

Premarital sex and promiscuity



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

This essay will be discussing the topic of promiscuity and premarital sex from both Elliston's and Punzo's theories. According to Punzo on Premarital sex, it is for two people to have engaged in a sexual contact/intercourse without having the full commitment but on the other hand, promiscuity according to Elliston it is to have sex with many different people without having any commitment. When comparing both, Punzo is seen as the conservative while Elliston is seen as supporting casual sex. Punzo's theory is when two people are together having sex they both must be engaged in a deep commitment between the two people. On the other hand, Elliston is arguing that sexual intercourse doesn't require any thoughts or strong consideration with any commitments since it is not that big of a deal.

According to Elliston promiscuity is seen as free love, where you can just meet someone and starting to fall in love with them. With this definition, it might be easier for some to understand it, as having freedom. It can also be recognized as having recreational sex, having sex just for fun. When the word fun comes with anything, it will be seen as attractive and easy going. Elliston has created a definition himself that better defined promiscuity. "Promiscuity is defined as sex with a series of other adults not directly related through marriage and with no commitments; no promises of affection, sexual exclusivity in future" (Elliston 144).

Elliston also stated that for those who just want to get others in bed to have sex by lying, exploiting, and deceiving or something close to it are wrong. It is seen as wrong because it breaches the ethical principles that we all learned as a child, which is not to lie. When someone is lying about everything just because they are trying to get someone in bed to have sex

with them, it is seen as very unethical. Promiscuity is seen as to the advantage of males and to the disadvantage of females because it is true that males do not have anything to lose while females will lose their virginity and at times their love. It has become exploitive; woman would get social blame but man would get sexual satisfaction. Promiscuity is not actually wrong but it is the double standard that is in places where woman is at a disadvantage in comparison to man. Promiscuity can not be defined as wrong all the time; the charges that it necessarily violates generally accepted a moral principle is false." (Elliston 146). Elliston is saying that the double standard that should be remove but not the promiscuity, since it is always seen as a disadvantage for woman. The female involved might not feel the same as to being cheated or being used for the man to have their sexual satisfaction but it might be the woman who is using the man to satisfy herself.

Sex is just a body language in the form of body interaction between the two people that are willing to interact and it leads to pleasure. It also has a deep meaning behind it. According o Elliston, " sex is more than thrusts and moans, caresses and sighs...just as verbal language has a dimension of meaning beyond phonemes and morphemes, so body language has a significance beyond the intertwining of two bodies...Promiscuity has instrumental value in that it can facilitate the mastery of one kind of body language...sexual body language is learned through sexual interaction... experiences enable an individual to develop a repertoire of gestures for communicating desire and affection and of decisive movements that clearly state intentions of love or amusement. People can be moved not only by the

things we say but also by the things we do-with them, for them, or to them... desire and satisfaction can be communicated not only through verbal exchanges, but also through a lingering look and an appreciative caress. To a shattered ego a physical embrace may express far more reassurance than its verbal counterparts, and a kiss may convey desire more eloquently than pleas or poems...The observance of this etiquette is an acknowledgement of the selfhood of the other. The acquisition of it is one of the opportunities promiscuity provides"(Elliston 149). Based on this quote, Elliston is saying sex is a part of body language and the more you practice it the better you will get. The skills that you get from promiscuity will wider range of people outside of marriage or committed-relationships. Usually a married couple would be seen as only one man is allow to have dinner with one woman, which is referring to only having sex with the partner and that is it, third party is not acceptable (traditionally). Elliston sees having sex with one person at first before you decide to love that person or not. Pretty much he is saying having sex first will be a pre-stage of trying out whether the person's sexual skill or chemistry from sexual intercourse will help you decide to love this person or not. Therefore Elliston is arguing that promiscuity should be allow and should not be seen as wrong because it is something for the two to try out and see if the chemistry is there.

In Punzo's view, sex before marriage or even having sex with no commitment is seen as wrong. Punzo has answered the question of is having pre-martial sex without any commitment wrong, with using Wilson's theory of " sexual intercourse" to compare it with playing tennis and Chesser's theory of two people going to see movies together. Both Wilson and Chesser

see it normal and there is nothing morally wrong about having pre-marital sex. At the same time, Punzo has disagreed with both of them stating that going to the movies or playing tennis with many people are just some general activities which anyone can encounter, but it does not necessary have to be the one you would have sex with, or have any sexual interest with. In Punzo's view, sexual intercourse must be between two committed people, so having sex without any sort of commitment is wrong. Punzo states that commitment is a must before sex, as one must agree to commit to a relationship before they can move on to a new level in their relationship, through having sex, the two gives themselves to each other in the way of trust, expressing one's mind, and feelings through the most intimate activity, sexual intercourse.

Punzo see Elliston's argument between sex and dinning is a wrong example because dinning and sex are two different things, it is in an extreme that it has nothing to do with each other, dinning and sex has no connection at all. Dinning can be with any friends, or family members, and it does not involve any sexual contacts. Yes, dining can be with your spouse, partner but it can also be with someone else. Both eating and sex do give people satisfaction, but they are totally different from each other. Food is a need for people to survive but people can live with out sex. Elliston's theory is to have sexual intercourse with as many people as you can before falling in love, but Punzo's theory is to be in love or have the necessary commitment before having sexual intercourse. The moral perspectives of both are totally different from each other. This is why Punzo would not agree with Elliston and vice versa.

Elliston's argument has a defect to it, it is having sex with a number of people does not only increase the skills of one's sexual ability, but it also limits the important value of having the most intimate relationship with the other through sexual intercourse. I believe we all know that having sex with the one we love is the most loving and special feeling of being complete as a whole. If one is engaged in a sexual activity with many other people and then stated that the one is now in love with their partner is not a rational theory, but it is also very confusing and unreasonable that promiscuity does not damage a committed relationship. Having sex without any commitment, and isolate oneself with uncommitted sex is a view that may not be true. They can have sex without any commitment but they might realize more about themselves. It doesn't mean they are isolating themselves just because they do not involve in a committed relationship. Punzo's full commitment does not have a clear definition, does it mean to be in a legal marriage with legal documents, and so if the two are just common-law couple then does that mean they are not legal? Punzo should have clear that term and have a better explanation of it. With the mutual understanding and respects towards each other with pre-marital sex, it is not going to affect the two negatively. It would not be harm if pre-marital sex will lead the two into commitment and onto future commitment, it would become a good thing. If pre-marital sex is happening then protection is needed to prevent any unexpected or unwanted pregnancy.

In conclusion, both Punzo and Elliston has their pros and cons. Premarital sex should follow Punzo's theory of sex, and they must involve commitment, but not with 'full commitment'. Punzo did not clarify what full commitment

means, if it meant at the stage of being legally married, then those who are only engaged or soon to be marry couples should not be having any sexual interactions. Also promiscuity must be permitted only if no one is being hurt and lie to as a result of promiscuity. It is true that Elliston's argument of double standard needs to be remove because it is only seen as woman being the one that are at a disadvantage, but sometimes it is not the case, woman would be out to lie to man just to get money or any material that need from the man. Therefore double standard should be remove but not promiscuity. Also promiscuity is a good way to practice one's sexual skills and ability in the bed, it is true to the term " practice makes prefect", it would suit this practice of promiscuity closely.