

Sir, I saw you in TV last night, Media In Focus. I have some clarification or better yet, call it reaction. What do you mean by “WE ARE ONE?” I quoted you last night as saying that what made you furious over Justice Cruz's remark is his judgment over “some” homosexuals that are distasteful to his standards. You simply refuse to put such “distinction” between you and those he despises. Like what you said, “he's already separating the sheep from the goats.”

Well Sir, why can't that argument of “putting distinctions” among homosexuals be used against you? Who do you refer to by giving this very specific identification:

“A minority meekly and absolutely surrendering to the tyranny of the majority, a sub-culture reduced to the subhuman, in which the individual is instructed to live out, every day, a total repudiation of the self”

You're not simply referring to Justice Cruz's **pleasing thought** with some homosexuals, but to those **homosexuals** pleasing to Justice Cruz's thought or standard, right? Because there are still homosexuals who are like these, priests even, who suffer self-denial for the sake of Christ. Who are sometimes, criticized, and even rejected by their fellow homosexuals just because they won't tolerate the principles other homosexuals are fighting for. Why put distinction on them Manolo? Why separate the wheat from the weeds? Is it because they don't conform to the majority's idealistic sensibilities or standards?

Oh how deafening it is to hear this very powerful cry, “**we are the same, for in the fundamental things—those we choose to love, to have relationships with and with whom we aspire to share a life marked by a measure of domestic bliss and emotional contentment—there is no difference**” And equally deafening silence when **one** of its members is convicted for a crime like pedophilia, sexual molestation, or for being a pimp. I didn't see anyone in support of this poor fellow? I didn't see any streamers and placards promoting this oneness?

I'm not saying, you tolerate such acts, but the least is still **to own** this fellow as your own; as someone capable of loving, capable of having relationships and aspire to have a better life despite of the crimes he's committed. Isn't this a very good example of what Vonnegut pointed as basic immorality of society's self-proclaimed moral custodians. Hate the sin but love the sinner? Why abandon a soldier in the battlefield, if there is indeed no distinction and authentic oneness? Why not do what the Pope did in matters like this, “let us pray for our fallen **brethren**, for he's still one of us” He still calls them brethren; the very homosexuals, who molested altar boys, who have sex with their fellow men, who fell short of the kingdom of heaven. This, is what I called authentic oneness, when one is not just legally being absolved and adopted, but considers him or her as family.