

Sanity despite waves of immorality

Jamal Johnson

April 27, 2014



Let's look at the benefits of Marriage

- 1) If you're religious you get to have sex in a way that your God approves of
- 2) If you're smitten with someone, you get to have their pledge to stay with you forever and ever and ever
- 3) If you're a socially responsible person, you don't wish to mistakenly give birth to unsocialized bastards
- 4) If you're a legal hawk, you want to secure, for your partnership, the legal standing that shows you and your partner to be family members in the eyes of the court system.

5) If you're a normal heterosexual man and you're into legacy, you want to make clear the fact that your offspring are yours and they have your name.

6) If you have the heart of a poet or nature lover, you think the dance of masculine and feminine is a thing of high art and you want to participate in it, with all of its chapters, before the journey of life comes to an end.

7) If you're a spiritual person, you know that God is male and female (Yang and Yin as they say in the East) and you want to become one with the opposite sex and join to become the reflection of that epic duality through which new life comes forth.

All of these but one have private implications (#3). The one that has public implications calls attention to the issue of marriage for the sake of the public good. Because of #3, enlightened people realize that we cannot have irresponsible procreation.

We cannot have irresponsible procreation because it is a matter of public good, of social health. #3 is the only compelling reason for a public debate. In light of #3, homosexuality does not cause the public the same concern and doesn't summon the public attention with the same intensity. Why because gays can have all the sex they want and not produce citizens. Because of this, when it comes to procreation, there is no such thing as irresponsible homosexuality. Thus the public needn't be summoned to recognize those erotic arrangements as if they are divided into the responsible kind and the irresponsible kind, the way that natural (heterosexual) sex is.

The only issue that summons some public concern for the homosexual couple is #4, and this is likened to the concern that the public has about business relationships and contracts. When most people responded to this issue, they became agreeable with the idea of civil unions.

When, in light of issue #4, homosexuals were granted the civil union option they savagely fought for marriage, even though the public has no reason to care, other than to honor contracts between two parties. Thus the whole homosexual marriage issue has been one big national exercise in minimizing the importance of #3, reducing it from a social imperative to a negligible peripheral consideration. And because they diminished the value of civil unions by expressing dissatisfaction with it, #4 has been diminished as well.

It seems to me, the only surviving standard that makes it all gel is if we go forward viewing #2 as if it is the only publicly held concern that guides individuals when they ponder what marriage is. Now this may seem fine to some, but the immutable reality is this. #3 is still the most grave reason that the public should be concerned about marriage and we have allowed a twisted notion of equality to reduce, in the public mind, the importance of #3. This will no doubt continue to be reflected in our culture and we will, one day, fully divorce the notion of sex from that of parenting. The forces of social decay have been wanting to do that for quite some time. and it looks like they are succeeding in brainwashing people that this separation between sex and parenting has become reality, but the truth is it really hasn't, not for practitioners of natural sex (which happens to be 97% of the population).

In light of the civilized need for socially responsible parents, what have we done to the idea of responsible sex? We have turned all civilized concerns for socially responsible sex into something that is viewed as nothing more than "a villainous intrusion of a nosy public into the free sex lives of individuals". And by doing this, we have chosen the ravages of barbarism. We have chosen the proliferation of bastards over the peace that comes when each child of our community has his/her own natural progenitors honoring his life with their love and attention and combined wisdom. We have thrown the next generation under the bus in the hopes of ensuring that we have our orgasms in precisely the way that we want them.

Homosexuals shouldn't ever feel unloved and denied, because many in this population were willing to throw civilization under the bus just to make them feel normal.

BTW, you can forget about #1, #6, and #7. That ain't even attached to the word marriage anymore.

Jamal Johnson
April 27th 2014