

On Sodomite Morals and Rights and Freedoms:



By Nyron Medina

1. Definition of Rights. Rights are divinely required life-sustaining behavioural codes of equality under law.
2. A proper definition of freedoms. Freedoms are inborn human mental and dynamic functional abilities that sustain Rights.
3. Other important definitions.
 - i. Provinities: (From “provided” and “opportunities”). These are “provided opportunities” by legislation that are not Rights and Freedoms, but relate to them in some functional way. For example: Health Care is not a Right, but relates under the Right to life. Also, Education is not a Right, but relates to Freedom of thought, opinion.
 - ii. Pro-Rights and Freedoms Provinities: These are provided opportunities by law that uphold and sustain already existing Rights and Freedoms that preceded them.
 - iii. Anti-Rights and Freedoms Provinities: These are legislated provided opportunities that go against the Rights and Freedoms of man generally, and/or favours special interest groups whose issues are based on their own use of choice and thus are avoidable by them.
 - iv. More Equal Legislation: Since all men were given the same Rights and Freedoms by God, and therefore naturally possess them, all men are equal under law. Legislation that grants provinities (provided opportunities) to special interest groups as Rights and Freedoms, making them possess more “Rights and Freedoms” than the average people under the law, breaks the principle of equality under the law. Such laws are called More Equal Legislation.
 - v. Meta-Gender Legislation: This is any legislation that goes beyond (meta) the two common genders that all peoples already fit into for the sake of including some people’s choice of and/or habits of sexual preference and orientation.

- vi. Judgement-Positional Discrimination: This is the individual exercising of values discretion and adoption of a lone position among many, to resonate with his conscience.
- vii. Reverse Discrimination: The act or policy, by the use of law, of preventing discrimination against a person or persons or groups, which act or policy, at the same time, discriminations against the accused.
- viii. Anti-Rights and Freedoms Discrimination: Any form of behaviour or laws that goes against; the legitimate Rights and Freedoms of man. (Reverse Discrimination falls into this category).
- ix. Moral Preference: By the use of freedom of thought, opinion and choice and discretion, the forming of and adoption of a moral view and position in accordance with freedom of conscience.
- x. Discriminatory Equal Opportunity Legislation: Equal opportunity is equal provinities (or equal provided opportunities). But to attach them (especially marriage) is to still deny some the equalness of the marriage provinity. For example – polygamy, or one, woman having multiple husbands, or four or five women wanting to marry each other, or children wanting to marry between the sexes or same sex. This shows that equal opportunity should not thus be based upon sexual “preferences” or “orientation”, since these are only choices and habits in a limited sense, while many more choices (including that of the paedophile) are denied the provinity of marriage.

4. Here is a wisdom statement.

“Sex is never a Right, and even much more, the perversions of it. If this were so, it can be demanded of anyone in marriage and out of marriage, even sodomy also. To deny it to any asker; would be in breach of Rights and thus in breach of the Law or nature.”

5. Here is an example of sex being a “Right” because it can be taken by force and no wrong has occurred.

“This, verily, is loveliness among women, when she has removed her soiled clothes. Therefore when she has removed her soiled clothes and is lovely, he should approach and speak to her. If she does not grant him his desire, he should buy her (with presents). If she still does not grant him his desire he should beat her with a stick or his hand and overcome her (saying) with (manly) power and glory, ‘I take away your glory.’ Thus she becomes devoid of glory.” **S. Radhakrishnan, The Principal Upanishads, pg. 323.**

6. Now, Republicanism is not about the rule of law, it is a mistake to say this, it is about the rule of Rights and Freedoms, because this is the foundations upon how governments are

to operate. Republicanism is about the protection of the “public thing” which is Rights and Freedoms, not the Law. Laws are crafted to protect the “public thing” which are; Rights and Freedoms.

7. Governments derive their just mandate from the people only to protect their Rights and Freedoms, not to govern or change or diminish these Rights and Freedoms from the people.
8. Rights and Freedoms are inalienable, this means that they are not derived from human dignity, from man, from government, from law, from the courts, from the will of the majority or any earthly thing; Rights and Freedoms were created by God, they come from God only! Man therefore cannot create Rights or Freedoms for any special interest group.
9. Men can only define Rights and Freedoms as they already exist, but they cannot in reality create new Rights and Freedoms.
10. All of human rights can be adequately summed up as the:
 - i. Right to Religious Liberty.
 - ii. Right to Life.
 - iii. Right to Private Property.
11. Within, these three major Rights are a whole range of sub-rights that are all connected, but none are invented by man. Some sub-rights are like: the right to the protection of the family (related to the Right to life), and the right of inheritances (related to the Right to private property).
12. Likewise, all men are born with eight fundamental Freedoms, all given by God. They are:
 - i. Freedoms of Thought.
 - ii. Freedom of Belief.
 - iii. Freedom of Opinion.
 - iv. Freedom of Conscience.
 - v. Freedom of Choice.
 - vi. Freedom of Speech.
 - vii. Freedom of Expression.
 - viii. Freedom of Movement.

13. These Freedoms are called “Neutral Freedoms”, that is, they do not express a moral choice or idea, but allow for the expression of any moral or immoral position. This is why freedoms cannot be described as what one chooses to do with the freedom.
14. Thus there is Freedom of choice, but not “freedom” of sodomy which is what one does with his choice.
15. All men and women have the same Rights and Freedoms under law, and all are thus equal under law with the same protections already.
16. The concept of “special rights” being created and granted to certain special interest groups destroys the concept of the equality of all under law. All have the same Rights and Freedoms already, so to create “special” Rights and Freedoms will cause those who do not have these special rights and freedoms to cooperate with the special rights and freedoms which are always never neutral, but carry immoral positions like sodomy.
17. Sodomy and sexual preference and orientation are not Rights and Freedoms; they are how the Freedom of choice is used.
18. There are also “Moral Preferences” (and even moral orientation), and they are expressions of Freedom of Conscience.
19. Should a person’s sexual preference or orientation be allowed to discriminate against the moral preference of Christians? No! Moral preference is the exercising of freedom of conscience, which is a God-given freedom that is protected by law. Sexual preference and orientation is based upon the exercising of freedom of choice.
20. How a Sodomite uses his choice must not, by law, be made to nullify or destroy how a Christian uses his freedom of conscience, for this would be discrimination against the Christian and his freedom of conscience.
21. While the State may be seeking to prevent discrimination against Sodomites, by demanding that Christians should cooperate with their immoral choice as a Right, against the choice and moral preference of the Christian, is raw discrimination or reverse discrimination against the Christian.

Excursus on the Supreme Court

Of the United States Ruling on

Same-sex Marriage:

22. The US Constitution says nothing about genders nor the new definitions of genders that are current in American thought. The Rights and Freedoms outlined in the Constitution are assumed to be for all and hence covers both genders – male and female, that all the

human race already fall into. Marriage is not defined in the US Constitution and is not held as an issue in that document, but is assumed to be between one man and one woman as was traditionally believed to be by the founders of the United States. The Supreme Court is not the Legislature, hence it has no authority to create and write laws for the Union. This belongs only to Congress. The Supreme Court is an institution that belongs to the Judiciary, hence it is supposed to give rulings based upon the laws of the Constitution for the Union, or it can rule certain laws to be unconstitutional that goes against the written Constitution, but it cannot write laws from the bench. This shows that the Supreme Court has no legal authority to give rulings that are linked to new definitions of gender or marriage for all fifty States of the Union, which are not subjects existing in the U.S. Constitution and given no definitions in that document. Equal opportunity; for all genders - male and female - already exist in the Constitution, but not the subject of same-sex marriage. Since the Constitution says nothing about marriage, any ruling from the Supreme Court that touches all states, of the Union, must be neutral about the issue of same-sex marriage. The fact that a ruling on same-sex marriage was decreed by the Supreme Court that also calls on all states to issue marriage license that all must recognize as valid, does not justify it as Constitutional, for there was no Constitutional law for the five judges to base their ruling on. The ruling has illegally written a new definition of what constitutes marriage since it is about same-sex marriage, and the judges of the Supreme Court has no legal or Constitutional authority to do so. This means that their ruling is illegal and hence must be reversed after consultation among all the nine judges. Since there are no constitutional definitions of gender or marriage, but only sensible assumptions exist, the best act of the Supreme Court is to keep out of such issues, and let the States decide for themselves, since this is a constitutional power the States of the Union already have. If the judges revoke their decision, this shall help in curbing the already piling up of discrimination against Christians and conscientious objectors, who for moral and religious reasons refuse to cooperate with same-sex marriages. If the cry of “discrimination” trounces “liberty of conscience” for some, then discrimination still exist against conscientious objectors, this is also the absence of equal opportunity for all.

23. Anti-Conscience Legislation: Any legislation that causes or requires a citizen to abandon his moral preference based on his exercising of freedom of conscience, for fear of penalty by the state or courts, for the sake of accommodating the sexual or other choices of special interest groups.