Twitter Thread by hornsby



hornsby
@ybsnroh

This thread was inspired by @PrinceGanaku. He made a legal argument pushing back against the legalization of homophobia, which some like @konkrumah have happily advocated.

I come from an academic background in social and political philosophy. I wanna make a moral argument 1/x.

Homosexuality is better defined as sexual attraction in homogeneity. The claims made against this phenomenon have been drawn anywhere from biological science to majoritarianism in democracy. I would like to pick and tackle three of these: science, religion and majoritarianism

The search for what makes one gay, sensationally-named the Gay Gene, has dominated the scientific discourse on the matter. Science is reductionist materialism

The attraction btwn man and woman is thought to have been reduced to a material cause in our being so what about gays?

But have we really reduced heterosexual attraction to its material cause in our biology? The best answer is no.

I would encourage anyone to seek this: "what is the cause of heterosexual attraction" and I would confidently tell you that the science is inconclusive

We don't know

We have no idea WHY usually, those we call male are attracted in sexual biological and neurological terms to those we call female.

We know HOW it happens. That is to say we can explain observable phenomena like hormones and receptors moving but we don't know WHY men like women.

In Philosophy of Mind, where the participation of psychological and neurological scientists is encouraged, we are very careful as to how we communicate scientific findings that speak to our inner-being.

We know why we procreate, for eg. But we can't confuse that with attraction

Please observe that I have refrained from using the word 'love'. I speak of the observable phenomenon known as sexuality. And I have said, with confidence that the science is inconclusive on why we are attracted to those we are attracted to even in heterosexuality.

We know about sexual release but don't confuse with attraction. We may know why Grace is attracted to tall men or rich men but we don't know why she likes men

Heterosexual attraction cannot be answered with the sciences of procreation and sexual release. They are inadequate

Now, to the problem of Religion which I find the most unfortunate tool of opposition to homosexual humanity. The argument from religion is moral and cultural.

There are different religious oppositions but usually they operate under the notion of Divine Command

"Our God says..."

I would like to leave the obvious problem of men speaking for their gods and look at why it is dangerous to entertain spiritual claims in the matter of defining our physical humanity.

Religious conservatives believe we cannot have morality if we have no idea of a god. False.

It's also illogical.

Morality is acquired in socialization before the young have a concept of a being out of this world.

That is to say if they are never introduced to this God-concept, it's sensible to argue that it WILL NOT NECESSARILY AFFECT THEIR MORAL PERFORMANCE.

Human-to-human contact is our primary and most important relationship

Thus, if the argument is that our humanity and morality begin from beyond us, we are neglecting the importance of human-to-human relationships

Saying that "that's not how God created us" is fairly problematic

"If anyone says they love the God they've never seen but hate the man they've seen, do not believe them".

How do you know that's not how God created us? How are you more willing to hold on to an out-of-this world claim than respect the reality of another human in this world?

I don't wanna speak of scriptures that we obviously don't follow to the letter. If we followed the scriptures to the letter, we won't allow menstruating women cook our food. There's so much ridiculousness in everyone's scriptures.

My point about morality has been made.

We underestimate our rational capacity when we cling onto "God says".

We lie when we say we can't think of humans doing good without a knowledge of a god.

We know humans before we know a concept out of this world. Respect your primary contact before you move to the man upstairs

Thirdly, the argument from majoritarian tastes. This is even more personal to me because it was the subject of my undergraduate long essay

What do we mean when we say the majority must have their way in democracy? It means that there's an intrinsic value to pleasing the majority

A referendum on homosexual humanity will be lost by those of us who support it. The reason is simple: the well has been poisoned for so long you don't expect many of the town's people to avoid the disease.

In that case, authority in a democracy is expected to make a moral choice

Would you let the minority have their say? @konkrumah says he would vote to criminalize pro-LGBT-humanity education and advocacy

Having dealt with the first two opposition arguments, I believe @PrinceGanaku's legal arguments answer the moral question in the majoritarian problem

There's no scientific basis to say homosexuality is inhuman. Homosexuality is statistically plausible in considerable population sizes as @Sai_Pher once tweeted

To destroy the humanity of those who cause you no harm, don't rope in a god or morality. You just seek to do harm.

And then lastly, we have the moral choice in a democracy to allow a minority live in comfort. It's a choice that would be made by representative government.

End of.