

Holy Hallucinations 46

This is continued response to PPSimmons' video, "SUPER GONORRHEA! BRACE YOURSELF!"

[Whistling]. Hi boys! Sorry it took so long. The guys at the workshop wanted to reinforce this one with carbon fiber and tungsten alloy because they heard I was going to be using it on you two and knew it was going to get quite a work out.

I see that the bleeding's stopped, but don't you worry because we'll soon fix that. As you might remember, last time I dealt with your odious bigotry and denials thereof, but this time we're going to address some lies you're telling that could actually cause harm to people's health in the real world and the unbelievably inept views on reality that you're using to justify them.

Needless to say, the strokes are going to get somewhat more intense in both frequency and magnitude as we move forward, and I see, Pisspants, that you've already lived up to your name. Never mind about it now though because *tempus fugit* and all that. You can clean it up later, but right now I suggest you both grit your teeth and hold on tight.

"[Pisspants]: And they're saying that this particular type of sexual activity is producing dangerous gonorrhea and a decline in condom use is helping it to spread – that's nonsense. The... the last part of the sentence is total nonsense. The... the decline in condom use? [Carl]: Yeah. Condoms don't stop sexually transmitted diseases. Go ahead."

Aw, for fuck's sake Carl. Are you really this stupid or dishonest? Or perhaps you've been to a few workshops at the Vatican recently, because this is as stupid a thing as I've ever heard you spew in all the years that I've been introducing facts to your most rearward of recesses. Condom's don't stop STDs, Carl? OK, let's check that out shall we?

Let's look up the latest information on the subject at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the World Health Organization. You know, Carl? The institutions you were *so* impressed with elsewhere in your video: "*You got the World Health Organization. You've got the Center for Disease Control. These two huge government globally renowned and recognized health organizations.*"

I wonder if anyone else can see a theme emerging here regarding your sources, Carl? Because aren't you one of those paranoid nutsacks that's spent a lifetime railing against the evils of government and warning against the "propaganda" produced by its organizations? Funny, then isn't it, that as soon as your sloth-like consciousness perceives that those same organizations might support your position, they miraculously become "globally renowned and recognized"? You realize, don't you, that this kind of behavior isn't that of someone earnestly in search of the truth no matter where it might lead, but rather that of a reprehensibly dishonest and intellectually bankrupt charlatan who'll devour anything from anywhere as long as it feeds his voracious confirmation bias?

Well, unfortunately for you, your words are about to come back fuck you in the kazoo, because while the CDC and WHO might agree with you when it comes to the dangers of promiscuity and multi-drug resistance, your opinions differ just a tad when it comes to the efficacy of condoms in the prophylaxis of STDs. In this regard, the CDC says: "Consistent and correct use of latex condoms is highly effective in preventing sexual transmission of HIV" and "reduces the risk for many STDs that are transmitted by

genital fluids". Funny that, eh? And as for the WHO, they say: "When used correctly and consistently, condoms offer one of the most effective methods of protection against STIs."

And in the unthinkable unlikely scenario that you'd be a hypocritical shit-stains and turn around to say that both these organizations can't be trusted, then we can turn to the scientific literature and this excellent review by Holmes *et al.*, which shows that condoms reduce transmission significantly in 20 of the 35 conditions reported, and with marginal significance in almost all the others.

So where did you get the ridiculous idea that "condoms don't stop sexually transmitted diseases," Carl? Did it fall out of your arse one day while contemplating creative new ways to convince young people that abstinence is the only option when it comes to sexual health? We'll get to your hilariously inept reasoning to justify this lie presently, but regardless of whence you fished it, you should be ashamed of yourself on two levels. First, it's a documented fact that religiously-motivated abstinence only programs work only in the comedic parodies of reality being played out in the crania of fanatical loons like you, and so fail harder than Donald Trump trying to criticize a Nazi. As a result, the children subjected to them are far more likely to produce pregnancies, and considering that you same loons are also first in line to deny them the option of abortion, you should frankly be prosecuted for abuse. Second, do you realize what harm you're doing when you perpetuate this blatant, outrageous lie? You're potentially condemning some poor, hapless souls to catching those very diseases whose symptoms Pisspants found so amusing. How dare you deprive others of the information they need to make their own decisions on their health. What kind of a man are you? Are you willing to take responsibility for your actions? To face those who listened to your repulsive lies and are now paying the price? I very much doubt it because you're nothing but a foul, morally repugnant pustule who cares not one jot for the devastation he leaves in his wake as he obliviously pilots his leaky scow through the ocean of his own ignorance.

And not only are you content to endanger the health of others because of your alleged dedication to your god, but you're also willing to flick that forked tongue of yours in the direction of others who are actually trying to do some good in the world as we see here:

"The lies that are being told. You know, our kids are told all the time, "Oh, just use a condom. Everything's fine."

Oh, the bitter irony, Carl. Lying about someone else lying. It's like you say these things deliberately to hand me something to beat you around the head with.

I suppose, that the random staccato misfires that your synapses seem to be prone to may have led you to *actually believe* this, and so you may not be convinced when I tell you that *sane* people understand that comprehensive sex education teaches monogamy and abstinence as the primary mode of avoiding STDs. Barrier contraception is promoted only as a secondary measure because it's unrealistic to expect many people to temper their promiscuity. Unlike this pragmatic approach that's firmly rooted in the real world, of course, Christians like you tend to favor the one rooted in their hallucinogenic warm and fluffy Lalaland where it's perfectly reasonable to expect everyone to magically control their human nature and keep their peckers in their pants because it offends the baby Jesus.

Oh, and if you won't take my word for it, Carl, what about that "globally renowned and recognized" organization, the WHO, which says: "Counselling and behavioral interventions offer primary prevention against STIs (including HIV), as well as against unintended pregnancies."

Anyway, let's get back to the point and dig a little deeper to find out what kind of bumblingly inept yet ball-bustingly hilarious reasons the two of you dreamt up for denying the completely fucking obvious.

“[Pisspants]: Er... I mean come on. Uh. You're putting a... a... a... a rubber device, a latex rubber device between you and your partner. Does anybody else see how ludicrous it sounds?”

Well, I suppose that depends on who exactly purchased the device, doesn't it Pisspants. And since the context is your denial that condoms can't prevent STD transmission then, yes, I *can* see how ludicrous what you said sounds. I'd say its mind-numbingly, face-palmingly, dumb-fuckingly ludicrous. Am I right?

Now, Pisspants, let me give you a little friendly advice. You see, when intellectually honest, normal people think something doesn't smell quite right they don't just assume that their gut feeling is an after-effect of last night's mutton vindaloo, and rather they start some research to see if it's actually fucking true. Obviously, I realize this concept is anathema to you and Carl, but had you tried doing just that you might have avoided looking like such a clueless dick-splash in public. Of course, you never bothered to elaborate on the reasons for your fatuous incredulity, so let's see if the Good Pastor can enlighten us.

“Let me just step in and say... condoms were *never* produced or meant... and they're still not. In fact, there's a disclaimer on the condoms. That this is not meant to stop sexually transmitted disease and infection, because they're meant to stop pregnancy.”

Well, I suppose I can't blame you for fucking that up in spectacular style because obtaining an informed opinion on the subject would have involved you doing some reading. And if what's *actually* written on the boxes, isn't enough, Carl, I think we can safely assume you don't realize that they're legally classes=d as medical devices and so regulated by the Food and Drug Administration. As a result, all manufacturers must comply with the guidance document for “Labeling of Natural Rubber Latex Condoms,” and in that regard let me draw your attention to Section V, Part A, Table 1 where under “Risk of Transmission of Sexually Transmitted Infections” the “Labeling should indicate that latex condoms are *intended* to prevent HIV/AIDS and other STIs.” So, after that little display, I think it's fair to say that you told an outrageously blatant lie, Carl, and that you're a filthy fucking liar. And once again, I'll point out to your supporters out there that this alone should give them pause for thought, because I think it's quite clear that you can trust Pastor Gallups about much as you can Bill Cosby in the Dallas Cowboys cheerleaders' changing room with a bottle of Stoly and a handful of roofies.

So congratulations, Carl. Not only were you wrong again, but you were so wrong that your wrongness managed achieve escape velocity, break through the bounds of human incompetence and soar off into the uncharted yonder of unmitigated fucktardery.

As for your other contention, do you really think that just because something is designed for a specific function it can't be used for another? So presumably you'd agree that because clothes are designed to cover our nakedness they can't possibly also protect from UV exposure? Or that since cricket bats were designed to beat the shit out of small balls made of cork and leather that they can't be used do the same to the miniscule balls of creationist fucktards? And I suppose that because baseball caps were designed to be worn with the peak pointing forwards to protect sportsmen's eye from the sun they can't be worn backward to make white men look like complete twats? I could go on *ad infinitum*, Carl, but I hope that these examples suffice to highlight what a complete cowpat of an argument you just spawned.

And if that wasn't enough, we've left the best to last because you decided to follow that abominable lie with a true work of art. A *pièce de résistance* of unabashed stupidity that will make the angels weep. So without further ado I present Carl's masterpiece and what I'm sure will become a true icon in the annals of inept creationist bumbledom.

“[Carl]: But the... but the... fff ... but the... the... [sigh]... I don't know the words – not fibers – the latex – that they're are made out of. The... if you could look at it under a microscope, it's like... throwing... er... a golf ball through a tennis net. If I had a bucket of golf balls and was throwing it at a tennis net, every now one would hit the string and would bounce back at me. But I'm going to get the vast majority of that... that bucket of golf balls through the tennis net, right? And that's... {Pisspants}: Right. [Carl]: That's what STDs look like to a condom.”

Fuck me nude running Carl. I really wish you had the cognitive faculties to recognize how stupid that was so you could feel at least a touch of embarrassment at yourself. So in an hopeful attempt to introduce you that that novel sensation let's begin with the basics.

Latex rubber is produced from the milk sap of plants such as *Hevea brasiliensis* and its major component is the biological polymer *cis*-1,4-polyisoprene. Like most polymers it can be used to form networks akin to your tennis net, Carl, but while the net is held together by knots the latex network is strengthened by crosslinking the polyisoprene chains with sulfur in a process known as vulcanization, which was invented by Charles Goodyear in 1844. But that's about where your analogy ends and your dismal fail begins, because a two-dimensional film of rubber would be so thin that it'd be invisible and would break at the slightest application of force. Thus, products made of rubber are in fact *three-dimensional* networks, so for your analogy to run true your single tennis net would need to be multiple nets stacked together and connected with thousands of randomly placed ties.

But how many layers, Carl? Well, the average condom is about 0.05mm thick, which is 50 microns. And while I couldn't find an estimate for the thickness of a polymeric monolayer in a cursory search, I did find a paper by Yang *et al.* that measures polymeric nanofilm thickness down to at least 10 nanometers. So while this is an over estimate in favor of your tennis net model, let's use that distance, Carl, and while I realize it's not your forte, let's do the math. One nanometer is a thousandth of a micron so one hundred stacked films would be a micron thick. Thus to get to the 50 micron thickness of a condom your tennis net would actually have to be *at least five thousand* randomly stacked and cross-tied nets. What do you think would happen to your fucking golf balls now, Carl?

But of course, we don't even have to resort to these calculations because, contrary to your beliefs, there are such things as facts in the world. Remember what you said about what the latex fibers would look like if you examined under a microscope? Well I can only assume that you conjured up your micrograph of a tennis net out of the careening maelstrom of deformed thoughts and psychedelic ideas that you call consciousness. So, you may be surprised to know that scientists don't generally consider this approach as an optimal method of data collection, and had you bothered to pull your finger out of your nose for a minute and used it on that clicky thing on your mouse you could easily have found this image and the paper that accompanies it *showing* the surface of a latex glove.

Doesn't look much like the tennis net you conjured up out of your arse, does it Carl? And while a virus on this scale would be about half a pixel across and might be able to get through the two pores pictured,

when you consider the scale, which happens to represent the thickness of a condom, it shouldn't be too hard to appreciate that your imaginary net isn't a net at all, but rather a fucking brick wall.

But even those facts don't fuck your stupidity as hard as what's coming next, and that's because even a third grader could work out just how full of shit you are if they sat down and thought about it for a minute or two. And that's because when you apply one commonly known fact to your little hypothesis, Carl, it'll explode like a chastity pledge at the sight of a pair of wubby jubbies.

Have you ever heard of the word, inflation, Carl? You know? The thing that happens to balloons when you blow into them. You know? Those round party things that are made out of... oh, what's the name... oh yeah... *latex*. Well, what do you think happens to condoms when you do the same to them?

So isn't it strange that those tennis balls of nitrogen and oxygen don't exactly piss through the rubber like water through a inches

? Now, while air *will* slowly escape from an inflated glove or condom over a period of weeks, I think it's safe to say that, even if pathogens could do the same at this meager rate, it's unlikely any would in a copulation lasting, say, ten or fifteen minutes, much less the ten or fifteen seconds I suspect you're used to. And I'm sure even you ignorant bumpkins can appreciate that these diatomic molecules are just a tad smaller than even a virus because those very same viruses are made up millions of atoms, so their escape, if it happens at all, should be just a little more difficult, right? But let's not hand-wave about it and try to get a more quantitative grasp of the situation by doing some more math instead. So hold onto your hats and your arses boys, because this isn't going to be pretty.

First, let's take the larger of the two major constituents of air, that is oxygen, which has a molecular mass of thirty-two Daltons. So, one mole of O₂, by definition, weighs thirty-two grams and contains Avogadro's number of molecules, which we'll round down to 6×10^{23} . Therefore, one oxygen molecule weighs thirty-two grams divided by 6×10^{23} , or 5.3×10^{-23} grams. Next let's look at a virus – in this case HIV.

The Bionumbers site at Harvard gives the capsid diameter at 126.5 nanometers. So, converting to volume using the equation for a sphere, we get 1.05×10^{-21} cubic meters. We'll assume a density of 1 gram per cubic centimeter, though in reality, since the major constituent of the virus is protein which has an average density of 1.2, this skews the calculation slightly in your favor. So now we multiply our volume by the density of water, which is 1×10^3 kg per cubic meter and we get a mass of 1.05×10^{-18} kg, or 1.05×10^{-15} grams for the mass of a single virion.

So how does that compare with oxygen, boys, which we've already established can barely escape a condom at all much less do it like your balls though a tennis net? Well it turns out that the virus is about *20 million times more massive*. Hmm. Can you spot the discrepancy yet dumb-fucks? But, of course, we're not dealing with viruses here, but bacteria, so let's take a look at one, in this case *Escherichia coli*.

Bionumbers gives the wet weight of an *E. coli* cell as 0.95 picograms. So we divide this by 1000 to get nanograms, by another 1000 for micrograms, another 1000 and it's now milligrams and then a final 1000 for grams. So that comes to 9.5×10^{-13} grams which is *900 times bigger* than HIV and, get this boys, *eighteen billion times bigger* than an oxygen molecule. There's a phrase that scientists use to describe a number of that magnitude and, at that's a "fucking crap-ton".

So now let's take an American golf-ball, which has a diameter of 1.68 inches. The volume of this ball, which represents an oxygen molecule for the purposes of this demonstration, is four-thirds pi times 0.84 cubed, which is 2.48 cubic inches. Now we consider the worst case, a virus, whose mass (or volume) is 20 million times that of oxygen. So now let's scale up the oxygen golf-balls to the size of HIV by multiplying 2.48 by 20 million, and we get 49.6 million cubic inches. Now we can calculate the diameter of this golf ball and from its volume by rearranging the sphere equation, plugging in the volume, and getting a radius 228 inches and so a diameter of 456 inches. Got it boys?

Good. So with all that in hand, let's rephrase your claim, Carl, but this time after the injection of the appropriate dose of facts and reality. What you really should have said is: "Condom's don't stop STDs because it's as easy for a virus to get through one as it is to push a 12-yard-wide golf ball through five thousand randomly stacked tennis nets." I don't think I can make it any clearer than that, Carl, so I hope that this fully exposes your unimaginable doltishness to anyone whose head wedged isn't up your anterior décolletage, and that it demonstrates to the world that you're quite possibly the stupidest fuck to ever grace the internet, and perhaps even in our galactic supercluster.

Of course, it could be that I've overlooked something, or that you've yet to reveal to us the Gallups Theory of Condom Quantum Tunneling, but until either of these are revealed to me I think I'll continue explaining this unimaginably miserable demonstration of creationist argumentation as the inevitable consequence of the head-on collision of your religious indoctrination with your desiccated and withered husk of a brain.

Phew! So, I think that about covers it boys! It was quite a journey, I know, but I'm sure you'll agree it was one that was certainly worth taking. You can get up and pull up your pants now. I know the spanking got a little vicious in parts, but you both did really need to learn your lesson and I'm sure the wounds will heal in time. Just avoid sitting on them for too long and give them some air every now and then and you'll be just fine.

And if you do scar up a little, that may not be a bad thing. Perhaps they'll serve as a reminder next time you're fondling each other's arses to be a little more careful about what you're saying. After all, you never know *who* might be watching.

References

Bionumbers. HIV diameter. f. Accessed, August 18, 2017.

<http://bionumbers.hms.harvard.edu/bionumber.aspx?&id=101667&ver=10&trm=HIV>

Bionumbers. E. coli wet weight f. Accessed, August 18, 2017.

<http://bionumbers.hms.harvard.edu/bionumber.aspx?&id=103905&ver=13&trm=e.%20coli%20weight>

Class II Special Controls Guidance Document: Labeling for Natural Rubber Latex Condoms Classified Under 21 CFR 884.5300. Accessed, August 18, 2017.

<https://www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/DeviceRegulationandGuidance/GuidanceDocuments/ucm107076.htm>

Condom Fact Sheet In Brief. Accessed, August 18, 2017.

<https://www.cdc.gov/condomeffectiveness/brief.html>

Holmes, K.K. *et al.* (2004). Effectiveness of condoms in preventing sexually transmitted infections. *Bull. WHO* **82**: 454–61.

Kohler, P.K. *et al.* (2008). Abstinence-Only and Comprehensive Sex Education and the Initiation of Sexual Activity and Teen Pregnancy. *J. Adolesc. Health* **42**: 344-351.

Sexually transmitted infections (STIs). Accessed, August 18, 2017.

<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs110/en/>

Vinches , L, Hallé1, S., Peyrot, C. and Wilkinson, K.J. (2014). Which gloves are efficient to protect against titanium dioxide nanoparticles In work conditions? *Int. J. Theoret. Appl. Nanotech.* **1**: 24-29.