

Sexuality and Politics

I believe human sexuality exists on a multi-dimensional continuum. Our society views sexuality as two things, male and female, each existing at opposite ends of a bar, like a bell bar (used for weightlifting).

There are a number of dimensions to sexuality:

- Clothing
- Hair style
- Makeup
- Behavior and mannerisms
- Reproduceability
- Presence of genitals
- Sex partner preference
- Legal right to marry another regardless of the partner's sex

In a person of either sex, each of these dimensions can have different values. For example, cross-dressing has undoubtedly existed for thousands of years, while the person exhibited their sex more traditionally in the other dimensions. Recall Joan of Arc, who dressed as a man to gain acceptance in her self-appointed task of fighting for Charles II of France.

There are two variations of the “normal” male and female personas who hew strictly to the end points of their sexual dimensions: homosexuality and transgenderism. I heard the word “homosexual” in my childhood, but only learned what “transgender” was in 2016. Each person who identifies as homosexual or transgender views themselves on the continuum a little differently.

It is my opinion that our society would be healthier, both physically and mentally, if we accepted the dimensions of sexuality and stopped trying to force individuals into a box that does not fit them. By forcing a child into a “boy” box, we have deprived them of ways in which to express their “girl” dimensions. When the dichotomy is strong, they have little choice but to “identify” as “girl,” and thus reject their “boy” preferences. This is not healthy.

Since the 1970s people whose sexuality is non-standard have raised political demands. Eventually homosexuals demanded the legal right to marry another regardless of the partner's sex and transgenders wanted to be able to use the public bathroom of their chosen “identity.” Politicians rose to the demands. Most of the time it was much ado about nothing, in that politicians blustered, the media devoted inches and pages to said blustering, petitions were signed, and little was accomplished. Yet, finally, same-sex marriage became legal in America in 2015.

Beginning in 2016 with federal and some state attention to the users of public bathrooms, politicians have addressed that issue. At the beginning of 2017 some states are intent on reversing what their more “liberal-progressive” predecessors enacted — as their first order of business. Frankly, I think they are more interested in establishing themselves as the political victors, by reversing their predecessors, than sincere concern for users of public bathrooms.

Changing gears a bit here. Of the eight dimensions listed above, legal marriage offers same-sex couples a way to be legally entitled to participate in medical decisions regarding the partner and in the personal and business affairs of the partner at the time of their death or disability. Allowing a partner to assume responsibility for these is a kindness as well as a benefit for society who is thereby off the hook for same.

All of the other dimensions represent personal expressions of personality that hopefully remain outside the interest of politicians and laws.

Yes, there is one exception: Some politicians feel entitled to control a woman's right to pregnancy (this falls in the reproducibility dimension). Most of these politicians are men who feel they can exercise their God-given right to dominate women, God bless them. Wrong-headed fools! (wouldn't want you doubting my opinion here).

Shifting more into politics. I read the news accounts of state congresspeople working to overturn bathroom bills as their highest responsibility and wonder how did we get here? I think each of us, in particular the so-called LGBTQT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, and Transgender) community, is responsible. The latter group raised such a ruckus that their issues got the full attention of the governments, pushing more pressing social issues completely off the plate.

Furthermore, the 2016 presidential campaign issues were revealing more for what was missing. We clearly have no idea of what our government can and should do. The *Constitution* only prescribes how the federal government operates, it does not address what it should accomplish.

As long as we push our narrow special interests on the government, we are going to continue to get poor government.