



Father Nelson Medina speaks to us:

Father, why not? That a man expresses his femininity and a woman her masculinity (she wears trousers, why would a man not wear a skirt?), without that erroneous and necessarily have to say that is lesbian or gay. -RR

My conviction and my experience go in the opposite direction and I think there are enough reasons for not disconnecting the biology of behavior. Every day, from the first of our lives, we use the organs of the senses, and these are different in various ways, and above all, in their neural interconnection, if we look at men or women. This is a fascinating topic that I don't think can be omitted.

It is irresponsible, from the scientific point of view, to omit an important factor of change but the gender ideology does exactly that: it takes all the biological reality and says: "This doesn't matter".

Another aspect of your writing is the relationship between being and expressing oneself. The expression, in particular, is a social fact and not simply individual. Unless we profess a radical individualism, which would therefore not be ethical, we must admit that everything that has a social impact implies responsibility and therefore restrictions from the individual.

Imagine for example a person who said: "I believe that one should speak so that it can always be heard, and that is why I am convinced that all human communication must be shouted". Consistent with his conviction, this man goes out to shout at everyone: on the street, in the restaurant, in the church, in the park, in the library. Soon they begin to look at him wrong and scold him, but he holds on to his own: "Human communication flows better to cries". One knows how a story like this will end: everything that implies a life in society implies the care of the common good.

In the case of respect for life or physical integrity, it is easy to see where it is in the common good. It is less obvious but no less real than the same well exists in other

dimensions of social life. If I decide that in every restaurant I will eat sitting on the floor because, according to my opinion, "that is the right way to eat" there is a rupture that is not tragic but uncomfortable and useless in the social fabric. Who cares about the common good cares of how to make life possible and better for everyone?

All this means that, although the social codes of expression are not immovable, we must not consider the matter of individualistic whim. If the same restaurant where a client who insists on sitting on the floor arrives, another one insists that we have to talk loudly, and another one who thinks that deodorants are the beginning of the collapse of the cosmos arrives, and another one considers that the waiters should speak only with their eyes closed ... what is the good that is being built?

Unfortunately, our time knows too much about the individual and too little about the common good. The loneliness and abandonment of so many people and the disintegration of so many families push us, in a certain way, to give importance only to our tastes or desires: "I want to be a woman" "I want to be a man" "I want a baby" "No; I do not want it: kill it".

A question that one must ask himself as a priest, counselor, psychologist, the teacher is: What is my social responsibility to this state of things? Push a little more in the direction of individualism that dispenses with society to impose their own, waiting for one day to impose a law on me what the ruler of duty comes to mind? Won't be the opposite: to hear the deep voice of our nature, beginning with the voices of our being, which is biology and body, and also soul, and then hear the voices that lead us to the common good?

I invite you, then, to cultivate an integral look that takes account of everything: from the most physiological to the most spiritual; from the innermost to the fullness of the common and social good.

P. Nelson M.