Taboo

(July 2024)

It can hardly be maintained that, for all intents and purposes, the climactic activities of one's procreative organs are not considered *Taboo* outside private individual quarters or the conjugal alcove.

For those in doubt, suffice it to observe that children around the breakfast table on Sunday mornings do not usually inquire about their parents' amorous gamboling of the night prior, nor fathers about those of their married or celibate daughters, and neither are solitary activities ever mentioned, let alone described, in the parental household, nor in the public place for that matter.

Similarly, the copulatory preferences and *Kamasutra* predilections of parents and children alike are, in general, rather vehemently ignored by their relatives, if not totally.

However, it seems that as soon as amorous activities involve two individuals sporting the same chromosomic arrangement ¹, the *Taboo* vanishes and everyone and his cousin is willing to comment freely on the subject, openly and in the public forum.

The author of these lines, who does not think he is entitled to voice the slightest opinion on the genital preferences of others, which he thinks can hardly affect his own life, let alone be any of his business, is perplexed by the vanishing of the *Taboo* in such cases.

He suggests that the *Taboo* omission may reveal some concealed perversion of the public psyche.

He proposes that a genteel *Taboo* be restored, as for any other amorous penchant.

¹ The author will avoid the usual word "homosexual", a neologism of the late 19th century, which is both a barbarism employing roots from both Latin and Greek, and an oxymoron, since the word "sex" implies "section", thus marking the difference between genders. A better choice of word would be "homosynous".

Authors and artists of the time found the word "homosexual" abhorrent, not for moral, but for aesthetic and linguistic reasons, in the same fashion that most of them abhorred the newly built Eiffel Tower, which, although impressive structurally, especially in 1889, could hardly be deemed beautiful by the aesthete (see link).