

Wednesday, March 14, 2007

Be Right? Or Left? When it comes family values, BOTH are wrong

The last few days have been filled with pontifications, mostly from the right, about how this candidate or that candidate is a good (or bad) choice for President, citing some form of "family values".

Gulianai has had his indiscretions. So has Newt, it appears, including during the time that Clinton was being investigated for..... the same thing.

There are questions about whether or not Mitt Romney can be a good President because he's a Mormon, with a clear allegory to the LDS Church's past history on polygamy - although those making the comment aren't brave enough to just come out and say what they mean.

Well, folks, I'm calling BS on all of it.

Why?

Let's look at the positions of the left and right with a critical eye.

The Left claims to support "Gay Marriage"; that is, allowing any two people to "marry" each other, irrespective of their genders. This is claimed to be a civil rights issue by the left.

The Right, on the other hand, claims that this is an apostasy.

But *both* are happy to violate the precepts of marriage with wild abandon.

Its time to stand up and say "**ENOUGH DAMNIT!**"

Let's face facts here. Fully *fifty percent* of first marriages fail. Among second and subsequent marriages, the rate is *more than sixty percent*.

Even if you were educated in a government school, **a fifty, or forty, on a paper is still a SCREAMING "F"!**

Now there are a bunch of folks out there who will try to defend this by saying "oh but the percentage is only about 2-5% a year" (depending on your particular group you're studying.)

To that I call "BS" - marriage is supposed to be a *lifetime* commitment, not a party until one of you gets tired of it! If you don't want that, then you shouldn't take the vows or get the license.

I call for us to quit fooling around with this thing called "Marriage", and until reform can be put in place, for people to simply "just say no."

After all, what do you *really* need to get married for nowadays anyway? It no longer protects women's access to wealth or inheritance, and it no longer protects a man's ability to raise his children.

We need a marriage system that *actually delivers what it promises; specifically:*

- You must be given with your "state marriage license application" a full and complete copy of the rules governing your marriage by default, including the procedure for dissolution if the marriage fails including what will and will not be considered both for custody and asset division and how "fault" in any of these

areas, if it matters, will be determined. All this must be written at a high-school reading level and fit on no more than three or four printed pages in ordinary magazine-size print.

- States must permit you to file *your own* rules with your marriage license, agreed to by you and your intended. The State must either accept or reject them in their entirety *before issuing the license*.
- Once you are married under that license *it must be treated as a contract and not subject to retroactive modification by the state*. If you and your intended wish to change the terms governing your marriage post-ceremony, that's fine. *What is not acceptable is for the state to change the rules retroactively after you've been married for 2, 5, 10, 20 or 50 years!*

You wouldn't take a mortgage for a house where the bank reserved the right to change not only the interest rate to whatever they'd like but also the outstanding value of the loan any time they wanted - without prior notice to you and without recourse!

So why do we accept this kind of foolishness when it comes to the so-called "marriage contract"?

We should not - and must not - if our society is to continue to prosper.

Until these changes can be put in place, "Just say no."

You can obtain superior protection for property and inheritance by using other estate planning tools. Medical access for your partner is easily obtained using Powers of Attorney. Yes, it will cost you a few dollars to go have these papers drawn with an attorney, but in return you will get REAL protection on exactly the terms that you and your partner choose - and best of all, what you decide and agree on will be enforceable.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 23:20

The dramatic rise in divorces and decline in marriage was not an accident. Both the New Left and the Neoconservatives are, by definition, Trotskyite. Trotsky wrote extensively about the "need" to forcibly abolish the family while in exile in Norway. I suggest privatizing marriage, under the concept of "private law". regards Anonymous on Mar 20 2007, 15:18