This article has little to do with what fallows in this site. It is an exercise in our thinking to demonstrate how tradition affects our thinking and how an enemy uses tradition to justify themselves. This is not an attempt to forbid same sex relationships for it is a measure of our psychological and cultural problems of identity. Since the Supreme Court refused to take up five states seeking to overturn appellate court rulings in favor of gay marriage, the reasoning of the court is to decide by not deciding. Not intended to dwell on any moral principle, this article shows the errors of our state traditions. More important it demonstrates how we should correctly define our cultural identity. OOOO First, we must ask an important question, “Why do same sex couples want to be married?” Obviously, culture places value on marriage. If a culture placed value on sex and Hollywood certainly helps in this regard, almost everyone wants to participate. We place value on wealth and success so every soul seeks it. When the grass is greener on the other side, we want to possess it. Can you blame same sex relationships for wanting to have the same symbol of love we culturally assign to marriage? OOOO With that being said we need to ask another question, “Who originated marriage and why?” Who is not the issue, but why is fundamentally the answer to our cultural identity. It is perfectly justified to say that God instituted marriage. Since we like it so much and place great value on it, others who we normally cast out will want it if they can justify it. Our culture has put so much taboo on sex outside of marriage that any relationship will want to be justified. So why did God institute marriage. The answer is simple, procreation—to multiply and replenish the earth. Is this not also nature’s argument? Perhaps God should have instigated a license to procreate and not a license to wed. If our culture specified the right of procreation rather than the right to love, would the gay community push as hard for equal rights? Even gay couples might want to participation in procreation by insemination and adoption. Our culture puts so many symbols of love in the wedding arena that every same sex couple’s love for one another wants to prove their love with the same cultural identity we give marriage. Marriage has become a measure of love and has diminished the right to procreate. OOOO Now consider the state. The government gave many privileges to heterosexual couples. Would not homosexual couples desire the same? No matter how you look at it, government created a supply in demand scenario that passed on to business and nonprofit institutions further aggravating the problem. The real issue as far at the state or any government is to protect each person from the harm of another. Our constitution created a bill of rights that protected each citizen from our own government and from any law that is not equitable. First comes the equal rights amendment and then it is followed by the gay rights initiative. Where is the legal president other than if they get something, why not us? The precedent is in the state issuing licenses to wed in the first place. Churches had cultural rules, but why did the state get involved unless the state assumed that religious tradition should be the states tradition. This was not only a mistake, but unconstitutional. Where in the world did states justify the control of marriage in the same way they justify the control in licensing the operations of a vehicle? What then defines the purpose of the state? Should they give likeness to procreate? OOOO We need to go back to the state’s reason for getting involve in the first place. When we realize no state should require a license to love or give benefits to any couple and not another. It is really quite simple. The state attempted to protect the rights of the unborn child. It required licenses to wed for this very reason, but out culture seems to attach other purposes such as the right to love in the marriage covenant. This is fine for the church, but not the state. The states responsibility is to the rights of the individual and not the couple regardless of the relationship. If lawmakers could see this then they might be able to make laws correctly. We have laws against heterosexual rape as well as homosexual rape if by force or without consent. Laws even go so far as to protect the minor from their own consent. Why cannot the sate come up with laws to protect every child or potential child and not the couple or group relationship? Does the state have the right to prevent a man from having seven woman companions or a woman from living with seven men? The state is responsible only to the individual that does not provide consent. Consent in relationships might be debatable at times, but the lack of consent of and unborn child comes under the protection of law. Abortion is another topic, but illustrates the direction we should think in defining marriage. OOOO Suppose the state required a license to commit a heterosexual act involving the possible creation of a child. This becomes impractical, but making a law to affect behavior, the state can impose a fine if pregnancy arises in order to give equal opportunity to the child. During World War II, many Jews lived in forest camps during much of the war. One of the rules expressed, “No Pregnancies.” The state can properly do the same unless the participants sign standard contracts to protect the child in possibility of any new birth. This removes the license to love and places it into the realm of responsibility. That was the purpose of a license to wed, but religious tradition imposed a cultural image of romance to the contract. The church has its own covenant that require the individual to obey or suffer rejection of the church. Why should the state simply adopt the same covenant? Is this not a violation of religious liberties if the participants are atheistic or of a religion that does not believe in the covenant used. Even if a couple makes a religious covenant the state, cannot enforce that covenant without a written and sign contract by both parties. What if a written and signed contract was all that the state required and in that contract was the protection of any unborn child regardless of the type of relationship. Taking the romance out of a contract and insisting designated responsibilities would do a great deal for our culture. Keep the marriage ceremony and its promise to love in the hands of one’s religious persuasion. OOOO Perhaps we might understand why the Supreme Court does not want to hear the issue. States need to abolish the marriage license and require standard contracts signed and witnessed by the parties concerned. This alone provides the right to procreate, adopt, or whatever. Call the contract “Conditions of Procreation and Child Nurturing.” This standard contract then has the teeth of the law and protects the unborn child. Love is a romantic and religious matter. If every state rewrote their laws correctly and left the wedding nostalgia to the churches with no requirements by the stare to authorize the marriage or the one officiating in the marriage, we might do much better. If a pregnancy develops without a contract there is a fine directed to the parties involved. If minors are involved then the state issuers the appropriate punishment and fines to the parents equal to the cost delivering a healthy child. Abortion should not limit the punishment or the fines. Our problem as a state is we adopt religious belief in our laws. Individuals should learn to think twice because of the state law and not because of some moral guilt. If we fulfill our legal commitments and accept our responsibility and judgments with pleasure that we might overcome, God will forgive. OOOO **Gods Marriage Covenant:** It is reasonable to suppose that God created the marriage covenant for similar reasons as the state. For the sake of the children, both mother and father make a covenant to continue a loving relationship until death for the sake of social good. The social good imposed by the state often follows the design of Satan and less that of the Lord, so it behooves us to limit the states responsibility to the rights of each individual and avoid the social justice so many claim the responsibility of the state. Allow contracts to rule outside of individual rights. With God contracts rule indefinably. When you study both the Greek Orthodox and the Mormon tradition, eternal marriage is present. The marriage between nuns and Jesus Christ is the eternal marriage in the Catholic Church. With this in mind, we can consider the Mormon marriage covenant in order to set a foundation for the next article. This covenant comes from Section 132 and indicates the Lord provides power through the Holy Spirit of Promise to seal one up unto eternal life through the marriage covenant. The apostle Paul mentions the Holy Spirit of Promise on several occasions to explain the grace one receives. Mormons also provide the principle of plural wives seal to a prophet as a basis of eternal salvation in the same way nuns are eternally bound to Christ. The question asked is for what purpose. OOOO Brigham Young comes along and says for raising up a righteous seed or bring more spirits to Mormonism. This became Brigham Young’s justification, but he also suggested many wives would make it essential to propagate the future worlds of which he intended to be a God. First consider Malachi. “Yet ye say, Wherefore? Because the Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet *is* she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth” (Malachi 2:14–15). Two principle come from Malachi. The first is a godly seed comes from one wife and second there was a residue of spirts to be born yet God made one.” Was this a prophecy of the Mormons misunderstanding the purpose of marriage? If not what is the purpose of many wives of the prophets of old. In the revelation, the Lord said that in nothing did Moses, David or Solomon sin save in the case of Uriah when David sent him in battle to die in order to receive Bathsheba for himself. The Lord specifies these wives, given by the hand of the prophets, continues out of the world. OOOO A carnal man would then consider sex and procreation the primary function and would justify himself in this manner. Brigham Young decides that the procreation of spirits came from resurrected men and their wives. He considered this as the works of Abraham. From this tradition, the Mormon Church considers the Gospel of Abraham as the practice of the eternal marriage covenant because the Lord referred to Abraham in the revelation and told him that his seed would become as innumerable as the sand of the seashore and that he would inherit his wives out of the world. By assuming procreation in the resurrected world, Brigham Young justified polygamy. If procreation does not exist in the world of spirits, Brigham Young incorrectly applied the principle of a plurality of wives and there had to be another reason for inheriting these wives out of the world or Christ inheriting his wives out of the world in the case of the nuns and the Catholic Church. OOOO **The Nature of Intelligence:** “Man was also in the beginning with God. Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made, neither indeed can be. All truth is independent in that sphere in which God has placed it, to act for itself, as all intelligence also; otherwise there is no existence” (Doctrine and Covenants 93:29–30). If intelligence is not created or made and man was in the beginning with God, then intelligence evolves in each individual from some lower level or state to the point that he can learn from God. This implies individual identity with freedom to decide for ourselves. This is the act of intelligence. “Whatever principle of intelligence we attain unto in this life, it will rise with us in the resurrection. And if a person gains more knowledge and intelligence in this life through his diligence and obedience than another, he will have so much the advantage in the world to come” (Doctrine and Covenants 130:18–19). This certainly implies that intelligence increases and if it increased, perhaps if neglected it can decrease. It all depends on how we think. “…if there be two spirits, and one shall be more intelligent than the other, yet these two spirits, notwithstanding one is more intelligent than the other, have no beginning; they existed before, they shall have no end, they shall exist after, for they are gnolaum, or eternal. And the Lord said unto me: These two facts do exist, that there are two spirits, one being more intelligent than the other; there shall be another more intelligent than they; I am the Lord thy God, I am more intelligent than they all” (Abraham 3:18–19). This also supports the eternal and evolutional nature of intelligence. We cannot create intelligence. Also a spirit is intelligence that has no beginning. One spirit is more intelligent than another is. This explains why the Lord chooses the great ones for his purposes: “Now the Lord had shown unto me, Abraham, the intelligences that were organized before the world was; and among all these there were many of the noble and great ones; And God saw these souls that they were good, and he stood in the midst of them, and he said: These I will make my rulers; for he stood among those that were spirits, and he saw that they were good; and he said unto me: Abraham, thou art one of them; thou wast chosen before thou wast born” (Abraham 3:22–23). We can derive certain facts from the above if true. Individual identity Intelligences were organized, there were noble and great ones, God saw and knew these souls and was in the mist of them, and the Lord called them spirits. Thus, spirit, soul and intelligence link together as one identity separate from another. If God does not create intelligence then God does not create spirits or souls. The traditional Mormon became so carnal from the doctrines of Brigham Young that they assume that procreation comes from resurrected beings that gather an intelligence and make a spirit body, which in turn procreates into a physical body, by mortal beings. If the body or our spirit is the same as the body of our intelligence, then Mormons assume incorrectly and eternal marriage has a purpose other than procreation. OOOO If intelligence is both masculine and feminine then these different personalities nurture evolving intelligence. If an exalted being has many wives it only means a greater need of that feminine traits becomes paramount in training young intelligences. This does not diminish individual masculine intelligence any more than in mortal existence. We probably have to admit that the desire for sexual intercourse resides in the mortal world only, otherwise our world would die from a lack of procreation. The two universes differ in physical processes. One is entropic, but procreation renews it and the law of conservation maintains it. The other is antientropic and evolutionary towards law, conservation and order. The feminine and masculine natures in both are as eternal as intelligence. The state, like the entropic universe, must maintain itself by law and provide freedom to the human spirit that tries to evolve. Forcing any good by the state will only depress freedom. Laws protecting the right to aspire will fulfill the purpose of mortality.
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