

Religion

I do not know a lot about the specifics of any religion. I do recognise the themes of religion, when I have encountered them, as being an apt description of morality in general.

I do not prescribe to any belief that doesn't make sense or seem true to me. I think the truth of existence is everywhere.

I think you can seek the truth without religion, and that it might be preferable to, although it may contain insights and teachings that I am currently unaware of, and exposure to the basic concepts seems healthy.

I am under the impression that a lot of it is interpretive, and that it is maybe limited by it's interpretation.

I am against religious and cultural practices that cross a line in reality and violate the rights of other people.

It is unacceptable and wrong to perform significant body modification on people for the purpose of religion, culture, cosmetics, or personal gain, where it would impose itself on the natural will of that person before they can give proper informed consent.

Religion cannot impose itself on reality and expect reality to conform to it's purposes. Religion is derivative of existence and nature, and must have respect for these foundations.

First, do no harm. Why would any religion reject nature and obvious truths? We can judge these things best by this measure.

It is so obviously wrong for adults to allow children to be exploited for the sake of "beliefs".

The natural will of a person is the natural extension of who and what they are. Fundamentally altering someone through damage, or injury, or an act of wrongness, might render the person changed and disassociated from the harm that was done to them.

It doesn't magically erase the significance of the loss, just because a person is comfortable with, or even likes, who they have become. It also doesn't remedy the natural dysfunction of the disassociation from your natural origins.

I am worried about this because I am worried that there is a prevailing belief, that harm doesn't matter if the person would be ok with it after the fact, after it has changed them. Even if they are no longer really the same person, and the loss becomes invisible.

This is where it is really important that reality is the guide, and that the course of action is not being determined by actions that are fundamentally wrong in reality.

Not all change can be considered natural growth. It seems like a careless disregard for the past, and for nature, and the natural state, and possibly a disregard for a higher order, purpose, and timing, generally speaking. Our choices make a difference in that.

An example of this is with current medical trans practices. Giving people hormones affects their brain development. A person who has altered the way that they think, probably likes the way they think, and they don't know the alternative. No one really wants to reject what they are and how they became that person, it is not really an option. That does not necessarily make it “good”.

I have heard the term “self affirming” in relation to gender affirming care. This is the idea that a person has a natural “sense” of who they are.

If there is a natural pull or magnetism of “outcomes” that self affirm, or self perpetuate, then offering no resistance to that, (when it would be appropriate to), could be a trap not befitting of nature or reality.

Physical reality offers natural, proportionate limitations on our wants, this is not a bad thing.

It is not right to modify the bodies of developing young people. They cannot give proper informed consent and you are robbing them of their natural growth.

Even if natural outcomes had somehow become an affliction, there is so much risk of harm involved with this issue that there is no way that this is responsible medical care.

I am against the coercive exploitation of children that is the medical trans movement.

I am against the forced circumcision of children.

If it ever served a purpose as a leap of faith of any kind, if it holds a place until we are strong enough to say stop, then we must say stop, it is wrong, it is an unknown burden placed on innocent children and we condemn it.

Woke/gender/sexuality

I don't know what the woke movement is. It does seem like some people's behaviour defies explanation. Nothing really quite adds up, as if it alludes to something more.

To me, it seems like there could be a lot that is spiritually, fashionably, instinctually motivated. I can only really hazard a guess, or vibe off of what the deeper motivations are, if any.

I don't know of any ethical reason why a person's gender or sexuality can't be what they think and feel it is. If somebody wants to be referred to as a specific gender casually, then that's fine, it would probably be rude to insist otherwise, or to make a spectacle of their personal choices.

A lot of what I've heard about this seems to be about wanting care and respect, but not reciprocating when it comes to encroaching on other people's rights to get it.

Who knows what a pronoun is? I don't think natural English speakers are that technical or finicky with language. It would be weird to insist past the point of politeness because it's too complicated.

Male born athletes in women's sports is obviously cheating. Hormones are not the only thing that influences sex differences. I do not believe that it eliminates the natural born physical advantages inherent in their physical make up or DNA. It would be great if everyone can compete, but this is like anything, you have to deal with the hand you're dealt until you can make it happen fairly.

A woman is a woman. This is defined by nature first. Suspension of disbelief, or absence of specifics, can be as appropriate as the situation allows for. The gender a person was born will never be erased, or become totally irrelevant.

For the purposes of the law, a woman can be defined by biological sex, or, to a lesser degree, a sense of gender, as applicable.

It is correct to acknowledge the threat that men, and specifically male sexual predators, can pose to women. This includes motivated threats to privacy, physical dominance, and sexual harm.

Any place where it would be inappropriate for a biological man to be, “for reasons of safety”, is the same consideration (of biological sex).

Allowances should be made where possible for any unnecessary social awkwardness or discomfort, or lack of fairness and facilities, experienced for the transgender individual.

As well as the same safety considerations for gender specific threats, posed to transgender females, as exists for biological females. Threats to privacy from the opposite sex are applicable to both genders to various degrees.

I am not sure that I agree that the definition of a woman should be defined exactly as a “biological female” for all legal applications, as this could “lock out” very specific instances where a sense of gender would be more appropriate.

The problem is not a lack of definition in the law so much as a total failure in the application of it as it is. We need to be very careful that every misstep doesn't bring us closer to a worse outcome.

What is the real purpose of this? It's dehumanising to nullify natural gender by force, and it leans toward the misogynistic.