

Burr labels it as a “puzzled chemistry” in his Atlantic Boston article arguing the scientific approach to homosexuality concluding that society is to accept gay cases with consciousness according to the implications of thorough research about its source.

The provided framework of understanding homosexuality as indeed a “natural matter”

implies a more theoretical approach regarding whether it even matters for it to be natural?

Is it sin not to act upon what culture has haphazardly decided to be proper? Is it even crime for our gender preference not to match what is common? Furthermore, is it your judge or even care what he/she considers as more attractive? Or is it our judge to neglect a forced narrow-minded attitude towards the broad subject of gender identity.

Are we to abide, unconsciously by what is spoken or are we to discuss, debate, and think? In fact, we are in the possession of an undeniable weapon to defend our case: a historic ruling states that identical-sex relations are not "contradicting the laws of nature" and cannot therefore be considered a crime. (Dan Littauer in Lebanon: Being Gay Is Not A Crime, Nor Against Nature) It is not a simplistic application of what our legal papers state as one's gender that automatically imposes the gender of our partner. One's story goes beyond this stipulation, the question of gender identity