

## A Universally Bad Idea: Ambles' Leap and the Ethics of Incest... kinda

"In theory, there's no difference between theory and practice, but in practice there is." This old chestnut, roasted over the wisdom of our betters, advises me to shut the fuck up about that stuff of which I don't know what I'm talking. As we shall soon see, this is where things should have ended.

To begin earnestly then in the greatest overconfidence, let us consider the strongest possible arguments against incest. If we can overcome them, we should be confident we shall have no trouble convincing all others of the merit of our impeccable reasoning, and in so doing progress spiritually to a more rational society and indeed, a kinder, gentler world and definitely not be called in the comments of our peers mentality ill sisterfuckers who deserve to die. I will attempt to render such an argument here, necessarily limited by my lack of special (or even cursory) study into the literature of what is known of human psychosexual behavior, my current metacontrarian views to the contrary, and the inexhaustible diversity of my own endless ineptness.

Tragically, you asked for this.

I think before seriously considering the question of whether the incest taboo is unnecessary and should be abandoned at a societal scale, because certain kinds of incest are not necessarily unethical, we are burdened with the noble obligation to be well sure that we know, A.) how the universal taboo against incest came to be universal, B.) why it has persisted without serious challenge for as long as it has throughout history, and C.) who gives a sWhether the likely consequences of abandoning the taboo are better or worse than the consequences of continuing...

continuing, um...

continuing incestuous taboo adoption.

...

(Yes, that's what it says right here: "continuing taboo adoption"... No, I don't think it's ambiguous: it's obvious it means the continued adoption of the taboo. What else couOooooooh... Ah. Well uh, we'll-We'll fix it in post.)

Birth control is not 100% effective — particularly when people think it is.

Sex in general is a risky activity. Doctors and actuarial types tend to regard it as a kind of necessary evil best to accept as an unvanquishable enemy not going away and seek damage control wherever possible.

The main problem with sex (aside from the fact (Amblen's 3 Laws of Sex) that it's talked about 10 times as often as it happens, 75% of sex is between people who are settling for each other, and 0.9 of sex is lousy) is that the state of mind you're in *\*right\** before sex with someone you're attracted to (1/4) is one in which the collapse of the ceiling on top of you wouldn't be enough to make you think you might stop, and the bits before the bit right before sex is where you're trying to get to the bit right before sex. So you end up either trying to have sex or about to have sex, leaving no time period available for the booking of *\*considering the negative secondary consequences of sex\**. As anyone with any sense knows, doing *\*pretty much anything\** without *\*considering the negative secondary consequences\** is the leading cause of people hurting themselves because they're being stupid.

There are upsides too. For example, genital warts aren't half as bad as giving birth to *people*, which I still can't quite believe is how everyone was made.

Incest can result in people (already a bad start) who have to live with genetic disorders resulting from the lack of genetic variation which in the chromosomal crossing-over phase of sexual cellular reproduction ordinarily prevents multiple chromosomal copies of submisRecessive (recessive) genes that express harmful traits like being dummy fat. This is likely the reason for the taboo. No-one likes fatties. Especially if they look wrong. You know, like with the bug eyes. Bad. Don't even talk to those peIn general, uniformity breeds redundant weakness in game theoretical evolutionary dynamics, including vulnerability to viral pandemics. This is why sex exists, diversity is often considered an intrinsic good, & a fever killed 13-27% of all pigs in 2018 & 2019.

Thanks evolution? 👍🙄👍

You would know this, if you *\*paid attention in class, Jacob!\**. (Unfortunately, Jacob was emotionally dysregulated during the crucial developmental period of his childhood during which the high-definition attention-deficit hyperactive disorder stuff was accumulating causal probability for itself in his brain, leading him to be unable to effectively store memories during the few minutes of the particular day during highschool bio when Mrs. Bordeauxoutofourfuckingminds was monotonically going over the fine points of meiosis, not that knowing this causal chain would help him at this point to achieve his lifelong living-dead dream of becoming an astronaut. Don't pity Jacob, for Jacob is us all.)

Incest may result in sexual abuse, but people who are already all about that sexually abusing people lifestyle actively don't listen to social mores so hard that you have to beat imitation of intrinsically empathy-motivated behaviors into them with a rod. Bad sexual predator! Bad! Consider the feelings of your fellow beings, scum! *\*crack\**.

We, uh, we're working on it.

Now, the master-slave dialectic between adult citizens and non-adult... legally libertyless sub-human "yuts" is... not great. And probably why pedophilia is bad.

The taboo may have been a reasonable societal norm that developed independently in every culture in response to forms of familial conflict that now do not exist at sufficient rates for anyone to be aware that they ever existed. If this is so, it would represent the independent verification that a justification for a strong warning against incest exists. It wouldn't tell us what that warning is or is \*of\* though (that would be too easy) only what it is \*against\*.

This is the classic Chesterton's Fence argument beloved of conservative pseudoscholar spoiled private-school cokeheaded dimwits appealing to tradition in the absence of explicit knowledge of justifications known to be reliable for the way things are, which, for them at the very most, is so good it's bad.

Briefly, if there is a fence up and you don't know why it's up, you shouldn't remove the fence because whoever put up the fence probably had a reason for it, and we are supposed to suppose that it was a good one because, apparently, we're all supposed to know that most reasons people act on are good ones, because we're presumed to agree that we know that the way things have been going up to roughly 50 years ago is net good on balance, civilizational evidence and idealized past biases notwithstanding. And apparently your reasons for removing the fence aren't as good as the reasons of whoever put up the fence. And apparently you suddenly have the time and material resources to uproot the posts of a fence. And apparently a fence is supposed to do something other than segregate people through immigration borders which prevent the literal doubling of global productivity, exclude or trap animals who apparently don't have good reasons for being where they want to be, define limits of hoarded private property with a totally ineffective barrier to entry which only really serves to indicate the limits of a premises within which strangers may be shot in the skull, and that's actually it.

I guess that wasn't so brief after all.

I have a version of Chesterton's Fence I call Ambles' Leap, which goes, not at all briefly, as follows: if all your friends jump off a bridge, at once, you should almost certainly look behind you to see if there's a train howling with lethal redundancy for your soul, while preparing yourself to jump into open air if you should see such a thing. You should also be aware of the fact that bridges are built over things people pay structural engineers in order to avoid, like swift currents, and ravines in which erosion exposes sharp rocks — and that not only is it usually a bad idea to jump off of bridges, but all of your friends were probably aware of that fact before deciding to jump themselves.

(Unless of course you don't have any friends, such that "all of your friends have jumped off a bridge at once" constitutes a vacuous logical truth, in which case, you're on your own.)

((Curiously, if you're your own only friend, you've already jumped.))

What were we talking about again?

Incest?

Well fuck.

Just use a condom or something.