

Reflections on marriage and family – Part One

Description

Chastity-Based Marriage, that is Absolute Monogamy as the Condition of Civilization and the Key to Human Flourishing

Imre Balásházy

Two mottos:

*“The mission of man is to learn the truth, love what’s beautiful, desire what’s good, and do what’s best.”
/Ludwig van Beethoven/*

*“A society that lives carnal love outside of marriage lives a culture of death.”
/Pope Saint John Paul II/*



The definition of marriage and family has become a particularly important issue in recent decades, because by expanding their meaning their prominent role in the society can be made less important or even nullified. To illustrate this point here is an example: if we also call the groups of people living in mere cohabitation families, we may end up considering almost any group of people families removing thereby the family’s prominent role. So, it makes a big difference how we define marriage and family.

The institution of marriage and family has been under attack for some time. For example, Karl Marx saw marriage as the first form of class struggle. According to him, the wife in a marriage is oppressed by her husband, therefore the institution of marriage should be abolished.

Therefore, we are launching a multi-part series of articles on marriage and family. These articles will also be published in the European Family Science Journal (<https://ecssz.eu/english>), an occasional joint publication of the Family Science Alliance and the European Family Science Society.

On the following pages, we will analyze some of the important aspects of the interrelationship between the definition of marriage and family and will examine the reasons that led to the current crisis of family life, or in other words, to the currently experienced alarmingly low cultural level of human relationships. Finally, we will list some of the reasons why is it proper to call a married couple family. We find it necessary, because many people still do not consider a childless married couple as a family, saying

that to qualify for the term of family the two individuals must have children too in their household. However, the author does not consider this to be a good approach.

Definition and some basic properties of the marriage:

The marriage is a lifelong union based on the sovereign decision and the mutual love and respect of *one woman and one man*. This alliance is being considered as a legal institution with special status and thus it is protected and solemnized by the laws of the state. This union can be free of stormy waters only if it is built on chastity-based marriage. Marriage based on chastity is hereinafter referred to as absolute monogamy.

Marriage is a mission of the married couple to fulfill its basic qualities, which are complementing each other, creating a wholesome interrelationship, maintaining sexual and general fidelity to each other, and willingness to accept children to be part of their family, and this is how to create jointly a flourishing union. This unity is the basic cell of society that constitutes a family even without children. The society is expected – for the sake of the healthy life of the individual, the couple, and the society as a whole – to guide the institution of marriage on a scientific and cultural basis towards the acceptance and practice of chastity-based marriage, that is absolute monogamy and keep it there for good. This would be much needed today.

The interrelationship of some important components when defining marriage:

In marriage, a man and a woman complement each other, and together, as two partners, they create a complex unit. This complex unit, formed by the couple, as we shall see, constitutes the family for a number of reasons and is therefore considered to be the basic cell of society. Considering its elementary significance, both for the individual and for the community, the marriage should be regarded by each person, as well as by the society as one of the most important missions of the individual. Marriage is a union of love and thus its vital element is self-giving. Contracting the marriage is one of the most significant events in an individual's life. The harmonious functioning of marriages is in the basic goal of the spouses, families, communities and of healthy societies, and is the determining factor of the health of the individual, the family and of the society.

According to Joseph Daniel Unwin as described in his famous work *Sex and Culture* (1934, Oxford Press), *a developed society has only come into being throughout human history when sexual life has been in some way restricted by society to marriage (absolute monogamy)*. One could therefore say that the necessary condition for creating an advanced society is to make the marriage built on chastity-based marriage that is absolute monogamy generally acceptable. *Civilization was clearly created and sustained by the institution of absolute monogamy. Namely, if this constraint were released, society would collapse within three generations at most, without exception*. When premarital sex became commonplace, all advanced societies would have collapsed without exception already within one generation. Let us prevent this happening to our current society. It is worth mentioning that Unwin's work was later verified and confirmed by K. Mascher at the University of Munich in 2005 and 2009.

Based on an analysis of his own findings, Unwin concluded that the legal guarantee of women's equality and the restriction of sex life to marriage could together mean the long-term realization of an advanced culture for the prosperity of the individual and society in the future. If we think about it, it is natural, because on the one hand, in an advanced culture, respect for human equality and human dignity must be expected. On the other hand, the general acceptance of sexual intimacy before

marriage and, generally, outside of marriage, makes true female equality impossible, because uncommitted sexual life objectifies the woman, i.e., the man will look upon her as the object of his instincts and not as a partner of equal dignity, who is loved and respected, and also fulfilling his life. Thus, today's fashionable "gender mainstreaming", i.e., the validation of gender equality, the validation of "sexual and reproductive health and rights" and the introduction of so-called "comprehensive sex education" can only be accepted and considered humane, plus will express its intended meaning only if the proposed restriction of sexual intimacy to marriage is becoming one of the listed components. For without this, as we shall see, they will only remain attempts that are fundamentally wrong or false and seriously hurt the dignity of men and especially that of the women, while they, degrade, and sicken, and destroy the civilization.

Kirk Durston (2021) summarizes six important results of Unwin's work:

(i) Effect of sexual constraints: Increased sexual constraints, either pre- or post-nuptial, always led to increased flourishing of a culture. Conversely, increased sexual freedom always led to the collapse of a culture three generations later.

(ii) Single most influential factor: the single most important correlation with the flourishing of a culture was whether pre-nuptial chastity was required or not. This had a very significant impact in both directions.

(iii) Highest flourishing of culture: The most powerful combination was pre-nuptial chastity coupled with marriage. Civilized (rationalist) cultures that retained this combination for at least three generations exceeded all other cultures in every area, including literature, art, science, furniture, architecture, engineering, and agriculture. Only three out of the eighty-six cultures studied ever attained this level.

(iv) Effect of abandoning prenuptial chastity: When strict prenuptial chastity was no longer the norm, real marriage, religiosity, and rational thinking also disappeared within three generations.

(v) Total sexual freedom: If total sexual freedom was embraced by a culture, that culture collapsed within three generations to the lowest state of flourishing – which Unwin describes as "inert" and at a "dead level of conception" and is characterized by people who have little interest in much else other than their own wants and needs. At this level, the culture is usually conquered or taken over by another culture with greater social energy.

(vi) Time lag: If there is a change in sexual constraints, either increased or decreased restraints, the full effect of that change is not realized until the third generation.

Given the successful spread of sexual freedom since the 1960s, unless there is a significant change in the tightening of sexual freedom, Western and European civilization is expected to collapse within a few decades.

An important point to note when discussing this topic is *the existence of several significant asymmetries in the relationships of couples*. Not only gender equality but also differences need to be discussed. Legal and moral equality is natural since the dignity of every human being is identical and absolute. *If differences are not considered, the weaker, the more vulnerable is disadvantaged*. This is how it happens when while women's equality is proclaimed, in practice it is the women who are being oppressed in today's so-called developed Western and European societies. This becomes obvious

when we hear the slogans that 'everyone has the right to free sex' and 'everyone has the right to abortion'. Proclaiming these two rights next to each other we arrive to the result which is hypocritical male chauvinism. Those who proclaim that women have the right to abortion claim that they are protecting women, when in fact they are giving men the opportunity to have free sex without consequences. If problems evolve, they will be sorted out for the man, so that he does not have to worry about it. Let the woman remove whatever caused trouble for the man. The man doesn't have to deal with those things that hurt the woman physically and makes her soul wrecked; it is the woman's problem. And those who proclaim these things they pretend as if they were proclaiming the equality of men and women. It's time to get rid of these kinds of lies once and for all.

Based on Unwin's results, one can say that the only way to ensure the physical and mental health of man and the thriving of the society is the chastity-based marriage, that is absolute monogamy, which is the strict criterion for the formation and survival of advanced civilizations with no exceptions.

The biological and psychological asymmetries inherent in sexual intercourse and in the couple relationships in general, in the absence of absolute monogamy, preclude equal burden-bearing, risk taking, confronting dangers jointly and the chances for a successful, healthy, and happy life for both sexes. For this reason, if women are not protected by society from the risks inherent in sexual intimacy and in relationships by means of marriage, which for women are significantly greater than for men, they will automatically be exposed to oppression and greater danger than men exactly because of these asymmetries in relationships.

The five most important asymmetries in this area are:

- (i) In finding mate and establishing a permanent relationship with him, the chances for girls diminishing faster over the years because their biological clock runs faster, and they run out of time for mating earlier than men.
- (ii) A girl may become pregnant as a result of her sexual relationship, which may change her life radically, whereas there is no such risk for the boy.
- (iii) The chances for and the stability of future marriages are also less in the case of girls due to their previous sexual relationships with others. As an example, I want to refer to a publication by Patrick Fagan (USA, Institute for Research on Marriage and Religion, 2017), which shows that the probability of divorce within five years of the marriage is twelvefold for girls who have had just one premarital partnership and this chance will be increased sixteen-fold for them if they had two premarital partnerships. For boys, these two figures are "only" four and five respectively.
- (iv) the girl is running out of time to have children or enough children. For boys, there is practically no such time.
- (v) girls are physically weaker and more vulnerable to violence. We should note here that violence against the partner in the relationship is about by one order of magnitude higher if the relationship is not based on marriage compared to the ones that have been solemnized by marriage.

Obviously, we could continue this list. It is no coincidence that following the launch of what has been called the 'sexual revolution', depression in the US has increased tenfold in 35 years and the incidence of depression in women has doubled that of men.

The famous American sociological work 'Demographic Winter – the decline of the human family' (2008), which earned positive comments even by Nobel Prize laureate researchers, points out that the number of births in the developed Western countries has halved in the last 50 years, that is from the beginning of the 'sexual revolution'. The only solution to the demographic crisis, they argue, would be the re-introduction and "cultivation" of good marriages. The so-called Swedish model, that is the strong family support system, does not work on its own, because it is not money that is needed for a good marriage, but a mother and father for the children living in a good marriage. Their conclusion is clear namely if good marriages are not re-introduced on a massive scale, the population of these countries will die out. According to the study, the most damaging event of the 20th century was the "sexual revolution". This 'revolution' has led to many women not marrying the first person they have had sex with, plus to the advent of artificial contraception and birth control methods in many forms. People's attitudes to sexuality, marriage and having children has changed. These have a profound impact on family life. Cohabitation outside marriage has become more common, resulting in fewer children than living in a marriage, postponing the time of marriage, and reducing the chances of getting married. One important reason for the low number of children is that people decide to have children too late, if they do at all. People who have had a single partner are much happier with their partner both sexually and emotionally than people who have had many partners. The correlation determinants are striking in this area. The children's psychological development requires stable and predictable relationships around them, where the interrelationship between their parents is very important. It is a definite plus for the children's psychological development if their father and mother live together; in such cases the chances of having serious problems are significantly lower. It is obvious that children who were brought up not in an intact family based on unscathed marriage would be more likely to suffer from poverty, severe neglect, and the results of bad parenting. Depression and delinquency are more common among these children. A marriage-based family is key to accumulating and establishing a social capital. More specifically, *the key: marriage and family based on absolute monogamy.*

Unwin concludes from human history that *marriages based on absolute monogamy, or absolute monogamous marriages, ? as they are also called, ?* constitute an indispensable condition for the social progress. Sociological analyses of marriage stability also led to the same conclusion; see the results of Patrick Fagan's research (2017) mentioned above.

This correlation is also well known to those seeking to break up marriages and the families. Obviously, they aimed not at making the present society more prosperous, but rather at destroying it, and realized that the best means to achieve this was to promote free sexuality, and as the result to undermine the institution of absolute monogamy. In doing so, they torpedoed the institution of marriage and the fortress of family very effectively. It is worth noting that the 'sexual revolution' is an element of the 'cultural Marxism', which can be connected primarily to Antonio Gramsci, the Frankfurt School and, therein to Herbert Marcuse. For many people, the word 'revolution' implies a courageous and totally justified heroic movement organized from below to fight an inhuman and cruel power. The 'sexual revolution' is something else. Here, the goal is to corrupt and destroy a culture, the civilization, and the man himself. Due to its violence nature, furthermore because of its real purpose and the method it uses, the 'sexual revolution' should properly be called sexual terrorism or sexual war. Due to its wide

distribution, in this paper we will stick to the term ‘sexual revolution’, but we will put it in quotation marks.

The “sexual revolution” is a subject worth analyzing in detail, but here I will only briefly mention three of its representatives: (i) The English writer Herbert George Wells wrote before 1890: “It is essential to promulgate free love in order to break down and abolish the obsolete institution of the family.” (Watt, 2011.) (ii) According to the German sexual revolutionary Wilhelm Reich (1936), there is no need to condemn churches, religion, or marriage; it is only necessary to promulgate free sexuality and the processes set in motion will do the work of destroying the family and churches as well. (Kuby, 2013.) The author of this paper notes: Knowing the couple relationship patterns in Germany, we should not be surprised that in 2015 or 2016 600 churches were closed there. If the churches take their own teachings seriously, they should not fear that today’s man will turn away from them. Lucky for the churches, while justifying their teachings, experience shows that the opposite is true: where they insist on Christian sexual ethic, the church gains strength and grows, and where they abandon it, faith will dwindle. However, the churches need to wake up to see this connection! The bulk of the financial resources available to them should not be used to renovate churches, but for the restoration of absolute monogamy and, more generally, of a sexual culture and behavioral patterns for couples living in relationships. This culture and these patterns will serve and edify man. It is also strategically important since this is the direction from which the churches and in essence the entire society have been and are being attacked, under the flag of ‘sexual revolution’. By joining forces with institutions that support absolute monogamous marriages, by setting up research institutes and university departments, and then by training professionals and widely educating and disseminating the results, the churches could also have a positive impact on society in this area. This could be a way to counter the false and anti-human ideologies that destroy the individual, marriages, the family, the nation, the churches, and the culture they have created. (iii) According to Herbert Marcuse (1955), society must be sexualized, and the consequences will be far-reaching. This has already been achieved in the Western world; sexual relations outside marriage have become commonplace, and we know the consequences. In conclusion, the outcome of the efforts to destroy marriages and the family clearly demonstrates that the spread of premarital and in general, the extramarital sexual relations is disrupting and then destroying the institution of marriage and the family. Thus, we may conclude that if we do not strive to restore the marriage module built on absolute monogamy, we should not even dream of strengthening the institution of marriage and the family. It should be noted here that the long-term alleviation, let alone defusing the demographic crisis is not likely to be achieved before this strengthening happens, because the demographic crisis is also a symptom of the crisis of family life.

Definition of the family:

The family is a communal union based on marriage. A married couple constitutes a family by itself, and the family may include the wife, the husband and their biological or adopted children, or a family may also consist of a single parent and his or her child or children. The family is the foundation of the social order, the smallest and most important unit of society, and the guarantor of the survival of the whole nation.

If the need arises, this definition of the concept of family will be explained in detail in a forthcoming paper.

Marriage by its very nature is essentially different from all other forms of cohabitation:

First, a thought as to why marriage, especially marriage based on absolute monogamy, is essentially different from any other form of cohabitation. If a society is built on couples and young people desiring to marry with the basic condition of absolute monogamy, its structure will be made of love-based units. If a society lives and thinks in terms of non-marital cohabitation, then the basic unit of the society becomes the individual, who seeks self-fulfillment and will become damagingly selfish. In such a society the social relationships become crude, women become objectified and have to live in a state of increased vulnerability, where equality may exist on paper but not in reality, and where life for a child is prone to be unhappy.

When studying the effects, we will first distinguish between two types of relationships: (i) marriage (based on absolute monogamy) and (ii) the non-marriage-based relationships. The negative symptoms around the family, and ultimately the crisis and failure of family life, were mainly brought about by the mass proliferation and then general acceptance and practice of non-marriage-based relationships.

Why is marriage, especially the marriage based on absolute monogamy different from other relationships or sexual relations? Because the former is based on a unique and permanent commitment. In other words, from the first moment of matrimony, the two spouses will form a permanent (or intended to be permanent) union. Once married, there are no conditions. One loves not the qualities of, the other, but the person who is his or her spouse. This seems to please the human soul and the human body. Actually, surveys clearly show that married people are healthier both in mind and body, live longer, are more productive and are more satisfied with life than unmarried people. Even in today's world this is the case, though everything works against young generations to turn them later into inadequate spouses. It also indicates that marriage is the natural way of life for the adults, because if they deviate from it, they will suffer from the expected effect which then will have an impact on their environment too. It is also clearly better for the children if they are conceived, born and live in a family of a married couple. (It should be noted that the health of priests, monks and nuns is also better than average. It is interesting that all these lifestyles are based on a permanent and loving commitment, just like marriages.) It seems that an adult person feels "at home" in this world when he or she makes a permanent commitment based on love.

As we have seen, marriage is a love-based final commitment, in which love is a passion and a choice to learn and fulfil what the other person really needs (Nitsche, 2001). Love is also the most advanced ability of man. Man's goal in life is to cultivate this ability that is to love. This ability is obviously the greatest gift of nature. Care, as a fundamental trait, can be observed and traced across a very broad spectrum of living creatures. A relationship based on love cannot end, because love does not have time limits, it does not expire. Man in love does not seek to dominate the other person but pursues what's good to them. Of course, love is perfect when it is mutual. Love is beautiful and attractive to the human mind and the human soul. Thus, if it is persistently cultivated, it will be transmitted to the other one and to the environment of the other as well. It works not because it is directly beneficial to the person expressing his or her love, but because lovers ultimately do their thinking and planning in terms of "we" rather than "I". Obviously, it pays off planning one's life this way. Qualitatively this lifestyle is better and more human than any other version of the multi-partner lifestyle. In marriage, a new unit is born through the unique and ultimate love relationship. Stephen L. Nock (1995) has found that the

lifestyle of people living together without paperwork is more like the one of those living alone than to those who live in matrimony.

Surveys shows that it is clearly best, one might say natural, for the offspring to be conceived, born and raised amidst a permanent and loving commitment. A harmonious, loving parental unit and the complexity of the family mean basic security for them. Many studies show that without it they will be vulnerable. We may say that a child has the natural right to be conceived, born and raised in a marriage, and in a good marriage. Unfortunately, this right is ignored by today's consumer society. This also means that this society is rather anti-child oriented! No wonder there are not enough children! If the parents don't really love each other, they are depriving the child of his or her basic and legitimate needs, which are more important for him than a bigger house or a car for his parents.

Sexuality is a fundamental part of our lives and is directly linked to the issues of relationships, marriage, family, children, and demography. Therefore, if there is a crisis or a trouble around the family, marriage, and demographic indicators, this suggests that there is trouble around the couple's relationships (and not around the social support).

We have concluded that there are two types of life paths that are worth categorizing in terms of the relationships: the single-partner life path (life planned for a having only one sexual partner) and the multi-partner life path (life planned for having several sexual partners). Today, a mixture of these two life paths is very common, namely. having multiple partners until marriage, then having only one partner (faithful and monogamous). Please note that according to our definition, this is a multi-partner life path! There is, of course, a significant difference between life paths designed for this combination and those designed for a completely single-partner life path!

Surveys clearly show that relationships being multi-partner before marriage and then turning into faithful in marriage work with difficulties. This is quite natural since a multi-partner lifestyle before marriage has already transformed the partners. The stakes are high. Look at the price of the 'sexual revolutions' of the twentieth century: over a billion broken relationships, and over a billion broken families, two billion abortions, hundreds of millions of people with mental illnesses, who knows how many millions of suicides, burnt-out lives, large number of intimate partner violence, loneliness, physical and mental illnesses, a multitude of nations that possibly will be extinct because of the demographic crisis, and so on. The devastation caused is far greater than that of World War I and World War II combined, so it may be considered as World War III, and it is still not over, it has been globalized and is finding new forms that are increasingly morbid, so it is attacking the institution of marriage on several fronts, but these will be dealt with in a future article. *Therefore, the only way out that we can recommend is to avoid social collapse and to create prosperity in the society is to reintroduce absolute monogamy!*

Pre-marital sexual intimacy is a failure when preparing or attempting to prepare for married life and it means denying matrimony, because the future spouse is excluded from being the only one in sharing sexual intimacy. Marital infidelity is a violation of the exclusivity of the relationship in the presence. Premarital sexual intimacy with another person is not only a violation of the feeling of the spouse's in being the sole one, but also the feeling the to have priority and to belong exclusively to his or her spouse, and as mentioned above, even the denial of the married way of life. All this is very important, since the first sexual relationship is associated with the formation of a serious bond and a major psychological transformation, especially for girls. In fact, biologically and by the laws of nature, carnal

relations are 'marriages', since they result in transforming the individual both hormonally and psychologically, and they create a strong bond between the parties. Nature does everything in its power to keep the couple together, because if they are going to have a child, this togetherness is very important for all of them, but especially for the child and the mother. In the old days, aptly enough, it was called a 'wild marriage'. Thus, we can say that premarital sex is both a denial of matrimony and a betrayal of the future spouse, and it hurts the women's equality and dignity, because in premarital sex for the asymmetries mentioned above, the woman is more vulnerable.

In our environment we often see girls in the age group of 25 to 40 who live with their partner for 3 to 5 or even 7 to 10 years waiting for their partner to commit. As mentioned above, the biological clock of women and men is different. It is much easier for a 35-year-old man to find a suitable wife than for a 35-year-old woman to find a suitable husband. For men, this seems to be a good and comfortable situation. The end of the story is that after a while she often refuses to wait any longer and they break up. The girl then finds someone else again whom she is comfortable with, but who does not want to commit, and eventually it may also happen that she will no longer have a chance to find a husband and will be left alone, while her man will marry a girl in her twenties or early twenties. The story is quite common, deeply sad, and the man's action is shockingly selfish and inhuman. Free love makes the man very selfish and obviously changes the woman too in some way. Under such circumstances, it is natural that the relationship between the sexes deteriorates. It goes without saying that marriages will be contracted later when the marrying partners are older, that there will be fewer marriages, that the number of divorces and the number of so called "mosaic families" will skyrocket, that there will not be enough children, that a large number of children will be born out of wedlock, that the 'single' lifestyle will proliferate, that there will be a large number of mental illnesses, that there will be many abortions, that there will be many problematic children, and that there will be a significant increase in the harmful practice of pushing the individual in the forefront instead of the community. It is interesting to note that often even among politicians it is now fashionable to present many of these things in a positive light, as modern values to be followed! They even have the face to add – mistakenly or deceptively, of course – that this serves the cause of women's equality! If we do not change these things drastically, we will be marching towards our destruction.

It is interesting from a cultural point of view the way the Bible describes marriage – both in the Old Testament and the New Testament – as "a man leaves his father, his mother, clings to his wife and the two become one flesh". Nowadays, thanks to the 'sexual revolution', this is also practiced by many self-proclaimed Christians as 'the man joins his girlfriends, and many become one flesh'. This is a denial and mockery of the Christian anthropological model and therefore of Christianity. Of course, this hurts even the foundation of female equality and emancipation. Let me quote here from Rod Dreher's book titled "St Benedict's Crossroads", which has become the second most popular religious book on the world market in recent decades after St John Paul II's "The Theology of the Body". Ron Dreher writes: "Sexual practice became so central in Christian life that when believers abandon the true faith teachings about this issue, one practically cannot call them Christians anymore." "God intended sex to unite a man and a woman physically and spiritually. However, with improper use, sex can be one of the most destructive forces in the world." "For a Christian, there is only one way one may enjoy the gift of sex: in marriage between a man and a woman. Today there is no other central teaching of the Christian faith that gained more unpopularity. And perhaps, there is no other that would be more important to obey." "Christianity has taught that the body is sacred, and that since God created all men in his own image, the dignity they possess requires that the body be treated accordingly. This is the reason why the modern-day paganization that has been called sexual revolution can never be

reconciled with the true Christian faith. Sadly, on a cultural level, this revolution has shattered the authority of the church, and now it is shaking its very foundations.” “The fact is that the rejection of the Christian teaching on sex removes the very factor that provides – or perhaps only provided? – the energy of social force embedded in Christianity.” “Philip Rief has identified the sexual revolution as a major sign of the demise of Christianity.” “We are past the sexual revolution, and it has had nothing less than disastrous effects on Christianity. It has almost struck at the heart of biblical teachings on sex and the human person. It destroyed the fundamental Christian understanding of society, families, and the nature of humans. Christianity and the sexual revolution cannot be reconciled, for they are radically opposed to each other.” The author of the present article agrees with all this, of course, but adds that unfortunately the ‘sexual revolution’ is not yet behind us, for today it also manifests in global form and is attacking on new fronts, but as I had said before, these will be dealt with in a future paper.

Finally, here are some reasons why a married couple should be considered a family:

(i) The couple is the basic unit of society. It is matrimony, where they are permanently and lovingly committed, where the person is fulfilled and reaches his or her healthy wholeness, that is becomes the basic element of a married couple. It is this definitive loving relationship that gives a new dimension to the fulfilment of man, making him feel at home and secure in the world. This union, which strengthens and gives security to both parties, should be considered the basic cell of the society, and it is called the family.

(ii) It is the marriage where the presence of two genders has meaning, and it is only in this relationship that they can fully develop and provide a safe, permanent, and ideal nest for their future children. The child is their fruit, but not the primary subject of this love relationship.

(iii) The individual is the basic element of society. The family is the basic cell of society. As we have seen, the married couple is also the basic unit, or in other words the basic cell of society. Thus, the married couple is also a family.

(iv) Language also refers to this, since we speak of childless families, that is of married couple who have no children. The time to start a family is the wedding. So, through the wedding the family is created.

(v) If a child is born only of a cohabitation-based relationship, then by the above definition, a family is a mother and her child, a family is a father and his child, but together they do not form a single family. However, it is very important for a child to be conceived, being born and raised in a family based on marriage, which, according to surveys, provides much better conditions than those offered by parents who choose other forms of cohabitation. A child’s basic need is the unconditional love of his or her parents towards each other that comes only from marriage. It is the married status itself that gives a qualitatively new standard to its members and to the society, so is there a reason why we shouldn’t call the married couple the basic cell of society, that is a family?

(vi) The primary reason of the crisis surrounding the family life is the breakdown of the image of marriage on a societal scale. Therefore, marriage should be highlighted on as many levels as possible. One level is to consider the married couple as a family, yet not the couples living in other relationships. If the couple is considered by the society as a family, it is already a valid moral support of the institution of the marriage.

(vii) Europe is in serious trouble and consumer societies elsewhere are also in serious trouble. The most fundamental reason is the weakening of the image of marriage which began decades ago. In the so-called consumer societies, an anthropological crisis has emerged, caused by the disintegration of the generally accepted and expected absolute monogamy-based marriage module. In its place a chaos of selfish relationships has emerged. It would be in society's vital interest to support marriage, and indeed the absolute monogamy module. It is therefore beneficial to support and elevate the institution of marriage. Therefore, it would be helpful to consider the married couple as a family.

(viii) If we presume that a family is created only when there are already children, it becomes questionable at what point in time this would be. At the conception? The exact date of conception is often unknown. Then at a certain age of the fetus? But then at how many months? Or, only when the child has already been born? Since there are several dates for the 'arrival' of the child, it is not practical to link the creation of a family to the 'arrival' of the child. And if the fetus or the child dies, is it no longer a family? How about if one parent dies? Do the other parent and the child form a family? If the child dies, why shouldn't the two parents form a family? If the two parents, whose child has died, both form a family, why would they not form a family without a child, just as a married couple?

(ix) It is interesting that the Bible (both Old and New Testaments) says that the married couple represents the new quality, for example, "and the two shall be one flesh. From now on there are no longer two bodies, but one" /Mark 10:8/. If the family is the basic cell of society, then it is also appropriate to call a married couple a family in the Christian culture. According to Pope St. John Paul II in The Theology of the Body, it is the marriage where man receives the divinity of the Trinity, for the husband, the wife and their love relationship are like the love relationship of the Trinity. In marriage a new unity is achieved. The married couple becomes the basic cell of society and has now earned to be called a family.

Summary:

Europe and the Western world have allowed and in certain ways even supported the discrediting and trashing the institution and the sacrament of marriage: the institution from which all advanced civilizations, including the European and Western civilizations, have evolved and which has sustained them. They have allowed the deception and lies by some people who misled their societies to manipulate what marriage was created for, the pursuit of only one sexual partner. By rejecting chastity-based marriage based (absolute monogamy), they have thrown away one of the most essential elements of their culture! Who knows if they can still be recovered? However, it is already proven that if not, our culture will soon be lost! Science, politics, the civil world, and the churches should all unite to recreate the demand for chastity-based marriage (absolute monogamy)!

So far, we have only talked about the abolishment and the need of restoring one of the pillars of marriage, the absolute monogamy. Today, however, a powerful group of the major representatives of the 'modern' society is also making strong attacks on the other pillars of marriage and are exalting their own human- and culture-destroying achievements as 'modern values'. This will be examined in some forthcoming papers.

Considering that the chastity-based marriage (absolute monogamy) is indispensable both for the physical and mental health of the individual and for the development, survival, and prosperity of advanced societies, we can conclude that anyone who opposes chastity-based marriage (absolute monogamy), or even marriage deprived of absolute monogamy, claiming that even that is better than any other form of cohabitation, is committing a crime against humanity! This will be discussed in more detail in another paper.

If all this is understood by the leaders of countries and churches, for example the by leaders of the European Union and North America, then there is hope for the survival of these countries, Europe. and North America. Otherwise, however, the prevailing lack of relationship-based culture and the anti-human, anti-civilization, false or deceptive relationship ideologies, that today dominate, will eradicate the present culture. What will come in its place and who will survive and how the surviving people will live afterwards.

We should realize that the survival of our civilization, our individual happiness and health is unthinkable unless we return to a society based on absolute monogamy. Without achieving this the demographic crisis cannot be defused in a humane way.

References:

Demographic winter – the decline of the human family (2008)

<http://gloria.tv/?media=134357&language=DGtkouwHWmP>, SRB Documentary, LLC, USA, Acuity Productions.

Dreher Rod (2017) The Benedict Option. A Strategy for Christians in a Post-Christian Nation. Book.

Durston Kirk (2021) Thoughts about God, truth and beauty, Why sexual morality may be far more important than you ever thought. <https://www.kirkdurston.com/blog/unwin>

Fagan Patrick (2017) The most important correlation in all of social science.

https://www.mercatornet.com/family_edge/view/the-most-important-correlation-in-all-of-social-science/19344#sthash.aPOEKn1c.dpuf

Kuby Gabriele (2013) The Global Sexual Revolution. Destruction of freedom in the name of freedom. Book. United States. Angelico Press.2015.

Mascher Konstantin (2005) [Sex and Culture. Eine Untersuchung von Joseph D. Unwin.](#) In: DIJG-Bulletin 1/2005.

Mascher Konstantin (2009) Is Sex a Private Matter only? Sex, Sublimation and its Effect on Society – an Introduction to the Work of J. D. Unwin

Nitsche Walter (2001) A szeretetet tanulni kell. Keresztyén Ismeretterjeszt? Alapítvány.

Nock L. Steven (1995) A Comparison of marriages and cohabiting relationships. Journal of Family Issues 16, 1, 53-76.

Unwin Joseph Daniel (1934) Sex and Culture. Book, Oxford University Press.

Watt Alan (2011) How to manipulate the human mind. <https://www.vilaghelyzete.com/2011/08/az-emberi-psziche-manipulalasa.html?fbclid=IwAR1HfLoB-ekE76Ozf1ez-6rpJbTQx8qQRPYdcBN55ix4c6tODR-qXxCjNJK>

Marcuse, Herbert (1955) Eros and Civilization. Book.

Date Created

October 2021

Author

hamar-laszlo