

Sex and Society

Harry Neuwirth

Harry Neuwirth is a retired postal employee.

Anyone who has read the literature, listened to the music, viewed the visual works, or resonated to the motion pictures of artistic giants who've lived deviant personal lives must accept, reluctantly or eagerly, that talent grows where it grows. Some of the wittiest, most pleasant, entertaining people we've known have pursued lifestyles well outside "normalcy," verifying that pleasantness, intelligence, and charisma also take root where they will.

If ". . . life, liberty, and the pursuit. . ." have any reality for Americans, "pursuers" on her shores must have the right to live lives of their own choosing so long as their behavior causes no harm to others. Unfortunately we seem to be losing our ability to recognize what constitutes harm to others.

Here on the threshold of the twenty-first century we find otherwise-rational people citing the deviant behavior of historical and contemporary giants as justification for everyone jumping into the boiling stream of uninhibited passion.

Similarly we find people attempting to normalize deviant sexual behavior in homo sapiens by citing such behavior in lower order animals. If ". . . even birdies in the trees do it. . ." it must be okay for thee and me as well. We are but animals ourselves, therefore. . .

Yet no one advocates giving up the spiritual, intellectual, social, economic, and cultural treasures inherited incrementally over the millennia as mankind perceived and preserved the behavioral characteristics and intellectual insights that have elevated our lives above even the most advanced creatures in the animal kingdom.

Nothing distinguishes homo sapiens from the lower animals—or from atavistic humans—more absolutely than their behavior, than their observable behavior and the consequences thereof. OBSERVABLE BEHAVIOR, as opposed to the quirks lingering in everyone, quirks plastered to the psyche just above the level of instinct, traditionally suppressed and hidden from view out of a legitimate fear of the heavy social cost of visibility. But many "fair minded people" are insisting that it is okay for mankind to discount the social cost of proclaimed sexual deviance in today's enlightened climate. Public opinion shall be declared obsolete (?) since there is no apparent "cost" to sexual deviance—since there is no harm to others.

No cost? No harm to others?

The single most important prop of society is sex. Civilization will never be more than one generation away from extinction. But no need to worry, sexual energy will sustain the stream of civilization to overflowing. What the sex drive cannot do is to keep civilization civilized to the levels we have inherited over thousands of generations as mankind struggled to overcome the forces of nature and our own psychological shortcomings.

Society—the village of mankind—has an oblique but vital interest in the by-products of normal sexuality. In recognition of that interest, policies have been adopted that essentially define family, then favor traditional family over “other” living arrangements. It is now being asked if such policies are rational and equitable.

They are rational; they are socially equitable!

Since children are necessary to the continuity of the human race, and since the maturity of those youngsters is vital to the burgeoning of society, relieving the heavy burden of bringing children into adulthood in our intellectually and technically sophisticated age has come to be our highest domestic policy priority.

Recognizing that the organic family is the best environment for adults and their children, and that over uncountable millennia that environment has been the only source of a constant supply of relatively mature, healthy young adults, thus sustaining and improving the health of society itself, the organic family logically holds a place of high favor in our hearts and minds.

There should be little argument that social policy ought to benefit society. And there is really very little dispute that children and family deserve highest consideration as beneficiaries of social policy. Yet there is growing clamor to assign equal merit to nontraditional families under the logic that such “enlightened” policies would serve simply to extend equitable treatment to other deserving unions, ignoring the truth that such unions bring no advantage to society; they are purely self-satisfying and selfish in the fullest sense of the word. There is clamor not only to accept, but to advocate deviant behavior, to outlaw the social cost of deviance, and to legitimize it by decree, effectively reversing the ancient roles of violator and violated.

The attempt to equate normal sexual relations with homosexual relationships by arguing that much if not most of “normal” human sexuality is purely carnal is to dismiss the obvious: the sun is not destroying itself to heat the earth, it is simply following the laws of physics to our immense but incidental benefit. To refuse to see that the beautiful union between man and woman grows out of a similar physical compulsion, a compulsion as vital to the perpetuation of the human race as is energy from the sun, is to blind ourselves to the importance of the strongest pillar of civilization. If children are incidental to sex, so be it: Society cannot survive without them!

It is not difficult to discover the warmly human motivation behind the drive for political and social acceptance of deviant sexual behavior. In an age when it is no longer necessary to pursue the demands of survival to the edge of exhaustion, passions that rumbled under the surface for aeons—or that were vigorously practiced in ancient, culturally vacant societies—are rising to take on a suddenly legitimate significance. Men who married, then challenged their own physical endurance every day to support the pressing demands of family while meeting what they necessarily perceived to be their own personal responsibility, may now entertain lesser motivations, tentative motivations. Women who accepted spouse, children, and household as the focus of their heavily burdened lives, are now

tempted to look outside and inside themselves for other inspiration. Where we look, we will find. Something! Anything! And as we lower the moral bar of society, what we find will inevitably become acceptable where it once was universally viewed as antisocial—at best.

Concomitant with the ease of modern life we have come to believe that we exert total control over those lives and of our culture, that we have no responsibilities as moral fiduciaries. Living in a social order is not a game! Yet we have begun to treat of society as though we were making rules for a bingo tournament in the face of universal laws that have been in place since the dawn of time, laws that we violate at our peril.

It should be perfectly clear that there will always be eccentrics. It should be equally clear that, as their behavior finds acceptance, others will emerge and rise up to claim concentricity for their eccentricity. When we cease to resist counterproductive behavior, instead of a civilization rising toward the sun that warms us and gives us ever richer life, we will find ourselves steadily retreating toward the cold discomfort of an immoral winter: “. . . nasty, brutish, and . . .” yeah, yeah, yeah.

Contempt for atavism can be found in all the great religions of the world, with secular equivalence in the exacting rules that govern the physical universe: violate the rules and the “experiment” fails. Society is just such an experiment, holding no preordained assurance of success.

We seek to consolidate wisdom in academe and in legislative bodies, then to pursue justice with wisdom in the judiciary. We do not always succeed at either level, but it would help to recognize that the physical and the spiritual are but two aspects of one profound truth; that we cannot ignore one without violating the other. Ω