



The contemporary society is suffering from some significant changes, many of them for worst. Among these are the construction of the family, the homosexual liberality, and the culture of death, with abortion and euthanasia.

Given the enthusiasm and support of this "modernity," it is worth repeating: not every change is progress. We also forget that "modern" is provisional, leading to another modernity. If society takes retrograde, degenerative paths, it is no cause for satisfaction or a need to "adapt to changing times."

The case of the family is of unimaginable importance, on a medium and long term. Those who celebrate the destruction of the nuclear family—which social scientists see as the basis of all society—, and to be consistent with their desire to preserve this weakened society, and to support the modification of social norms and laws, they must then accept other changes.

So, with the advance of drug addiction and the great power of drug trafficking, organized crime, they should propose several things. First, that if the economic power of drug czars has been imposing on political control, then society should give them once and for all the power; why wait to take it by force. Likewise, the growing drug addiction, rather than fighting and educating the population about its damage, we should legalize and support it. All this sounds stupid? Of course, as stupid as celebrating and supporting the destruction of the traditional family.

It is said that the family "as we knew it" has been disappearing, resulting in dysfunctional families and "that is it." Also, it is said that since these dysfunctional families have become the rule, we must recognize the fact, accept it as a "reality," and change our concept of family. Absurd.

First, the human person has virtues and defects, strengths and weaknesses, good and bad times. This is reflected in its institutions, starting with the family. There has always been "dysfunctional" families, in which either there is only the father or mostly only a mother, but that does not mean that we must set out the world towards that. Wars, for example, have been almost the backbone of history, and have meant millions of dead men, parents. The legacy are matriarchal families by

unwanted need.

To think that the family is a disposable institution when we please, makes many young people marry not "until death do us part," but "until the divorce (or a simple separation, a lover, or the desire to fly) do us part." No, marriage is to last, and so the couple will mate, the children will have a father, a mother and siblings to live with, meet the basic social needs (in the cell of the society), creating and maintaining emotional ties, having an education and satisfying their subsistence needs.

The concept of cellular family: spouses-parents and children, is taken to the very broadly concept of the family: grandparents, uncles, cousins, all united by strong ties, and a source of many virtues and benefits. The solidarity of these families is the basis of solidarity in wider circles of relations of human coexistence.

Attempts to replace the family with other forms of cohabitation, such as homosexual couples (and even promiscuous communes) are contrary to reason. But pro homosexuality activists, calling for rights that do not exist, demand that such coexistence be accepted as a family. No, the dictionary gives a definition of family from before history, and we do not have to change it to suit whims, a "reality" or "modernity" that as all of them, will only be fashions of the past.

Why is the acceptance of a false family contrary to reason? We do not have to resort to morality to respond. Let us make a comparison with an army. Its base is the fighter squadron and it runs by platoons, sections, companies, battalions, divisions, corps up to full armies. But if the squads under the command of a corporal or a sergeant, accordingly, are broken in their discipline and war operation, everything else, as a body, will become inefficient until it gets to be sheer incompetence.

The same goes for the society as a whole, from family, social organizations, businesses, schools, city hall or county, state or department to the nation. If we accept the dysfunctionality, the deterioration of its base: the family, is only a matter of time before anarchy overtakes the whole social structure of the State (*dejá vu?* Of course). Hopelessly accepting the degradation of social institutions is unacceptable; history says that there *is* restructuring.

We cannot and we must not, by simple rationality, destroy the "traditional" family. We cannot accept as a family mini-social structures which are not so, and that observation tells us they are more dysfunctional, less stable and permanent than a family supported by characteristics described by sociology.

What the pro-homosexuality currents want us to institute as alternate or diverse forms (or other adjectives) of family is unacceptable, let alone that moral criteria, with all its validity and significance, but by simple social survival. It is not difficult to ascertain its instability, lack of consistency, let alone for a long or medium term

(rare exceptions apart.) The children of an homosexual family are not such, he/she will be the child of one of the members of the couple, but never of both, and probably of none.

No, the concept of dysfunctional family is not acceptable. Given the proliferation of dysfunctional families, and by applying intelligence in favor of society as a whole, we must educate and support the concept of "traditional" family. We cannot accept institutionalize social fashions when they are intrinsically perverse for the general welfare, nor accept farces of families that