

Jazzy r

[Family](#), [Divorce](#)



Jazzy R Professor KKK Literary Analysis- A True, right and just sexual ethic 10
December 2012 Infidelity, Broken Relationships, Marriage and Divorce “

Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give unto your bosom. For the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again (Nelson). " In today's modern society such virtues that were heralded in the past as founding principles to ensure sexual morality in cultivating strong relationships are today no less than despised. There used to be time when relationships of all kinds were built on the foundations of trust, love, honesty, commitment and a mutual respect for each other especially the marriage relationship. However in today's open ended society, it is common practice for a friend or family member to secretly hook up with a married person or a person that they know is already involved with someone close to them or that is liked by someone close to them. Practices of such disregard for another person's emotions, wellbeing & trust while pursuing selfish gains and pleasures have shown themselves to be the driving force behind ruined friendships, relationships & marriage relationships that end in divorce as well as a threat to the social welfare of society when practiced by a great percentage of the populace. The effects of violating basic principles of trust, love, honesty, self & mutual respect and commitment has increased the chances of contracting sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDs; unwanted & unplanned pregnancies, abortion. Feelings of regret, guilt and shame are the common aftermath of uncommitted sex or disregard for sexual morality. Casual sex outside of marriage or in violation of marriage can be a corrupting influence. When there is no respect for sexual morality,

people will lie, cheat, betray friends and family to get sex or gain someone or something that they feel belongs to them even at the expense of losing a friend, family member and one's self-respect. " In one group of 75 middle class 19 year old male students, 65% admitted getting a young woman drunk to have sex, more than 40% had used verbal intimidation and 20% had used force or threats of violence. In a study with from the University of California done on students, found that a quarter of the men who were sexually active in non-committed relationships were involved with more than one person at a time and their partner didn't know (Mosher and Anderson). "

When people treat others without regard to their worth & feelings or as sex objects to be exploited, they end up debasing themselves. As one who was raised with Christian principles and beliefs, I was taught that marriage is a sacred institution put in place by God to ensure the emotional, psychological, spiritual & physical safety of the individuals involved. The teachings also ingrained in me that marriage wasn't only a sacred institution between two people consenting to a life together but it was a way to ensure that the children who were conceived within the confines of marriage were raised in a structured environment that mirrored through the parent's actions the definition of a healthy, strong relationship. I was also raised to be an honest woman, treating people the way I would want to be treated, not gaining anything in my life at the expense of someone else's feelings or loss intentionally or secretly. I was also taught that trust, honesty, love, faith and respect are key principles to obtaining, nurturing and maintaining health friendships, relationships and marriage. All of my life principles from an early child are based on a Christian foundation. However, when I studied the

causes of destroyed friendships, broken relationships, and marriages that ended in divorce, I found that even those relationships founded on Christian principles dissolved just as quickly as one founded without Christian principles when faced with the challenges of temptation, lying, betrayal & selfish pursuit without regards anyone else or at the expense of another person. My research reflected that it wasn't hard to end a relationship back then as it is today in modern society especially when it was the man ending the relationship. One would think that in traditional relationships it was easier to dissolve of a friendship, relationship or marriage relationship because there was a standard that helped to make such dissolution of such relationships including marriage harder because religious principles were dominant & enforced in past societies and interwoven into everyday life & business practices. Through most of history the reasons for divorce & dissolution of relationships were quite different than today and access to it was often unequal. In patriarchal societies of the ancient world, divorce was a man's right for whatever reason that he chose and polygamy was a practiced prerogative as well. For example, " Malaysia & Indonesia had the highest divorce rate in the beginning of the 20th century but in the Japanese culture a letter of 3 ½ lines was all a man needed to divorce his wife while if a woman wanted to divorce her husband, she had to put in two years of service at a special temple before she could get a divorce. (Coontz) . "

Christianity in ancient times taught that a man was the greater in the relationship with a woman and that the husband was the head of the wife whose responsibility consisted of provision and security with no punishment for infidelity or adultery if he committed it within the relationship. Also in

Christianity practiced in the ancient world, if a man slept with a woman, he had to marry her or she would be shamed for life. A woman who slept with a man that wasn't her husband was stoned or put to death whereas a husband just received a smack on the wrist. A man in biblical times could put his wife away for any reason but a woman could not in turn put her husband away unless for the cause of adultery and even after was not permitted to remarry as long as her divorced husband was alive. However even though, such practices were permitted, men lived by a higher standard of principles back then when it came to relationships and commitment. Men tended to be more protective & accountable for what they considered was their responsibility, such as a friend, woman, family and children. In today's society, relationships have little value compared to traditional relationships where at least there was a sense of accountability to the person one was committed too through the bounds of marriage. As the world changed and moved from colonization to industrialization, the causes for divorce increased along with the accommodations, the only difference was the price, money, emotional & mental drain involved in the process of divorcing or ending a relationship. In Modern practices today, if a person wants to get a divorce, they have to retain a lawyer, state the causes for the divorce especially when children, outside partners, assets and money is involved. The person would have to go before a judge who would award to the violated party entitlements due to them from the disputed grounds of the divorce. However, contrary to modern practices, the early church in medieval Europe allowed divorce for several reasons. Some local church councils had the equivalent of no fault divorce in which a couple was allowed to part after

swearing that "communal life has become impossible between us" or that "there is no charity according to God" in the marriage. However, I have found that when it comes to any kind of relationship whether it be a friendship, commitment outside of marriage via dating or marriage, that each person involved has to take into account the social welfare of the other party involved and the individuals effected by that relationship. I once read, "All institutions (including marriage institutions) and laws find their justification for being in social welfare and the good of the individuals composing society. If the state is not essential for social welfare, then anarchism is a justifiable political theory. If the church does not enrich the moral and spiritual life of the people, then anti-ecclesiasticism becomes a virtue. If family life does not make for the happiness, stability, and culture of social life, then sexual promiscuity is justifiable. The state is not an end in itself, but exists for the protection of individual rights and the promotion of human welfare. The church is not an end in itself, but stands for spiritual culture, the propagation of religion, and social service. The family is not an end in itself, but exists for the ordered and lawful expression of love and the perpetuity of the race. Normal life begins, continues, and ends in the family. Monogamy is justified of her children. When any modification or serious change in family organization or life is proposed, we must insist upon its sure benefit to the social welfare. No immediate pleasure or profit to one or two individuals can count against the welfare and consequences to society at large (Delk). " If this is the case, then marriages are formed from relationships that start off when two people respect one another before being with one another. However not at the expense of betraying an innocent party otherwise

nothing good will come of the relationship. It is not something that will be blessed by God if the foundational principles that define a strong relationship are not honored which is, trust, love, honesty, self & mutual respect and commitment. This means that a man who is married is not justified in leaving a faithful wife for his secretary who got pregnant from the affair that he had with her or the friend who betrays a friendship by secretly dating a person that he or she knew their friend cared for & never tells or lies about it & believes that time will permit such betrayal to thrive without recompense. Nothing good can come of such deeds done behind closed doors and at the expense of people who love us, which is why the principles that surround marriage should be honored and practiced in not just marriage but all relationships, including friendships to ensure that the benefits that come from honoring sexual morality will be preserved for future generations. And again, " No immediate pleasure or profit to one or two individuals can count against the welfare and consequences to society at large (Delk). " " Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap (Nelson, Galatians 6: 7). " References: Coontz, Stephanie. " The Origins of Modern Divorce." *Family Process* (2007): 7. Delk, Edwin Heyl. " Divorce & Social Welfare." *Biblical World*, Vol 43, No1 January 1914: 33-43. The University of Chicago Press. Gies, F and G. Gies. *Marriage & the Family in the Middle Ages*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987. Mosher, D. L. and R. D Anderson. " Macho Personality, Sexual Aggression, and Reactions to Guided Imagery of Realistic Rape." *Journal of Research in Personality* (1986): 77. Nelson, Thomas. " Galatians 6: 7." Nelson, Thomas. *King James Bible*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1982. 1134. Nelson, Thomas. "

Luke 6: 38." Nelson, Thomas. King James Bible. Nashville, Tennessee:
Thomas Nelson, Inc. , 1982. 1002.