

Next Up: Legalization of Incest, Necrophilia, Pedophilia, Zoophilia and More

By destroying the institution of marriage, the “gay rights” LBGQTI movement made possible the extension of similar “legal rights” for other “lifestyle choices,” including zoophilia, consanguinamorous relationships, necrophilia, pedophilia, polygamy, and every other “fluid” sexual preference or identification—including sologamy and trans-polyamorous relationships.

Efforts to normalize sex with animals as an accepted lifestyle choice resulted in one documentary winning an award this year that idolizes a sexual relationship between a man and his bottlenose dolphin lover.

The 40-year movement to legalize sexual interaction with children is working. People are publicly advocating *without shame*: “I’m a pedophile, but not a monster;” and, “pedophilia is natural and normal for males.”

Now, incest activists in the consanguinamorous community argue it’s their turn to have their sexual preference and lifestyle choice validated socially and legally.

Because of a case in New Mexico that’s making national headlines, incest activists argue exactly what homosexuals argued to normalize incest.

“I was born this way.”

“I can’t choose who I love.”

“I have a right to be happy just like everyone else.”

"We aren't hurting anyone."

"Who is the government to legislate love?"

Incest activists maintain that all sexual preferences and acts should be legal if they are consensual and don't harm anyone. More importantly, the government should not be legislating love.

Christina Shy, an incest activist who runs an advocacy and support website for consanguinamorous people, and is in a relationship with her half-brother, argues that incest "needs to be brought to the attention of everybody in the country and people need to start thinking differently. It was the same with gay people just a few years ago and now they can get married they are accepted. Well why not consanguinamorous people like us? We are all adults. We are not pedophiles, there's no domestic issue. We are in love, we want to be together, but we are related. That shouldn't be a deciding factor."

She's right—if sex is consensual among adults in the privacy of their own home—how is it wrong or even illegal?

How is consensual sex between two adult men different than consensual sex between adult brothers and sisters or adult mothers and sons? If two adult men can legally marry each other, why can't consensual adult incestuous couples?

Why should one consensual relationship be denied and another legal?

Incestuous adults aren't coercing anyone. They are knowingly making choices about their own bodies, so why does anyone have a problem with it? It's really none of anyone else's business.

If transgender people in America, who represent less than half of one percent of the population, can have the government dictate bathroom policies for non-transgender people in public

schools and stores, why won't the government legalize consanguinamorous relationships?

Homosexuals, who represent less than 3 percent of the population in America, can legally marry and adopt children, why can't incestuous, polygamists, pedophiles and zoophiles?

If morality and laws are determined by personal preferences (that are fluid and always changing) to justify societal norms, why is a different standard being used to legislate incest, necrophilia or pedophilia than that of same-sex relationships?

Incestuous relationships are mutually consensual, therefore they should be legal. (The same reasoning can be applied to murder. Surely, if two people agree to murder someone, in fact a group of people consent to murder another group of people, their consent justifies their action, which should therefore legalize murder.)

The same goes for polygamy. And necrophilia.

Why is having sex with dead people wrong? The corpse doesn't care. It's dead. It doesn't hurt the corpse; it doesn't even know what's happening. Granted, it can't consent to the sexual act, but that doesn't matter because there are enough necrophiliacs to argue that their sexual preference is normal.

When it comes to not hurting anyone, incest activists argue that abortion is legal, so again, what standard is being used to legislate harm to another person?

They are right. If a baby has no constitutional rights, and adults do, why can't the adults, who aren't harming anyone else, be together?

Practicing homosexuality used to be illegal. Now gays can marry. Times have changed, so who has the audacity to suggest that incest is not the new normal of the 21st century family?

Or bestiality?

“Non-human animals have incestuous relationships and multiple partners,” some activists argue. Likewise, it’s well-known that kings and queens had incestuous relationships for centuries to ‘keep their bloodline pure.’

So, who is the government to legislate love? Everyone has the right to love whomever they choose. All love is equal. How is heterosexual love better than incestuous love or being in love with multiple partners?

As the defendant in the New Mexico case argues, as to why he should be allowed to love, have sex with and even marry his mother, he says: “This is about whether I have the right to love someone. And I sure (expletive) have the right to love Monica. You can’t tell people who to love or who not to love.”

His mother’s name, Monica, could easily be “Matthew,” the name of a brother, father, uncle or homosexual boyfriend.

No love is wrong.

Gay rights activists and corrupt politicians who chose to legalize same-sex marriage and transgender bathroom policies, have no justification to prevent the legalization other sexual behavior.