuals.

But remember the general rule that *the rights of one person or group of persons end where those of another begin*. Certainly in the case of homosexuals, many dangers to society can be adduced to limit or exclude their potential rights<sup>41</sup>.

---

<sup>41</sup> To give a concrete example: willful transsexuality seems at first sight a private choice with no societal consequence. Yet, as such sex changes spread, men become more and more unsure as to whether the women they meet really are women, or are ex-men; and similarly, women come to doubt the real gender of the apparent men they meet. This may seem amusing anecdote, but it constitutes a further erosion of heterosexual relations.

In recent decades, many activities traditionally judged as immoral have been declared legal in Western countries. Some notable examples:

- Some laws have been favorable to corporations, permitting them to operate industries known to be polluting, or otherwise harm the health and wellbeing of many citizens.
- In North America, though much less so in Europe, ‘genetically-modified organisms’ (GMO) have been allowed with hardly any research or debate concerning their long-term environmental and health effects, and without granting consumers any information or choice in the supermarket.
- The law has come to allow mass production of and commerce in pornography, morally corrupting countless people who would otherwise have remained much purer in their sexual behavior.
- Abortion on demand has become legal in many countries, despite fierce resistance by pro-life advocates. What is amazing is how the pro-choice advocates are presented by most media, in Europe at least, as moral crusaders (for “the right of women to their own bodies”), while defenders of the unborn human baby’s right to life are portrayed as backward morons (with murderous tendencies, since a few of them have resorted to force). It is rarely mentioned that in the past century an estimated

*one billion* abortions have been performed legally or illegally worldwide!<sup>42</sup>

Many other examples can be given of the divide between law and morality. One particularly shocking example is the legalization of homosexuality in only the last few years.

Homosexuals have certainly existed in relatively small numbers throughout history, though they were usually frowned on and often legally sanctioned. Suddenly, starting in the USA, these people have succeeded in changing the law in their favor in most Western countries. They have gained the sympathy of certain media, and become fashionable. Many youths, confusing legality with moral permissibility, have been drawn into perversions that, had they been born a few years before, they would never have even contemplated.

At first, homosexuals claimed their practices were the private concern of consenting adults (seemingly just saying: ‘mind your own business’). Then they demanded the right to provocative public displays, irrespective of other people’s sensibilities (which incidentally, propagated their ‘values’ in the population at large including children, lowering general standards and increasing their own numbers). Then they claimed legitimacy and respectability.

Now they demand the right to marriage (which involves tax advantages, i.e. public subsidies). Also, they claim the right

---

<sup>42</sup> Compare this figure (a round number) to the fatalities of war during the same period. See [www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/abortion/wrip338sd.html](http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/abortion/wrip338sd.html).

to adopt children (thus directly transmitting their values to other human beings, who are not even consenting adults).

Thus, step-by-step, these people have sought: public tolerance, then justification and condoning, then support, then propagation. To top it all, posing as a persecuted minority, as poor victims of causeless hatred, they have managed to hijack the legislative and judicial system at its highest level, in some countries, apparently making even merely verbal opposition to their progress a constitutional or bill-of-rights crime<sup>43</sup>, so that even ethical philosophers dare not debate the issue without wondering whether they are risking imprisonment or fines. Check mate!

Even so, it must be said that homosexuality is not a “right”, exempt from all scrutiny. *No voluntary human act falls outside the scope of ethics. Nothing in ethics precludes that certain behavior patterns might be evaluated and considered reprehensible.* The role of ethics is precisely to consider the various consequences of each proposed behavior pattern, and evaluate it dispassionately, i.e. without being intimidated by social threats or pressures, with reference only to the profound needs of humanity.

On a material level, we could for example mention the factual, historical role played by homosexuals (and in

---

<sup>43</sup> I gather they are currently seeking recognition and protection in international charters, too. They well understand that the more legal protections they achieve, the more difficult does it become to reverse the trend.

particular, bisexuals) in the spread of the AIDS disease during its early years in Western countries. Consider to what extent this affected relations between heterosexuals (the majority of the population): men and women could no longer so freely have sex without condoms; and when they did have sex, the condoms they used constituted a physical separation between them. Consider also how many heterosexuals eventually contracted the disease and died (millions, no doubt), although innocent of homosexual practices.<sup>44</sup>

On a spiritual plane, the main traditions of mankind would all seem to agree that humans must not allow such lowly, impure impulses to develop and to propagate. Certainly, the Judaic, Christian and Moslem traditions consider such behavior improper, harmful and to be interdicted<sup>45</sup>. The Eastern traditions do not specifically attack these practices (as far as I know – I have never seen them mentioned), but effectively disapprove of them in the larger context of control of sexual lust, and (I also suspect) they concur in view of their social mores and legal dispositions.

As regards individuals involved in such practices: the issue is not just biological, a material issue relating to a duty of

---

<sup>44</sup> I marvel at commentators who prefer to ignore such “accidental” victims of homosexuality, so as to appear “tolerant” and “kindly” to the culprits; they surely share in the moral guilt.

<sup>45</sup> The fact that more and more clerics have of late been compromised or intimidated into advocating or allowing homosexuality does not change the clear doctrinal intent of the Scriptures.

reproduction; the issue is especially spiritual, and we have seen some reasons why in the present essay.

If these men or women experience certain impulses or urges in their sex organs or in other parts of their bodies or minds, it does not constitute a justification for following these feelings. They are certainly not mechanically forced to – they are humans, they have freewill, they are responsible for their own acts.

They certainly cannot reach any spiritual ‘salvation’ or ‘liberation’ if they allow themselves to be carried away by such drives, as they do. And of course, the more they yield to their impulses and urges, the more they become enslaved to and negatively affected by them.

## 16. A call for recovery

If we admit that the mere *desire* expressed by homosexuals is proof of some real *need* and *right*, then all ethics and law disappears. For then any other category of individual or group can come along and present felt tendencies as justifications – and indeed, this is just what is already happening!

For instances, pedophiles (“why, bonono monkeys do it!”) and zoophiles (“animals are our cousins!”) are starting to make claims of their own (and ominously, according to news reports, some of them are in the legal and other significant professions, note). For the time being, they are suppressed by the authorities, the media and public opinion; but if their numbers multiply sufficiently, who knows what will happen?

And once something is legalized, it is made to appear “moral” and can then be freely taught and encouraged. Any attempt to block further expansion is argued to be discriminatory. Few people seem to have the self-confidence

and moral courage to resist such developments; so that ultimately, if no one reacts, it seems probable, all law will be dismissed as arbitrary imposition, and hedonism will be given free rein.

The current social trend towards more and more homosexuality was made possible by the forbearance of the “silent majority”. To reverse this trend, it is necessary for people who disapprove of homosexuality to voice criticism of it, in every civilized way and at every appropriate opportunity, openly and without fear of censure.

Even in a non-democratic system, the people is ultimately responsible for the acts of its masters, assuming they could with courage oust them; all the more, in a democracy, we are all guilty of the weaknesses of our leaders if we do not speak out and reprove them.

Instead of opting for appeasement and compromise, we must demand, in the name of ordinary decency and for the sake of future generations, the progressive *de-legalization and re-criminalization* of homosexuals. The purpose of such legal recovery would not be to persecute existing homosexuals, but to prevent the further spread of homosexuality.

Homosexuals should, in a first phase, at the very least, be legally and constitutionally forbidden from adopting children. It is unthinkable that innocent orphans should be legally handed over to sexual deviants, who might abuse them, and who would in any case spiritually corrupt them.



Secondly, same-sex marriage must be banned in all jurisdictions. To allow this is to imply that society in general blesses and participates in such unions; and moreover, giving homosexuals the legal status of wedded couples or something like it constitutes financing by society of homosexual activities.

Thirdly, all public manifestations, pornography and extolment of homosexuality should be banned. If consenting adults wish to practice this form of sexuality, they ought to at least do it in private, and not flaunt their deviance in front of the public (directly or through whatever medium or forum), and particularly not in front of children.

But ultimately, it is the practice of homosexuality as such that has to be made in principle illegal again. A society that tolerates, let alone promotes, such corruption cannot expect to survive long<sup>46</sup>. If any lesson is to be learned from the permissiveness of the last few decades, it is that people come to think that what is “legal” is “ethical”. They interpret tolerance in practice as approval in principle.

In theory, something can be unethical but still legal. We cannot expect the law to enforce all of (or even most of) ethics – this would be a formula for totalitarianism. The meaning and moral authority of ethics lies precisely in the fact that people can freely choose to follow it or not. But in practice, too many (ignorant) people confuse legal

---

<sup>46</sup>

Consider ancient Rome and other historical examples.

permissibility with ethical permissibility, and this observation must be taken into consideration in formulating social policies and the laws to impose them.

To declare something illegal is to mean it to be punishable in some way. If breach of the proposed ban were without material consequence, the law would not be obeyed. The threat of some sort of retribution is intended not so much to avenge, but to dissuade. At least some people would think twice before engaging in homosexuality. There is no need for a “witch hunt” – but there is need for a sign of firm resolve by society to stop such practices.

Thus, what is being advocated here is nothing less than a radical reversal of the pro-homosexual cultural and legal trends of the last few decades. Society must ask how it will turn out if it continues to yield in the face of the current homosexual assault. The public must react responsibly, and with determination recover its collective lost sanity and strength. There is good reason to be intransigent.

Society is morally responsible for the directions it takes. When we consider the impact of legalization of homosexuality, especially its propagation to people who would otherwise not even think of it, it is clear that we have a disastrous spiritual failing on the part of society as a whole, a criminal moral abdication of too many of its cultural and political leaders, lawmakers and judges.

Instead of protecting the pure and innocent, they encourage further corruption. The present words are clearly not a call

for violent repression, but for rational reflection on ways and means to legally prevent further spiritual and social disintegration. Laws and amendments *can* be passed, which forbid and suppress certain practices; there is nothing immoral about such legislative measures.

To actively seek such social and legal reform is *to exercise our democratic right and duty to determine the shape of society*. Some people might be threatened with legal retribution, under some current laws, for such activism; but reflect that in no democratic régime is it truly illegal to call and work for changes in the law.



## Annex

### **The Rabbis must ban homosexuals from Judaism**

This is an appeal to Jewish religious authorities (orthodox or traditional, at least) for more decisive action against the spread of homosexuality in this day and age.

The rabbis ought to impose a *cherem* (ban, excommunication, anathema) on homosexuals<sup>47</sup>, and even on ‘homophiles’ (supporters of homosexuality), so as to stop the growing social plague of homosexuality from spreading

---

<sup>47</sup> This term refers to all people who engage in sexual intercourse with partners of the same sex. With the possible exception of hermaphrodites and people whose genotype and phenotype do not match (estimated as 50-100 individuals per million population), who have to be considered on a case by case basis in all fairness; in such cases, the status of their sexual partners is also to be examined specifically.

further. If necessary, the rabbis should institute a *takana* (a corrective decree) to that effect.

Modern homosexual activists have a societal project, call it 'the homosexual society'. In this society, homosexuals will kiss in public and get married; they will adopt and raise children, and maybe someday have genetically engineered children of their own; the state will force employers and employees to accept them and even honor them; homosexuality will be explained and even praised in schools from an early age; homosexuals will be openly displayed and made attractive in the media; and so forth.<sup>48</sup>

***This shocking state of affairs already exists*** to various degrees in many Western countries today, including Israel.

If we refer only to the Torah, homosexuality would seem (though labeled an abomination and in principle punishable by death [Lev. 20:13]) like only a private sin that each *individual* will have to account for before God. Currently, most rabbis treat the matter as such, without really reflecting on the implications of such a limited position.

---

<sup>48</sup> This societal project is perhaps part of a larger one, call that 'the sexual society'. In that society, there would as it were be a permanent mass orgy. Sexual relations would be the main form of interaction between men and women, men and men, women and women, adults and children, and even humans and animals. The model for that social 'ideal' is the porno movie, where people are constantly either masturbating or having sex with someone or something.

But the current growing extent of this perversion in the population, and the danger of its infecting more and more people due to the aggressiveness of propaganda and activism in its favor make it a *collective* problem of previously (in past generations) unimagined proportions, a social disease. Each homosexual taken singly may be of little moment to anyone but himself or herself; but when their numbers increase sufficiently, they become a serious social danger.

Not only are the homosexuals themselves guilty of this greater social sin, but all the spiritual leaders, educators, journalists, politicians, judges, policemen, entertainers, etc., who either support or defend homosexuality in some way, or merely refrain from denouncing and opposing it, are also guilty of this mega-sin. Tolerance or advocacy of evil is immorality disguised as morality.

It is absurd and timid in this context to argue (as some do) that ‘the sin’ (homosexuality) is to be hated, but not ‘the sinners’ (homosexuals and homophiles). In the *Amida* prayer, the blessing *lamalchinim* ends with a clear condemnation of the sinners, and not merely of the sin in abstraction. Life is a test, and there are prices to pay for misdeeds. Modern “political correctness” is not a virtue according to normative Judaism, but an unforgivable breach of duty to truth and justice.

Reform and conservative “rabbis” who practice, support or merely allow homosexuality should be the first to be exposed and condemned, as extreme and dangerous heretics.

Normative Judaism will lose its moral authority if it remains silent and passive in the face of this latest assault on Jewish and human morality. Better to exclude than include such evil people; better to be few and pure than many and defiled.

Other religions should do the same, by the way, and energetically exclude and damn all voluntary homosexuals and homophiles. Such people should not be allowed to think they will get away with their crimes against humanity. Only in this way will this developing madness be stopped in its tracks.

Orthodox rabbis must wake up to the spiritually and socially criminal intentions of homosexuals and homophiles and fight them seriously. Till now they have responded far too mildly, uncertain how to react to the current onslaught on traditional values. Due to political naivety, they have failed in their obligation of leadership in defense of public morality.

The apologists of homosexuality have apparently managed to convince some naïve rabbis that homosexual behavior may be a mental sickness or a genetic compulsion, so that homosexuals ought to be pitied and helped rather than disapproved of and rejected. Yet the claims of mental sickness or physical difference have no scientific basis. And anyway, nowadays homosexuals prefer to be considered “normal” than to be excused (and thus humiliated) as abnormal or subnormal.

Moreover, the Torah makes clear that homosexuality is voluntary transgression; otherwise, it would not decree the



severest punishment for it, universally and unconditionally. It is immoral behavior for which the perpetrators are personally responsible. They have no one and nothing to blame for it but themselves.

The Torah death sentence for homosexuality concerned males only, according to Jewish law (*halakhah*). I am not sure whether this is taken as a sentence to be executed by G-d or by the rabbinical courts. In any case, the present appeal is not intended to advocate a restoration of such executions, if they ever occurred in history. The rabbis have no such powers today, in Israel or elsewhere, and I am not concerned with that issue.

The point made here is that we can learn a lesson from the severity of the Torah sentence. Death is permanent expulsion from this world; instead of that, we can at least expel Jews who so transgress from Jewish society. The latter is a lesser sentence, but the next best thing. Moreover, ostracism can consistently be applied to female as well as male homosexuals, and to the non-homosexual advocates of homosexuality.

In the modern world, equality between men and women is very important; people would not consider uneven treatment of them as just. Note that the rabbis consider female homosexuality as also indecent, though to a lesser degree<sup>49</sup>.

---

<sup>49</sup> In my essay *No to Sodom*, I also admit (on more naturalistic grounds) female homosexual acts to be somewhat less immoral than sodomy between males.

However, the ban proposed here is not intended as a punishment for like sins; it is intended as a political act to prevent further infection in the population, an act of social hygiene<sup>50</sup>.

The Torah does not justify a relatively mild response to this sin; it does not, for instance, provide for any cleansing ritual or temple sacrifice relative to it. No regrets will erase such past misdeeds; all repentance can do here is resolve not to repeat them in the present or future.

Therefore, the rabbis should harbor no doubt as to the appropriateness and justness of a strong, uncompromising anti-homosexual stance. A weak response, on ‘humanitarian’ pretext, will simply not do the job. It will only sully Judaism and the credibility of the rabbis, by seeming to condone such behavior.

Note that such a ban is not inhumane by modern standards. It does not imply the people concerned to be non-human – it merely denies them the right to call themselves Jews

---

<sup>50</sup> According to one estimate (see Jpost.com, 3 Jan. 2008), there are some 18’000 same-sex couples in Israel; that is 36,000 people! Suppose as many again are homosexuals not in couples, and a proportionate number of people of Jewish origin to be homosexual outside Israel (especially in the U.S., I imagine). Then we may guess at a *world total* of some 100,000 individuals. This is an epidemic, a veritable disaster for the Jewish people. The purpose of a ban would be to remove the bad apples from the Jewish barrel, or cull the sick sheep from the flock, before they infect more individuals. This is the prophylactic way, used in gardening, husbandry and medicine.

anymore, and to enjoy the privileges this designation implies. It is not discriminative in general terms – it merely expresses the right of any religious group to choose its spiritual companions.

If you try to show tolerance to actual homosexuals in the hope of reforming them, you will merely encourage potential ones. A kindly, ‘liberal’ attitude in this matter will not save many souls; it will rather cause many more souls to be lost, for people will not take the interdiction seriously. Many Jews have already been irreparably soiled, and are spiritually as good as dead. Forget them, they are lost forever: rather, think of those who have not yet been soiled. And the matter is urgent.

For years, Jewish spiritual leaders have allowed the problem of homosexuality to develop in society at large, without ever preaching against it in synagogues or visibly making any other effort to combat it. They have of course been hoping the problem would somehow go away by itself, but it is evidently getting bigger. It is admittedly not clear just what they could do about it, since the large majority of Jews who transgress in this manner never go to the synagogue or come under rabbinical influence anyway.

The rabbis willingly talk about keeping the Sabbath or not eating pork, but understandably hesitate in the name of modesty (*tsniut*) to lecture publicly on decent sexual behavior. The problem is that such virtuous silence has given the public an impression that homosexuality is not a really

big issue in their eyes – or that the forces of evil at work are too strong for them to challenge. In any case, ‘preaching to the converted’ cannot solve the problem at hand.

What is needed is a strong statement that will reach the general public. The proposed ban is just such a statement. It will and should *scandalize* all conventionally minded people, who have been trained by the media to consider homosexuality as normal and its defense as good. They will accuse the rabbis of extremism and similar epithets, to intimidate them into submission. Many Jews, too, will object and fear, demanding the rabbis keep a low profile in this matter. But some young people out there will surely get the message and be saved from following this decadent fashion.

Dear rabbis, people who are truly spiritually pure ought have no fear of evil. Consider that nowadays homosexuals are organizing lewd street marches in Israel, even in Jerusalem. This serves to legitimize homosexuality and make it fashionable, and thus spreads it. Some rabbis have verbally objected, or even recommended counter demonstrations, but such tepid measures are clearly far from sufficient to stop the trend; much more punch is required to down this monster. Take a firm stand and act decisively.

Homosexuals are cunningly using all the tools provided them by a simplistic and fallacious interpretation of democracy to further their subversive cause. They are an educated and wealthy lobby group, numerous and influential enough to affect national legislatures and international bodies. Judging

by their successes in North America and Europe, they will very soon manage to obtain in Israel all the legal freedom they desire to corrupt many, many young Jews. Do not be surprised if, moreover, they in time demand that the Torah's anti-homosexual verses be censored.

But there is one, just one, way to stop these loathsome people from progressing further, in the Jewish world at least. It is that all rabbinical authorities in Israel (and indeed, in the world) convene and together declare all evident homosexuals and homophiles to be *no longer Jewish*. Only such a powerful ban can put the fear of G-d in some of these people's hearts, and only the leading rabbis (the orthodox and traditional ones, at least) have the institutional and moral power to do it.

The terms 'Jewish' and 'homosexual' must be understood by everyone to be antitheses, contradictory terms. There can be no such thing as a "Jewish homosexual": such a concept is shameful to all decent Jews. Normal Jews do not want to be associated with homosexuals, even in thought. Such behavior is the depth of depravity, something incompatible with Judaism. Let it be known far and wide: if you are a Jew, you cannot be a homosexual; and if you are a homosexual, you cannot be a Jew.

If someone publicly acknowledges being a homosexual in the media, or admits to being a homosexual in front of two or more witnesses, then that person should be formally banned from the Jewish religion (for examples: Dana Olmert, the

current PM's daughter, and various reform and conservative so-called "rabbis").

If, moreover, someone by word or deed publicly takes a stand in favor of homosexuality or homosexual "rights", then that person should likewise be declared excluded from the Jewish religion (for examples: certain judges of the Supreme Court of Israel, certain Members of the Knesset, certain academics and journalists).

What does excommunication mean? If it is a man, he will no longer be counted as part of a *minyan* or be called up to the Torah, or granted any of the duties and privileges normally granted to Jews. If it is a woman, any children she bears thenceforth will not be recognized as Jews. Moreover, such people should not be allowed in Yom Kippur services or be buried in Jewish cemeteries.

Such exclusions may be difficult to administrate and enforce in practice, but the theoretical message they convey is important and effective anyway. A rabbinical court would have to decide each case, and a centralized blacklist would have to be maintained.

Some people inevitably object: what of *teshuvah* (repentance)? If the rabbis consider ex-homosexuals redeemable (though I do not see on what basis they would), then if after being expelled from Judaism such people sincerely want to return, they would have to go through *halakhic* conversion like any other non-Jew. Most of the

people concerned don't care about their Jewish identity anyway; but some may think twice and change their ways.

Note that secular governments can legally do nothing whatsoever to prevent religious authorities from excluding whomsoever they choose to exclude from their religion. A religion is like a private club, in principle free to choose its own members. Of course, a government can withhold much needed funding, and use similar means of pressure, or even persecute and imprison people on whatever pretext; but then the rabbis must decide what counts most for them.

The rabbis cannot remain passive; they must do something; that is their job. Excommunication is the one power tool the rabbis have at their immediate disposal, if they are really serious in their opposition to homosexuality. Only by such radical and forceful measures can the tide be stemmed. If our spiritual leaders do not show the necessary courage and determination, they will truly have failed in their ministry; and the world will get still more confused, dark and ugly.





## Supplement

### Philosophy of law

(From *Volition and Allied Causal Concepts*, chapter 18:3.)

Ethics naturally arises first of all within the individual, in the sense that he or she may have certain imperatives, inhibitions or liberties. Ethics as a social phenomenon presumably arose in the family, as the head of household (on the basis of his or her personal ethic) gave advice or orders and was obeyed (whether out of love or fear). More broadly, the surrounding community would have traditions and rules to be respected, as well as advice or orders from the leadership, whoever that included, to maintain social bonds. Eventually, the local shaman or other religious figure gave instructions, in the name of the deity or deities of the group. As these informal social ethics became more formal institutions, the concept of law emerged.

What I wish to discuss here is the distinction between ethical principle and legality, so as to stress that *making something*

*legal doesn't make it moral; making something illegal doesn't make it immoral.*

A distinction that people seem to often find confusing is that between ethical and political law. People generally do understand that the laws currently on a nation's statute books (here referred to as 'political' laws, meaning that they are enacted and enforced by the body politic, though they may concern any matter) are not necessarily moral in content; but they also generally consider that what such laws allow is ultimately permissible and what they forbid is best avoided.

For this reason, society may in some cases interdict practices that its proponents claim harmless, being "private acts between consenting adults" – on the basis that such acts nevertheless indirectly affect people who are not directly a party to them. For example, homosexuality can reasonably be made illegal on the grounds that making it legal gives some youths the impression that it is moral, causing such behavior to spread, to the consternation and against the will of a great many citizens (including very many parents), so that it is no longer a private affair but an issue of public policy.<sup>51</sup>

Let us briefly consider the concepts involved. Ideally, an absolute ethics would be derived from wise and informed consideration of human nature and of man's place in the world. Armed with such general moral guidelines, each well-meaning human being would in principle be able to know right from wrong in each particular situation facing him or

---

<sup>51</sup> Even if the practitioners did nothing to promote their practice, their mere negative *influence* on society would be sufficient reason to prohibit it; how much more so, if they make efforts to propagate it.

her, and would exercise will accordingly. There would be no need for laws enforced by society.

Practically, such a utopian scenario can only lead to social havoc. Even in a society filled with good will, people have different ideas as to what is right or wrong, and absolute proofs are hard to find. All the more so, since humans have free will, and many of them – under various influences – often opt for what they (themselves) consider bad, rather than (as logic would dictate) do the good. Conflicts thus inevitably arise, which are ultimately to the disadvantage of all. For these reasons, it is generally agreed that some minimal common standards have to be conventionally imposed by the majority or an empowered minority.

We accordingly constitute states, governments, legislatures, judiciaries and police forces, which together make and enforce laws. A guiding principle in enacting and enforcing such laws would be that “the rights of one person end where those of other people begin”. Another useful adage is “do not do unto others what you would not have them do unto you”. But clearly, such statements do not provide us with an exact science. It is not always easy to decide what needs legislating and what is best left alone. Political science is a changing, empirical discipline.

In this corrected perspective, ethical law covers all human action, while political law covers only some of it. The former is ideally universal; but only a fraction or subset of it is politically enacted and enforced, the rest being the responsibility of the individual to discover or at least practice.

The scope of such political law is vast, but not as vast as the scope of moral law. It includes criminal law (against murder,

theft, etc.), civil law (about marriage, inheritance, etc.), commercial law (concerning property, contracts, etc.), and indeed any legal issue that may arise in the interactions between human beings.

Theoretically, at least, the purpose of such laws is to ensure social peace, the common weal, personal security, justice, and so forth – although in practice, as everyone knows, they are often instruments of exploitation and unjust. In principle, what makes them stand out from the mass of ethical laws is the need to reduce frictions between people to a reasonable minimum. Historically, such minimalism has not always been accepted; some societies have been totalitarian, attempting to control almost everything.

In practice, for epistemological reasons already stated, the domains of ethics and political law are bound to somewhat drift apart, so that although the two domains intersect to some extent, the political domain is not wholly contained within the ethical domain, but partly falls outside it. Laws enacted by society, whether by democratic means or otherwise, may differ from the laws suggested by personal conscience or by reasoned study and debate by ethical philosophers.

Such divergence is in some cases reasonable; but it is often irrational. In a non-democratic system of government, the prejudices of the governing few are imposed on the majority, without room for argument. In a democracy, where in principle rational argument is the rule, *pressure groups* occasionally manage to format laws that accord with their aberrant views simply by virtue of the power of their numbers or through other considerations that force politicians to submit to their will. In recent decades, many activities

traditionally judged as immoral have been declared legal in Western countries.

Now, let me say that this is not a political tract<sup>52</sup>; I do not expect anything I say or do is likely to stem that unfortunate tide. My philosophy of history is very skeptical. *In each generation, some faulty belief held by large segments of the public comes to the fore and gains ascendancy, until it is brought to its natural absurd conclusion, like a sore spot bursting and releasing its pus, and disaster strikes, so that enough people learn to avoid that particular folly thenceforth.*

Nazism and Communism were typical examples: they arrived on the scene of history to the sound of popular cheers, and left in the midst of countless tears. People in Europe learned certain lessons, about the active use of brute force, about persecution of racial minorities, about national and class hatreds, and so forth; they changed their ways somewhat thereafter. They might have saved themselves the trouble and the pain, if they had resorted to reason, instead of yielding to their lowest emotions.

Remember that Hitler was democratically elected (more or less). Realistically, democracy is without doubt the best and fairest system of government available to us; but as we all know, it is not perfect. The fact that certain legislation is passed is not proof of popular support, let alone right<sup>53</sup>. Most

---

<sup>52</sup> I generally avoid getting into political comment or debate in my writings, because my philosophical aims are at a deeper level of epistemology and ontology. Controversy is bound to alienate some readers, who might consider some of my views as either too 'liberal' or too 'conservative'.

<sup>53</sup> All the more, the support of major media means nothing.

laws are based on indirect democracy; the legislators and judges involved in the matter may well be cowardly, amoral or personally compromised. If referenda were used, the results might well have been very different. But even in the case of laws established by direct democracy, *numbers of votes do not determine what is right or wrong.*

From this reflection it follows that the fact that some laws on the statute books socially-politically prescribe, allow or forbid some behavior pattern, does not mean that the behavior pattern in question is ethically-morally prescribed, allowed or forbidden, respectively. What society happens to have favored (or forbidden) may nevertheless, from the point of view of ethics, be wrong (or right, respectively). The arguments involved may have been fallacious or based on inadequate information.

‘Legal’ and ‘moral’ must be understood to be distinct, separate categories, although conceptually they are partly related (as we have explicated). Making something legal doesn’t make it moral; making something illegal doesn’t make it immoral. Youths should especially be made aware of this important distinction.

The individual may not reasonably regard the existence of certain legal tendencies in the statute books as indicative of ethical truth, because legislation is not exclusively based on rational reflection, but depends on social *forces*. The legislator may be faulted for misguiding fellow citizens, but these remain responsible for their own acts.

The individual is still required to think for himself or herself, and to at least consider the ethical advice of the wise doctrines that humanity has produced. The existence of

political freedoms or limits does not exempt an individual from moral responsibility for his or her choices. Legislation is not a substitute for conscience, or a just alibi for moral abdication. Although a legal threat or protection can mitigate moral responsibility, it does not absolve.

From an ethical point of view, laws are just one influential factor among others in behavior, which in certain cases it may be wise to volitionally dismiss or oppose.

### Works by Avi Sion, to date

- **Future Logic:** Categorical and Conditional Deduction and Induction of the Natural, Temporal, Extensional and Logical Modalities. Revised ed. Geneva: Author, 1996.<sup>54</sup> (454p.)
- **Judaic Logic:** A Formal Analysis of Biblical, Talmudic and Rabbinic Logic. Geneva: Slatkine, 1997.<sup>55</sup> (262p.)
- **Buddhist Illogic:** A Critical Analysis of Nagarjuna's Arguments. Geneva: Author, 2002. (65p.)
- **Phenomenology:** Basing Knowledge on Appearance. Expanded ed. Geneva: Author, 2005.<sup>56</sup> (144p.)
- **The Logic of Causation.** Rev. & exp. ed. Geneva: Author, 2003.<sup>57</sup> (247p.)
- **Volition and Allied Causal Concepts.** Geneva: Author, 2004. (175p.)
- **Ruminations:** Sundry Notes and Essays on Logic. Expanded ed. Geneva: Author, 2005.<sup>58</sup> (180p.)
- **Meditations:** A Spiritual Logbook. Geneva: Author, 2006. (76p.)
- **Logical and Spiritual Reflections.** Rev. & exp. ed. Geneva: Author, 2008.<sup>59</sup> (276p.)

All these works may be consulted on the Internet, at  
[www.TheLogician.net](http://www.TheLogician.net)

---

<sup>54</sup> First published by author in Vancouver, B.C., 1990.

<sup>55</sup> First published by author in Geneva, 1995.

<sup>56</sup> First published by author in Geneva, 2003.

<sup>57</sup> First published by author in Geneva, 1999. The first edition comprised only Phase I (Macroanalysis), whereas this edition also includes Phase II (Microanalysis).

<sup>58</sup> First published by author in Geneva, earlier 2005.

<sup>59</sup> First published by author in Geneva, earlier 2008.