



On What Planet ...

For Adult Eyes Only — By Guest writer, Joshua Deer

For all you need to know about my guest writer, Joshua Deer go [here](#).

Joshua asks:

On what planet is declaring war on your own body pro mental health?

This is of course a rhetorical question because here on Planet Earth we have a growing cultural mass/[glob](#) of “individuals” *and* capital ‘I’ [Institutions](#) who are agreeing with the LGB+T+Q+ *ideology* that says children—qua *not* adults *yet*—*should* declare war on their own body by using surgery to surgically remove and replace a penis with a vagina or vice versa. (And to use the *rate* argument—actually done so far on “only” about 56 people—as moral justification for this is double-down immorality. See below.)

And why should children use the AMA’s highly qualified, condoning-of-such-surgery surgeons to do this?

As ways and means—comes the “answer” from our [lcd](#) culture masquerading as [hcd](#) culture—to “curing” their extremely far-from-fully-developed-adult mind and body self’s of some identity *confusion* problem—*gender* for the case in point.

But doesn’t psychological *development* mean going *from* a state of “the maximum in not knowing” new born baby’s tabula rasa mind *to* answering a big chunk of all survival questions before arriving at the terrible two’s and then thereafter *continuing* on to becoming one who knows a lot of the answers even if not yet knowing all the answers before completing the second decade of his or her life?

Especially answers to *fundamental* questions such as: WHAT am I?

(And don’t delude yourself, this is a *complicated* question to answer and as evidence I offer this [statistic](#): over 40 million adults in the United States in 2021 sought professional help with psychological problems, voila: if they knew WHAT and WHO they were they wouldn’t need professional help figuring it out. And [there is nothing wrong with this](#), just sayin—or rather, if you *need* psychotherapy help and don’t seek it, this is wrong.)

So, by correctly answering a lot of these survival and identity questions, we go from this lowest level of 100% *not* knowing *to* the all knowing, all encompassing, no longer confused answer of a fully developed autonomous ADULT mind-self (ignoring for the moment the all too numerous to count cases of psychologically *underdeveloped* children walking around on the planet in adult bodies) who can finally say (after two or three decades of [question answering](#), kws: “a being”): “*I am a person who is the proud owner operator of a penis and I will stick it in any consenting hole I want to*”.

He said, albeit a tad (just a tad??? ok, a bit) raw in its truthfulness. (Notice to my readers: Joshua said this I didn’t.)

Since I—author—am a fully developed real heterosexual man I don't know what the corresponding *self-assertive* line would be for a fully developed real heterosexual woman.

But whatever it is, I think we would-could-should agree with the *principle* that I laid down in an earlier [article](#): “a *consenting* child is an oxymoron”.

This is one reason why—notwithstanding those progressives who *worship* chaos (the ones left of the alt-left) along with those to the right of the alt-right (the ones who *love* anarchy)—we have objective laws in this country. Rather, that is, *we strive with all our might* to make *all* our laws be objective so that we can take the moral high ground and say, no one is above the law—and confidently *enforce* them.

Why do you think the Progressives are burning—no, have burnt—the midnight oil taking over the political process, qua process, in addition to the public school system, qua system? The political, in order to codify their worldview *into law* and the public schools in order to pied-piper young minds away from objective reality.

Objective reality is the enemy of the irrational and the irrational know it.

Consequently, our rational striving is one of the characteristics of a free people—we protect our values to the death and strive evermore to make them be perfect, that is, match reality perfectly—that is, *link* mind to objective reality without contradiction, *contradiction relative to reality* being the measure of itself.

A *link* between reality and mind that must be severed—so sayeth the [Nazi mentality](#) sympathizers who still exist on planet earth.

Must if, that same Nazi mentality—qua worshippers of [unreason](#) (kws same)—dreams: is ever to rise again. That such is *possible* is not hyperbole. [Here](#) for proof.

Cultural Wars 3.0

It doesn't matter that only 56 such sex organ altering operations (see above) have been done in the last couple of decades—or half century. I forget just exactly what their *rate* argument is: *since I've only murdered one diplomat in my entire reign that doesn't make me a murderer.*

Well, actually, yes it does.

What matters is it, the anti-heterosexual philosophy masquerading as the LGBTQ+ *ideology* (and which ones and how many of the Letters are part of the masquerade is not up to me to figure out) is a growing philosophy that is trying to argue: *because you can you should.*

On what planet, I ask, should such a “philosophy” be endorsed, promoted, and implemented?

The answer here of course is, Planet No.

No. Just because you can doesn't mean you should.

What you *can* do and what you *should* do is correct only if *both* are moral. The *can* and the *should*—in a moral mind—are the same thing.

Because the *can* and the *should* are only sometimes the practical and the moral, but not always, the moral mind makes it be always by making it into a principle: *the moral and the practical are the same thing.* Then he or she moral mind uses the *principle* as a *test* (remember the lowercase ‘t’ in [TFAjots](#)) to check out projected future actions—that is, our *theory* of what is right and wrong, is it right (contemplated action will benefit me?) or wrong (contemplated action will hurt me?):

For selfish man, acceptance does not mean condone, it means being one who accepts facts, facts being anything and everything that is true about reality.

Including the realities about one's self, e.g., don't jump out of this tree from this third big branch up here because it'll hurt; followed eventually with: if I jump off the top of this [more than 100 foot tall] (Ranger) tower—here in Itasca State Park at the mouth of the Mississippi River where the 12 year old me along with other park visitors have climbed up into to see the forest below from the Ranger's perspective as I back away from the rail not sure about the degree of control I do or do not yet have over this inner ability TO CHOOSE my actions, e.g., if I choose to jump as a test—it'd probably kill me.

Bad test idea.

Deering, Gary. [Selfish'ism](#) . Raise Books, LLC. Kindle Edition.

As a *real* (heterosexual) man and *real* scientist—that is, one who worships reason—I agree with the Scientific Method: 1) Observe reality. 2) Think about your observations. 3) Generate hypotheses about these observations as to what they might mean for you and your life. 4) Test the hypotheses against the facts of reality.

Think about the test results and fold them back into your theory and adjust as required moving forward with your growing and developing life as you engage in your own Quest for the Holy Grail. That is, the Holy Grail known as ... as ... [insert drum roll] ... as Happiness.

For example, I traveled in my personal development from being against gay and lesbians as queer—i.e., not normal—in my teenage years to a 'live and let live' philosophy/attitude in my adult years: being not normal doesn't erase your *authentic* [individual rights](#).

Recently I've had to re-evaluate this attitudinal re-adjustment position that I had voluntarily accepted. That is, given the observable fact that the gay and lesbian movement—qua movement—had stopped being for their authentic individual rights as *adults* to practice sex as they saw fit with other *consenting adults* and started to move into elevating their *bodophobic* mentality into a moral ideology.

Here's where I draw the line.

Maybe I made a mistake.

But maybe not either.

Based on what I can observe about the Gay and Lesbian (LGB) part of the "Queer" movement it does not appear at this time that they advocate declaring war on your own body.

So my view of gay men has changed over my growth and development years and now I adopt as my new attitude a paraphrasing of Imus In The Morning (remember him, he was among the first casualties of political correctness being canceled so long ago you might not even know who he is—Google it).

Per "Imus'isms":

I—says a *real* (gay) man—am the proud owner operator of a penis and I will stick it in any consenting hole I want to and yes ~~Gary Dean~~ Joshua Deering, real heterosexual man, when you said, *consenting children is an oxymoron*, I real gay man whole heartedly agree.

I know it's a bit gross or even vulgar but primarily so only to the [intellectualizing-brainiacs](#) (FN 181)—no ~~Gary~~ Joshua, to me as your ego BFF it has this flavor too, but what the hey, go for it—among the so called intellectuals writing their high brow stuff inside the protective bubble of so called "nice" cultural wars where raw truths are to be avoided at all costs.

An *intellectualizer* is one who talks about his psychological problems in-the-abstract as the means of not facing them. For example, if I were a full fledged "intellectualizer" I would say: "My brain informed me that an intellectualizer is one who ...etc..." A *brainiac* is one who ... (see link).

Here's another raw truth for you: X.

NNATT.*

Rather, answers to [aos last Q' and A'](#):

1. b

1a. see above and [this](#)

2. see original question

3. a, 94% of the time, b & c, 6%

3a. no new update to this number—see link in original—so that number stands as is for now: we are 52% there.

4. issue of teleometrics (not psychometrics) as a science—which I haven't finished developing yet—so, a tbd. (For a possible direction: how many tads = a bit? And how man bits = “don't say that out loud”.)

Which two?

There are more than two but the two I'm thinking of—to be elaborated on later—are: our *sense* of humor and our *sense* of art.

* NoNotAtThisTime, X = a tbd,

Or maybe X = this raw truth FOR ME *about me* in the sense I don't make all my hidden dislikes explicit to my self because my mother (self) always told me: 'if you can't say anything nice about a person don't say anything at all' to which I now say—after some half century of me carry around this mantra by its handle, I now choose to say—fuck that.

Imus along with Howard Stern—per my recent inquiries—form a yin and yang self-cancelling nemeses circle—that is, in the shape of a a* holes couple or couplet. Or that is, I never liked Howard Stern and after I googled Imus in the morning just now for the first time and saw a plethora of his low self-esteem driven make-fun-of others comments (is this a New York City thing?) I'm crossing both of them off my list of *unattended* to implicits (fi).

But still, the one and only time I listened to the Imus in the morning radio show (one hot July day circa 1997 driving in my Ford Ranger pickup—yes I know it's a bit tad wimpy, but sbi—between construction sites) and heard his proud owner-operator comment (I was only in my early 50's at the time) in the context of he twern't apologizing to no feminists for being the proud owner-operator of a penis, jarred me loose from being overcome with the feminist hammer *then* operating in our culture. (I suspect the counterpart in today's culture would be some white people needing the same kind of jar against the guilt pounding from the Progressive DEI hammering side of the battle for hearts and minds.)

That is, I have always been a [sucker](#) for granting *to others* their inalienable right to authentic *individual rights*.

And with a tendency to go overboard in forgetting that I am an individual too and as such I also have individual rights.

That is, I have a right to exist for my own sake—sacrificing to no one nor asking anyone to sacrifice for me.

I had actually locked this in at a Branden Intensive—or so I had thought—some twenty years before this when I had to stand up in front of the whole [horseshoe](#) (kws: “My Full”) group and say: “I have a right to exist for my own sake”. And to repeat it over and over until I did manage to say it non-belligerently and felt very relaxed in the doing—saying—by the end of the exercise (I was only in my early 30’s at the time).

So, why did I need this Imus type self-assertion mantra if the locked-in were true?

[Dunno](#).

Yest. ([sos](#)? kws: slop)

Tbd.

Q’ & A’: Quizzes & Answers (next time):

What *exactly* is romantic love?

© August 4, 2023, Gary Dean Deering

Minnesota, USA