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[In the SIECUS book Sexuality and Human Values (1974), Masters and Johnson wrote: "... in the histories of many individuals referred for treatment, religious orthodoxy had apparently played a significant role in the development of sexual dysfunction. ... It did not seem to matter whether the orthodoxy was Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant. Nor, indeed, was it even a question of religious orthodoxy per se. What made the difference was the patient's interpretation of that orthodoxy."

In Love, Sex and Marriage: A Jewish View, published by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (1976), Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn wrote: "Liberal Jews must respect our tradition without necessarily following it. Most of the ethical insights of Judaism are at least as valid today as when they were first conceived by our ancestors. In some areas, however, because we have knowledge which was unavailable to them, it becomes necessary to revise or even discard their judgment."

This issue of the SIECUS Report centers around instances of how the religious world is trying to come to terms with a changing knowledge, understanding, and acceptance of human sexuality. Since the Vatican "Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexuality" (dealing with masturbation, homosexuality, and premarital sexual behavior) was considered by many people—both Catholic and non-Catholic—to be an important statement, and a step backward, it generated much discussion in the press, and even a joint response by members of the SIECUS Board (see "Speaking Out," page 2). In light of all this, we asked Rev. Richard Roach, a priest and theologian with an interest in sexuality, to comment on the Declaration and the situation in the Catholic church today. His response follows.—Ed.]

On the twenty-ninth of December last year, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued a "Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexuality." The Congregation is one of the departments of the central administration of the Roman Catholic Church based in the Vatican. The prefect of the Congregation, Franjo Cardinal Seper, signed the document. Above his signature the prefect claims that in the course of an audience with the pope on November 7, 1975, Paul VI approved the document and ordered its publication. This claim is meant to enhance the status of the document, which otherwise would have been largely ignored. Whatever the reason or the effect of this enhancement—and the popular press seems to have thought that it made the document very important indeed—the Declaration is not a papal encyclical letter, and that may well be the most significant fact about it.

Many, both within and without the Roman Catholic Church, do not understand or appreciate how this peculiar and complex organism really works. I do not claim to understand how it works, but as a priest and theologian I think I am acquiring something of a feel for the reality. I think my feeling for the organism is good enough to enable me to label fairly clearly certain misunderstandings. The Roman Catholic Church most certainly is not an efficiently run, centrally organized, and centrally planned organization with a single party line from which no one deviates. Certain Church administrators, particularly from the close of the First Vatican Council until today, would like to give the impression that such is the case. Certain Catholics would like to believe that such is the case, either because they want the security of a strong and never-confusing authority or because they want such an authority as a whipping boy upon which to take out their Oedipal frustrations. Others outside the Roman Catholic Church want so to view the Church because it seems simpler than really understanding her, and seems to fit with the long and vigorous tradition of anti-Catholicism.

In reality, the Church is better described by such organic terms as "mystical body of Christ" or "People of God." It is an organism that takes its life from a single faith in the living God, but expresses that faith in a plurality of applications, one might even say a confusion of ways, which result in differing opinions or theologies, differing moral evaluations, and a plethora of organizations which defy complete centralization. Such was the case at the time the documents that make up the New Testament were being

Continued on page 14
We, the undersigned, appreciate the concern expressed by the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith for the welfare of human beings as reflected by the quality of their most important relationships.

We too have a concern about the quality of human relationships, one we express in the daily practice of our professions. In particular, in our various specialized capacities as sex researchers, educators, counselors, and therapists, we are daily confronted by sexual problems that beset individuals and that influence adversely their most precious relationships of intimacy. We have seen marriages saddened and distorted by a sexual dysfunction in one or both members of the couple, difficulties that may have existed for years but that, for the most part, we believe need never have existed in the first place. Therefore, because our concern and professional skills are exercised on behalf of the marital, family, and individual welfare of Catholics and non-Catholics alike, we must state our conviction that much of this sexual misery can be traced to repressive attitudes about sex inflicted in early childhood, often in the name of religion.

What have been found especially and widely damaging to later adult sexual life are guilt and fear about masturbation. The evidence, as we have seen it in our research and our practice, indicates that such precepts about masturbation as are advocated in the Vatican Declaration, and by some—not all—Protestant or Jewish religious communities, have not served to enhance the quality of human life, but actually to damage it from generation to generation. Therefore, even though we find firm grounds for disagreement with other aspects of the Declaration, we have elected to respond specifically to that portion of it that deals with masturbation.

In view of the evident near-universality of masturbation, therefore, we respectfully challenge the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to document, with reliable scientific studies, its own claim that "masturbation is an intrinsically and seriously disordered act." We know of no such studies showing that masturbation causes, or is specific evidence of, psychic disorder. For the Vatican to make this claim in the face of what we know today lays the entire Declaration open to serious question, as well as the scholarship and competence of those who acted as advisers to the Vatican in framing the Declaration.

Furthermore, the Vatican Declaration, though acknowledging that "sociological surveys are able to show the frequency of this disorder," concludes that "facts do not constitute a criterion for judging the moral value of human acts." In response, the undersigning group holds that to insist on ignoring facts for the purpose of suppressing an almost universal aspect of normal and harmless human sexual behavior constitutes in itself an act of questionable moral value. We have a moral concern ourselves for those suffering persons of all ages who need to be freed from their "guilt trap" to look at and consider the evidence about an intrinsically innocent and personal act.
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SIECUS invites the Vatican to a continuing dialogue for sharing new insights into what in fact constitutes healthy and morally responsible sexual behavior.

We, the undersigned, are present or former Board members of SIECUS who specialize in the fields of sex research, education, counseling, or therapy. We are signing as individuals, not as representing fellow Board members of SIECUS or the institutions with which we are affiliated, the names of which appear for purposes of identification only.
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Richard Green, M.D., Professor, Departments of Psychiatry, Behavioral Science, and Psychology, State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY
Warren R. Johnson, Ed.D., Professor of Health Education, University of Maryland, University Park, MD
Helen S. Kaplan, M.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Cornell Medical College, and Head, Sex Therapy and Education Program, Payne-Whitney Clinic of New York Hospital, New York, NY
Gary F. Kelly, M.Ed., Director, Student Development Center and Program in Human Sexuality, Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, NY
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Lester A. Kirkendall, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus of Family Life Education, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR
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Daniel H. Labby, M.D., Professor of Medicine and Psychiatry, University of Oregon Medical School, Portland, OR
E. James Lieberman, M.D., M.P.H., Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Howard University Medical School, Washington, DC
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Moni Nag, Ph.D., Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction, Columbia University, New York, NY
John Rock, M.D., Formerly Director, Rock Reproductive Clinic, Brookline, MA
Gilbert Shimmel, Ed.D., M.P.H., Professor and Director, Community Health Education Program, Institute of Health Sciences, Hunter College-C.U.N.Y., New York, NY
The Reverend James A. Sietkes, B.D., Minneapolis, MN
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DO YOU KNOW THAT . . .

“Legal” Concubinage in Brazil

Although—or perhaps because—there is no divorce allowed under Brazilian law, according to the New York Times (August 22, 1976) “there are many legal protections for unlawful second marriages. A separated woman who forms another family may be considered a concubine in the eyes of the law, but at the same time she has almost the same rights as a legal wife—including inheritance, accident insurance, the right to use her companion’s name, and alimony should she separate again. Moreover, children born technically out of wedlock in illegal second marriages are considered legitimate.”

Apparently, these protections were established by a government unable to legalize divorce for political reasons, and therefore “illegal second marriages have become an accepted part of life among the middle and upper class in this largest Roman Catholic country in the world.” Furthermore, “the social columns of the leading newspapers regularly carry items on illegal second marriages and even on dinner parties commemorating these unions."

Sex Is New?

The 1976 cumulative edition of The Thesaurus of Health Education Terminology, an alphabetical listing of terms used to index documents related to health education published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the indexing tool used by the Health Education Information Retrieval System (HEIRS), includes the following entry: “SEX (new term 1974).”
SPIRITUAL RESOURCES FOR GAY PEOPLE

All religious systems deal with sexual energy in one way or another; some even utilize it for the induction of "higher spiritual states." However, in the Judeo-Christian tradition of the western world, for many years sexuality has been couched in negative terms, except within the context of reproduction in marriage. Therefore, many gay people, although firm in their religious belief, have felt uncomfortable or unacceptable as a "child of God" within their congregations, and/or hypocritical for practicing their faith while living a gay lifestyle.

In recent years, with the growing understanding and social acceptance of homosexuality, the mainline churches have been challenged by gay people seeking a spiritual home within the faith that they profess. SIECUS is indebted to The Advocate (Issue #200) for permission to reproduce the following list of groups within mainline religious organizations which attempt to provide two-way communication between gay people and their churches, and to assist gay people in their spiritual searching. (A more detailed look at one such group, DIGNITY, is found on page 5.)

CHURCH OF CHRIST
United Christ of Christ Gay Caucus
P.O. Box 25005
Philadelphia, PA 19149

EPISCOPALIAN
Integrity
National Office
5014 Willows Ave.
Philadelphia, PA 19143
This group of gay Episcopalians and their friends now has chapters in over 35 cities.

EVANGELICAL
Evangelicals Concerned
National Office
P.O. Box 371299
Miami, FL 33133
A relatively young group, EC was founded in February, 1976. It states as its main purpose "dialogue with evangelical churches."

JEISH
Although the number of gay Jewish groups throughout the country is growing, there is currently no national office of gay Jewish concerns. Since most of these groups are in touch with one another, either of the following can provide an initial contact:

Congregation Beth Chayim Chadashim
1945 Westwood Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Congregation Beth Simchat Torah
G.P.O. 1270
New York, NY 10001

LUTHERAN
Lutherans Concerned for Gay People
Box 19114A
Los Angeles, CA 90029

Lutherans Concerned
Box 15592
Salt Lake city, UT 84115

UNITARIAN-UNIVERSALIST
Unitarian-Universalist Gay Caucus
10 Eberle Road
Ithaca, NY 14850
This group is organized as an educational activity within the Unitarian-Universalist church, and supports the Unitarian Universalist Office of Gay Concerns:

Office of Gay Concerns
Unitarian-Universalist Church
25 Beacon St.
Boston, MA 02108

OTHER
Salvatorian
1735 Hi-Mount Blvd.
Milwaukee, WI 53208

Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches
P.O. Box 3570
Los Angeles, CA 90055
With over ninety congregations and missions throughout the U.S. and in some foreign countries, UFMCC is easily the largest alternative church for gay people, although its membership is not limited to gay people. The church has its own magazine and communications network.

In addition to the nationally based groups mentioned above, there are numerous churches and religious organizations with outreach to local gay communities.

There are also a few organizations that have had religious concerns generally, but which are not identified with any single denomination or caucus. Two such organizations are:

The National Alliance of Christian Homosexuals
P.O. Box 1273
Anderson, SC 29622

Council on Religion and the Homosexual
1076 Guerrero St.
San Francisco, CA 94110
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DIGNITY is a national organization of gay Catholics and other persons who wish to see Christ's love expressed to and among all men and women, regardless of sexual preference. Our membership consists primarily of Catholic gay people, but we also welcome many concerned people, gay and straight, clergy and laity, who seek a more constructive interrelation between the church and gay people.

The organization was founded in San Diego in 1968 by an Augustinian priest who, concerned with the difficulties gay Catholics experience in integrating their sexual orientation with their religious tradition, saw the need in his numerous gay counselees to come together for mutual support, encouragement, and education. The basic position adopted then still holds: that gay people can indeed be members of the Catholic church as responsible followers of Christ. We are working within the church to help both gay people and the church understand that gays can express their sexuality in a manner that is consonant with Christ's teaching and which is ethically responsible, unselfish, and uplifting.

Our originial Statement of Position and Purpose, reaffirmed and refined at our first national convention in 1973, provides for three areas of responsibility: (1) to the church—to work for the development of its sexual theology and for the acceptance of gays as full and equal members; (2) to society—to work for justice and social acceptance through education and legal reform; and (3) to individual gays—to reinforce their self-acceptance and their sense of dignity, and to aid them in becoming more active members of the church and society. In addition, we recognize four areas of concern: spiritual development, education, social involvement (individually, and with other gay groups and religious and secular organizations), and fellowship.

While our first attempt at dialogue within the church was almost disastrous—the bishop of Los Angeles gave "official disapproval" of the group and sent our "founding father" out of the diocese—DIGNITY has continued to grow and prosper. We now have more than fifty chapters in the United States, Canada, and Puerto Rico, and members in most of the English-speaking countries; and we affiliate with other gay Catholic organizations around the world. The National Office in Boston serves as a headquarters—coordinating the work of our chapters, administering the various programs, referring individuals to local chapters or counselors (when needed), and putting pastors, theologians, and other professionals in touch with current thought on homosexuality and sexuality in general. Our monthly publication, DIGNITY, contains articles and news of interest to the gay Catholic and other concerned persons. Many professional people use our resources to assist their clients and/or patients to deal with guilt stemming from unenlightened religious backgrounds, and we maintain a supply of articles, books, and other publications (available upon request) as resources.

Our local chapters, mostly in the larger cities, serve the direct needs of the individual gay Catholic. DIGNITY chapters offer the Sacraments, provide an opportunity for spiritual growth, educational programs, and social activities, and carry on an outreach program in their communities, as well as a continuing sensitizing ministry to the church and society, in an effort to provide a basis for social reform from the religious context.

DIGNITY has received important official support in various dioceses around the country, and following our 1973 national convention we sent a letter to all the bishops asking for their continuing support and pastoral concern in this important ministry. Following a meeting between our national officers and a representative of the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops in 1975, DIGNITY was invited, as "an official Catholic organization," to participate in the N.C.C.B. "Call to Action" Conference held in Detroit in October, 1976. Because of our presence and participation, that body of 1200 Catholic clergy and laity adopted a document on "Personhood" which proclaimed (in part): "That the Church encourage and affirm the pastoral efforts of DIGNITY... to reconcile the Church with its homosexual brothers and sisters."

This is our hope and our dream for the future: the reconciliation of ideas which help to develop the church's theology of sexuality, not just in terms of the gay person but in terms of the expression of all forms of sexuality. Our society is currently engrossed in developing new attitudes, and we feel that the church can—and should—play a very real part in this development. We hope that our sharing and efforts within the Catholic church will not only make the world a better place for the gay person, but, in the long run, for all men and women.

Interested persons can contact DIGNITY at our national office: 755 Boylston Street, Room 413, Boston, MA 02116.
New Sexuality Counseling Center for Catholics

Catholic Alternatives is a new, educational, nonprofit Catholic lay organization that supports and counsels the Catholic laity and those of other faiths in their use and choice of birth control and/or termination of pregnancy and sexual health. Based in New York City, it plans to open additional counseling centers in other parts of the United States and Latin America. Counseling will be by the Catholic laity for the Catholic laity. Among the Board of Directors is theologian Dr. Rosemary Radford Ruether. For further information, write Joan Harriman, President, Catholic Alternatives, 30 East 23rd Street, New York, NY 10010.

AASECT Meeting in San Francisco

The American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists will hold its tenth annual National Sex Institute on April 20–23, 1977, in San Francisco, California. The annual award lor outstanding service will be presented to Dr. James L. McCary; the major international participant will be Dr. R. E. Goodman, of Manchester, England, and other luminaries will include Drs. John Money, Wardell Pomeroy, and Theresa and Roger Crenshaw. Workshops on supervision of sex therapists and sexual enrichment in marriage will be featured, and each of the AASECT regions will present showcase models in sex therapy, counseling, and education. Special charter flights are being arranged to reduce transportation costs from the Eastern seaboard and the Midwest. For further information, contact AASECT, 5010 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Suite 304, Washington, DC 20016.

New York State and Sex Education

The State Assembly of New York, on June 26, passed by 85 to 51 a bill that would allow parents to keep their children out of sex education classes that “teach attitudes offensive to the parents’ values.” Those who supported the bill did so on the ground that “the parent has an inherent right to determine the sexual material and attitudes his child is exposed to.” The opponents of the bill claimed that it would “close young people off from sex information they needed.” The New York Times report (June 27, 1976) pointed out that the primary targets named in the bill are “courses of instruction concerned with sexual promiscuity, contraception, and abortion.” In the bill the measure relies heavily on the Commissioner of Education, who is instructed “to define moral attitudes and determine which age groups and grades the measure should apply to.”

Resources to Write For . . .

A Synoptic of Recent Denominational Statements on Sexuality (Second Edition), accompanied by a Study Paper on Abortion, are publications of the National Council of Churches. Compiled by former SIECUS Board member William H. Genne, the Synoptic summarizes the formal positions of member denominations, as taken from official pronouncements or study papers, with regard to various aspects of human sexuality. The Synoptic and Study Paper on Abortion are available at $1.50 for both from the Office of Family Ministries, National Council of Churches, 475 Riverside Drive, Room 711, New York, NY 10027.

SIECUS Report Special Issue on the Handicapped and Sexual Health has been prepared with an eye toward the White House Conference on the Handicapped, set for May 22–27.
An English-Spanish Dictionary of Family Planning Related Terms has been compiled by Donna Benton and Terry Contreras. Designed for ease of use, its first section contains an alphabetical listing of commonly used English words in the related fields of family planning, sexuality, and reproduction. Its second section provides meanings in English and translations into Spanish of frequently used medical abbreviations. The dictionary includes more than 100 words and their literal as well as the popular translations encountered in a variety of Spanish-speaking cultures. The price is $1.50 per copy. For information on quantity prices, write: James Bowman Associates, Inc., 2229 Lombard Street, San Francisco, CA 94123.

Directory of Organizations Interested in the Handicapped has just been published by the Committee for the Handicapped, People-To-People Program. For information, please write to the Committee at Suite 610, La Salle Building, Connecticut Avenue and L Street, Washington, DC 20036.

Sex Education in Mexico

Sex education is being introduced and integrated into many official programs in Mexico. Specifically, with the new Population Law, the National Population Council is very much aware of the contribution sex education can make toward a better understanding of a population policy and a more rational and responsible way of facing reproduction. Therefore, it has been appointed as the coordinating agency for all sex education activities undertaken by the various government ministries.

The most important work in the official sphere is being carried out at the Ministry of Education. In the new textbooks, designed and written by the Ministry for all grades, and printed and distributed free to each child in the six primary levels, the most explicit information on the biology of reproduction is included in the fourth- and sixth-grade natural science books. Some of the teaching is subtle: from the first grade onward, the books show that boys and girls have an equal share in the natural science experiments they are expected to carry out, in contrast to other textbooks that exploit, through visual means, the idea that boys experiment and girls passively observe.

Training teachers has been begun actively by a special group that travels throughout the country, meeting with groups of teachers and parents to discuss sex education and the contents of the relevant natural sciences curricula. The whole curriculum of the middle school has been reviewed and changed where needed to include sex education content, and the mass media have been encouraged to play a role.

The National Population Council concludes in a recent report that “Mexico will become in the next five years one of the countries in Latin America with the most important projects in and out of school, and this will also hold true for other parts of the world, including the developed countries. In such a context, Mexico is in a position to offer its experience and assistance in sex education to any country and group interested in the subject.” For further information on sex education programs in Mexico, write to: Dr. Esther Corona. Consejo Nacional de Poblacion. Paseo de la Reforma 136, Piso 16, Mexico 6 DF.

Psychoendocrinology

Psychoendocrinology is the study of childhood behavioral problems, particularly those associated with anomalies resulting from endocrine or genetic disorders. There are only two programs in psychoendocrinology in the United States: one is the famed Gender Identity Center at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, directed by Dr. John Money; and the other is at the medical school of the State University of New York at Buffalo, headed by Drs. Anke A. Ehhardt and Heino F. L. Meyer-Bahlburg. The emphasis in both centers is on prevention as well as treatment, with long-term counseling by specialists who, aware of the usually traumatic peer reactions to any kind of anomaly, stress preparation of the child to cope with these by helping it build or retain an adequate yet realistic self-image.

There has been a special emphasis in the Buffalo Center on programs to sensitize those who are in close contact with children—teachers, nurses, principals—to recognize and refer such actual and potential problems, and both centers deal with the management of such potential problem areas as homosexuality in adolescence, sexual acting-out, or transsexualism. Dr. Ehhardt believes that, while hormones certainly affect behavior and temperament, their effects are mild in comparison to a child’s social and environmental experiences. For this reason the parents, indeed the entire family, may be involved in therapeutic and preventative approaches to a given case over a long period of time.

Drs. Money and Ehhardt were co-authors of the ground-breaking work on this subject, Man and Woman, Boy and Girl, published in 1972 (see the review in the SIECUS Report, Vol. 1, No. 6, July, 1973).

Sexuality Education Via the Theater

In a creative change from the usual consideration of sexuality within the medical model, the Louisville (Kentucky) Planned Parenthood Center presented a symposium examining the marital and sexual aspects of human relationships through the medium of the theater. The day-long program, entitled “Man and Woman: The Delicate Balance,” featured excerpts from five plays by Pulitzer Prize-winning playwright Edward Albee, as performed by graduate students in theater arts at the University of Louisville, followed by remarks from the playwright, and comments and questions from a multidisciplinary panel including representatives from medicine, human services, and the arts. Since sexuality and individuals’ perception of themselves as male and female affect importantly the way those individuals relate to one another and to society in general, the symposium was intended to analyze, through the eye of the playwright, those components of relationships which are basic to the human experience.
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RELIGIOUS PUBLICATIONS ON SEXUALITY AND SEX EDUCATION

The following is a representative list of materials published by the major American religious faiths. The list is in three sections: (1) curriculum materials, (2) religion and sexuality, and (3) religion and sex education. All items listed are publications of the denominations indicated. Prices are included when known. Please order materials on this list directly from the sources given, and not from SIECUS. Additional single copies of this list are available free of charge with a self-addressed, stamped, legal-size envelope.

I. Curriculum Materials

American Baptist Convention

American Lutheran Church
- Created Male and Female. Augsburg Publishing House (426 So. Fifth St., Minneapolis, MN 55415), 1969. Student packet, $1.85; class resource kit (includes teacher's guide, charts, photos, records, pamphlets), $14.20.

The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
- Family Resources Guide. Pat Elliott, Dorothy Hunter, Robert Lemon, and Eleanor Morrison. Christian Board of Publications (see address above). Part of the Christian Life Curriculum, contains one unit on sexuality; $2.75.

The Episcopal Church

The Lutheran Church in America
- Preparing for Marriage. Lutheran Church Press (see address above), 1977 (in press). Teacher's guide and text.
- To Have and to Hold. J. Russell Hale. Lutheran Church Press (see address above), 1972. A study book for young adults and adults on the denomination's "Statement on Sex, Marriage, and Family." Teacher's guide, $3.00; student's text, $2.75; cassette, $5.00.

The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod

The Mennonite Church

The Roman Catholic Church
- Education in Love Series. Committee on Sex Education, Diocese of Rochester, NY. The Paulist Press (see address above), 1971. A handbook for parents. 50c (paper); and two teacher's guides—for grades 1-8, $3.25 (paper), and 9-12, $2.50 (paper).
- Mystery of Sexuality. Rosemary Haughton. The Paulist Press (see address above); $1.45 (paper).
- Religious Education and Sex Education. Rosemary Haughton. The Paulist Press (see address above). 1977. Designed for parents and youth workers; 35c (paper).
- Sexuality on the Island Earth. David Darst and Joseph Forgue. The Paulist Press (see address above); 95c (paper).

Southern Baptist Convention

The Unitarian-Universalist Association
- About Your Sexuality. Deryck Calderwood, Ph.D. Education and Social Concern Section, Unitarian-Universalist Association (25 Beacon St., Boston, MA 02108), 1975. A complete program for junior-senior high levels. Contains student workbooks, 10 teacher's manuals, 5 filmstrips, 5 records, 3 teacher's reference books, reprints, articles, and pamphlets; $135.00.

The United Church of Christ
- Claimed by God. Sarah Lloyd and Jane Evans. United Church Press (see address above), 1963. A course book/teacher's guide for junior high level, with one chapter on sexuality; $3.00.
II. Religion and Sexuality

The Lutheran Church in America
- Beyond the Seventh-Day Adventist Church
- The Dating Machine. Wayout (Box 2829, Hollywood, CA 90028), 1971; free flyer.
- Sex Through the Looking Glass. Wayout (see address above), 1971; free flyer.
- Sexual Solitaire. Wayout (see address above). Free flyer on masturbation.
- Two of a Kind. Wayout (see address above). Free flyer on homosexuality.
- When Two Become One. Wayout (see address above). Free flyer on marriage.

The Religious Society of Friends
- Homosexuality from the Inside. David Blamires. Friends Home Service Committee (order from: Friends Bookstore, 156 N. 15th St., Philadelphia, PA 19143); 95c.

III. Religion and Sex Education


The Church and Sex Education. David Belgum. Lutheran Church Press (2900 Queen L., Philadelphia, PA 19129), 1967; $1.50.


The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

The United Church of Christ

Nondenominational

Reviewed by Alan P. Bell, Ph.D., Senior Research Psychologist, Institute for Sex Research, Bloomington, IN, and SIECUS Chairperson-elect.

Despite efforts to prevent its publication by many feared and fearful men who inhabit the inner circles of the Roman Catholic church, the present book received an imprimi potest from the author's religious superiors and was allowed to see the light of day. Adjudged a "prudent work" that meets "the standards of scholarship for publication of a book on a controversial moral topic," it provides important insights into the origins and consequences of Judaeo-Christian thought about the place and purpose of human sexuality. Like a brilliant public defender, the author proceeds in a very systematic way to render highly suspect some long-held theological assumptions about homosexuality.

Although Father McNeill does not claim to be a biblical scholar, he has assembled an array of evidence from others' work which indicates quite persuasively that the Sodom and Gomorrah story in Genesis, the chief basis of the church's condemnation of homosexuality, had to do with the sin of inhospitality and not with homosexuality at all. Pointing out the irony of the church's use of this story to close its doors on homosexual men and women, the author goes on to spell out the less-than-divine features of biblical writers. Their lack of omniscience is evident in their failure to see homosexuality as anything other than voluntary sexual activities engaged in by basically heterosexual men who were therefore acting contrary to their sexual natures. Cultural limitations are also evident in the writers' support of a patriarchal society which lionized masculinity and equated sodomy with the forfeiture of the male's proper dignity. Their stress upon the procreative aspect of human sexuality is understood as the result of the Hebrews' determination to survive as the people chosen by God to be His faithful witness to the Gentiles. Although McNeill does not say so, it could also be argued that the New Testament authors' urging that we remain unmarried eunuchs stems from their conviction that the Kingdom was about to be ushered in. Finally, evidence that the writers of Holy Scripture were not literally acting as God's amanuenses is shown in their ignorance of human physiology, which led them to so anthropomorphize semen that spilling it outside of a vagina amounted to homicide.

Finishing off the scriptural basis for the condemnation of homosexuality by arguing that it is actually more supportive of a personalist moral theology than of a legalistic approach which does not take human motivation into account, Father McNeill then rives as brilliant a hatchet job on church tradition. He pictures the early Christian emperors, also misunderstanding the Sodom and Gomorrah story, as living in mortal fear that they and their people would suffer God's vengeance if homosexual activities were allowed to persist. It was their sincere belief that if enough people caught in this heinous act could be burned at the stake, the empire would escape the ravages of floods, famines, and earthquakes. The author lays bare the Stoic roots of much of church tradition, which championed an indifference to passions of any kind. Saints Augustine and Thomas Aquinas are seen as the philosophical heirs of Marcus Aurelius, who viewed anything but the rational as utter nonsense. Finally, McNeill points out the contemporary change in the church's view of sexuality as primarily procreative, which culminated in Vatican II's emphasis on conjugal love, and he argues that this new emphasis opens the door to applying a similar criterion to both heterosexual and homosexual sexual expressions. It is no longer the nature of the partner but rather the nature of the partnership (whether or not it is marked by love, fidelity, or commitment) which the author believes must be the sole criterion for the church's judgment. In a parting shot at those who condemn homosexuality as "against nature," McNeill argues that the mouth was made for more than eating, and that since ten percent of the population has been found to be homosexual "in all cultures and in all periods of history," this must be a part of God's plan.

Returning to his belief that human love can be expressed in homosexual...
partnerships marked by fidelity and permanence and thus must not inevitably be an occasion for sin, the author examines whatever information the human sciences can provide in this matter. Although finding little support (in what must be recognized as an inadequate review of the literature) for his belief that homosexual partnerships can amount to more than depersonalized, compulsive one-night stands, he rightfully concludes that homosexuals with stable, fulfilling relationships are not apt to be picked up in the nets of survey researchers. In addition, he makes the cogent argument that if even just one homosexual relationship is marked by mutual love and fidelity, then homosexuality per se cannot be condemned. This relatively weak section of the book concludes with a consideration of experts’ disagreements about whether homosexuality is ipso facto pathological and with the advice that if there is any possibility that an individual can be moved in a heterosexual direction through psychological counseling, such a move should be seriously explored. The fact that the author uses the word “cure” to denote such a change indicates to this reviewer the extent to which even an enlightened individual like McNeill can be affected by cultural attitudes and values. Such influence is even more evident in the last two sections of his work.

In Part II, the author addresses himself to the teleological question of homosexuality: to what end does it exist? He sees its purpose in the opportunity it provides for men and women to break out of their rigid “sexual identity images,” to embrace their androgyny through an acceptance of those (including homosexuals) who do not conform to society’s rigid sex-role stereotypes. He contrasts homosexual relationships with heterosexual relationships in which all too often the partners are of unequal status and suggests that homosexuality can provide heterosexuals with a model of human relatedness which promises a greater love and friendship between men and women. He thinks that the homosexual community can free males in our society from their equation of violence with true masculinity, and that the world will be better off when men become reconciled to the passive elements in themselves. He argues that the homosexual community, unburdened by rigid notions of what it means to be masculine or feminine, can free heterosexual men to devote themselves, without embarrassment, to lives of service and aesthetic purpose, and women to develop, without apology, their capacities for achievement and aggressiveness.

Although the author recognizes the possibility that his discussion of the positive contributions which the homosexual community can make to society contains stereotypical notions of the homosexual, he does so only in passing. Surely he must know that most homosexual males are not writing symphonies or working with mentally retarded children. Certainly he must be aware that, as with heterosexual relationships, many homosexual relationships are fraught with power struggles and that a preoccupation with sex role is not uncommon. But rather than finding chief fault with whatever stereotypical notions of homosexuality he perpetuates, I would have the reader notice what the author omits from his list of what heterosexuals might learn from their homosexual counterparts. It could have included the celebration of sensuality, of sexual contact without a host of other obligations, of one-night stands that may frequently be more honest than marriages counted up in years. It might also have included the willingness to follow sexual pursuits even when these offend the moral sensibilities of others, to be sexually engaged in ways which no church and few parents could possibly endorse. The risks of going it alone, of “sinning bravely” if you will, of not playing it safe through a slavish conformity to others’ tastes and interests, might be the most important lesson that the homosexual community can teach. These have been omitted from the author’s list of reasons that become clear when one turns to the last part of the book.

In Part III, McNeill shows the extent to which his reformulation of a moral theology toward homosexuality is hardly revolutionary, more of a plea to those in authority than a bold proclamation one nails to a door to test the church’s capacity for change. He weeps for those who feel abandoned by the church, rather than celebrating their willingness to pursue their deepest needs and interests even if that involves their alienation from an important source of security. He advises the homosexual to flee the difficulties of homosexual life if there are any chances at all for a “therapeutic cure.” Although he records the enormous dangers and difficulties of a homosexual’s attempt to live a life of sexual abstinence (“condemned to a living hell of isolation and loneliness”), he still maintains that “if there is any hope that a life of abstinence can be successfully undertaken, then it remains a reasonable choice.”

Finally, he reiterates the entire thesis of his book, in which he insists that sex of any kind is morally justified only when it expresses a mutual love and devotion and is accompanied by the intention of fidelity. Such an insistence leads this reviewer to question the author’s charity as well as his insight into the nature of human behavior. Is he so naive as to think that one can will a loving relationship any more than one can will an erection? A person loves another to the extent that he or she has been loved and has learned to celebrate his or her own existence. It is that simple and that difficult. All of us are in the process of becoming loving persons. Each of us is at a different point along the way. And none of us is ever helped by those who would flog us for not walking when we can hardly crawl or for not running when we can barely stand. What we need is an appreciation of who we are and a reminder that it is extremely difficult to determine where we are relative to one another.

We also need to know that appearances can be deceiving. For example, “fidelity” can sometimes be little more than a cop-out by those attempting to conform to societal expectations. “Commitment” can often express, and require from the other, inordinate dependency needs. “Love” can too frequently include the forfeiture of one’s personal integrity in an interpersonal relationship. The one thing that we can be sure about is that our sexual expressions exactly reflect who we are and what we intend our lives to say. And my only hope is that this well-intended book, beautifully written by an author who is still in the business of dichotomizing human activity into right or wrong and who feels a need to justify the homosexual condition to a biased institution, will not impose yet another “should” upon homosexual readers, preventing them from rejoicing in their present whereabouts and, thus, from expressing their joy in whatever they do with others.

Reviewed by C. William Jones, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Film Art, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX.

According to the author, the subject of this small paperback is “role playing and fantasizing, and it was done in a light vein by an architect interested in ambiance, mood and fun and who approached the subject on that level, rather than on a serious scientific one.”

The book is divided into “Roles” (“Blind Genius,” “Playboy,” and “TV Anarchist” for the guys; and “Prison Matron,” “Southern Belle,” and “Cruel Empress” for the girls) and “Plays” (including “They met in a strange hotel while traveling alone; after tonight, they will never see each other again. They play together without inhibition,” and “He has threatened her with severe punishment if she gets a premature orgasm; she has noticed a hot poker standing in the fireplace. She plays with mixed emotions.”) and artsy but very euphemized illustrations of twenty-two “Positions.”

The idea is for each person in the couple (or menage a whatever) to choose a role, then the role-players enter into one of the plays, to be consumed in a preselected position, or two, or three.

As the author has bravely exposed himself in writing the book (after all, they are his fantasies, and they do have a certain taste for mild forms of sadomasochism and fetishism), so a reviewer of the book will also be exposed by his reactions to it. My first response was to remember a scene from Fellini’s 8½ where the film’s hero is so confused that the film’s hero is so confused and dispirited from having to do a creative job he’s not prepared to do that he has his mistress dress up like a whore and pretend to come into his room by mistake. It is a mutual fantasy which, hopefully, will make one or both partners’ experience more delightful.

My response to the scene in the film was much like my response to this book: very creative, nicely done, and what a pity to be a jade. It raises for me the very important question of whether sexual fantasizing is not merely an appropriate response to the absence of one’s partner, or a therapy for couples with sexual inhibition problems (the author reports that several doctors are using the book with their patients), but perhaps also for couples who are in each other’s presence, fully turned on to each other, and who want to experience the gift of sexuality more fully. My vote for now is that unadorned reality is quite fascinating enough. I’ll keep the book, however. Maybe later—hopefully much later.


Reviewed by Robert L. Arinstein, M.D., Psychiatrist-in-Chief, Yale University Health Service, New Haven, CT.

In the Preface the author states that “Intimate Friendships include any and all of the various kinds of relationships, primary or not (including monogamous marriage), that involve some degree of social, emotional, sexual, intellectual, family, or career intimacy, wherein interaction between persons is more important than, but may include, sexual relations.” He goes on to explore the meaning of this definition as lived by the network of intimate friends. He states from the outset that the individual is the basic unit in society rather than the nuclear family or “couple-front,” and writes from this viewpoint.

The author differentiates between intimate relationships and primary relationships and recognizes that individuals may choose one or the other (or none) or a combination of both. He then provides an imaginative catalogue of all the different possible lifestyles, of which there are more than one might think—nineteen to be exact. Included in the list are various types of contractual agreements, intentions, time dimensions, sexual orientations, and numbers playing. One somewhat confusing point, at least semantically, for this reader was the fact that it was possible to have more than one primary relationship concurrently. This introduced the concept that one could have several people involved together in primary relationships and greatly multiplied the number of possible relationships. Eight people, however, was considered the upper limit of practicality (which translates to twenty-eight possible relationships).

The author apparently bases his ideas and conclusions on three longitudinal studies, but the methodological details of the studies are not given (at least, not in this book; I did not look up references to the author’s prior work). There are numerous case vignettes which are interesting and illuminating, but it is never made clear whether these are descriptions of subjects in the studies and, if so, how the subjects were chosen. This leaves the reader somewhat unclear as to whether the author is basing his recommendations on personal preference or on the testimony of individuals he has studied.

“In the area of human sexuality the liveliest, most informative films are available from Grove Press.” —Variety

For your copy of our catalog describing 50 widely adopted films on Human Sexuality write:

GROVE PRESS FILMS Dept. A
196 W. Houston Street, New York, N.Y. 10014 (212) 242-4900
On one or two occasions the sample is the source of a variety of opinion, but the relationship of the studies to the conclusions is rather murky.

Ramey quite openly favors the "peer relationship," or "peer marriage." In this, both individuals have a primary focus of promoting individual growth as well as growth of the partnership. It is stated that a peer relationship "exists only as long as the partners continue to grow." In addition, each individual "maintains autonomy." The author sees an accelerating trend toward what he calls the pluralistic revolution changes although he recognizes that there will be resistance to such arrangements from certain sectors of the society. A, PR


Reviewed by Mary S. Calderone, M.D., President, SIECUS.

Designed to be a basic reference tool for educators and program planners to enable them to locate at once the best available publication or audio-visual aid to use in a given situation, the 1976 edition of the Selective Guide continues to be an invaluable source for the selection and evaluation of materials in the fields of mental health and family life education.

Far more than an annotated listing, each of the more than 500 pamphlets, films, filmstrips, and other materials included is given a one- to two-page in-depth analysis by the Center's editors and consultants, with a summary, a discussion of its primary audience and reading difficulty levels, an evaluation, and its table of contents. Then several paragraphs summarize the main thrust of each item.

The editors have also prepared careful directions for the best way to use the Selective Guide, guidelines on how to order publications and films, discussions of how to use audio-visual materials effectively in mental health education, and a memorandum addressed specifically to discussion leaders regarding their craft. A subject index and an alphabetical index, totaling some twenty pages, provide helpful access to special topics. The three basic areas of mental health concern (including sexual mental health) cover child growth and development throughout the school years, consideration of problems of adults throughout the life span, and areas of special concern, such as alcoholism, drug abuse, mental illness or retardation, etc.

In the two- to three-year interval between editions, the Mental Health Materials Center issues its bi-monthly "In-Depth Reports," listing new selected and recommended items, and the purchase price of the Selective Guide includes a year's subscription to the "Reports."

While the cost of the Selective Guide may appear high in a year of tight budgets, its length (947 pages), comprehensiveness, and the quality of the reviews make it not only a bargain, but an extremely valuable resource. PR


Reviewed by Robert L. Arneit, M.D., Psychiatrist-in-Chief, Yale University Health Service, New Haven, CT.

The author has used four prior articles as a foundation for this book which stresses the importance of identity and commitment in the development of intimacy. His thesis is primarily an answer to the proponents of the Human Potential Movement as advanced by Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers and the theories of Marshall McLuhan and Norman O. Brown. Much of the book is devoted to the development of an argument specifically countering the concept of growth through fluidity of personality which he feels is the message of the self-actualizers and the concept of the "tribal village" as described by McLuhan. Although there is a very real attempt to construct a seamless thesis, the thrusts at his two main targets seem somewhat disconnected, and this reader was confused until he discovered an acknowledgement in quite small print at the beginning that the book is compounded of four prior articles.

Clearly widely read, the author refers to a host of references both classical and contemporary. The latter cover many of the main philosophosocio-psychological writers of the 1960s, e.g., Erikson, McLuhan, Keniston, Rogers, Maslow, Frankl, May, Toffler, Goodman, Riesman, Mead, Friedenberg, Kohlberg, Brown, Fromm, Marcuse, Laing, and de Rougemont (and that's only a partial list). Consequently, the book is both serious and scholarly in its intent and execution. Inevitably, however, the popular nature and "shooting star" quality of many of the writings cited make one wonder whether some of the effort spent in countering the various proposals for new forms of relatedness is really necessary. On the other hand there have been a series of books about relationships that suggest, at least indirectly, that any commitment to a relationship should be time-limited, so perhaps the book does state an important position.

Kilpatrick's heroes are Erikson, May, and less immediately Kierkegaard, whereas the antagonists tend to be Maslow, Rogers, McLuhan, and Brown. He believes that identity in the Eriksonian sense is a prerequisite to commitment and that commitment is essential for both love and true intimacy. It is a rather reassuring message to those of us who grew up in an older time and have tendencies to feel similarly even though we recognize that this concept can be oversimplified or misapplied in specific cases.

I am not sure I believe that the Human Potential Movement is as omnipresent as the author implies or that some of his generalizations based on "evidence" (i.e., songs, movies, books) of popularity in the culture could not just as easily be refuted by equally valid examples of other songs, movies, books, etc., but these are minor points. The book, although not always easy reading, has many points of wisdom and is a good antidote if one has been exposed to too heavy a dose of books extolling the newer varieties of relationships. A, PR
written, and such is the case today. And the disagreements
extended to significant moral matters, even if today we find
the matters disputed then are no longer matters of impor-
tance to us. The reader may confirm this claim simply by
comparing three sections from the New Testament dealing
with the question of eating meat offered to idols: Acts 15:20;
1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1; Revelation 2:14. As Paul Johnson has
pointed out, this was no trivial issue; rather, this and associated
issues constituted a matter of life or death for the Christian
faith (Johnson, A History of Christianity. New York:
Atheneum, 1976, pp. 3-63). At her birth, and at every signifi-
cant period of her life, the Church has held within her unity
strong differences, forever weaving from them new and
richer forms of union without ever achieving or even wanting
uniformity. When the synthesizing process has broken
down, the Church has splintered into what has been called
heresy or schism. There have always been at least two parties
at fault at a time of breakdown—the party of union which
would tend toward uniformity, and the dissident party which
would define itself in terms of a "purity" that made necessary
compromise impossible. Only a proper appreciation of the
plurality required within the union of the faith by the very
nature of that faith—it is not vision, but faith—prevents
repetitions in our day of the ugliness associated with Chris-
tian factionalism. In fact, that is what the ecumenical move-
ment is all about—an effort once and for all to overcome that
ugliness. Unfortunately, the spirit is willing but the flesh is
weak. We can watch the uniformity party driving our sister
church, Missouri Synod Lutheran, to the state of splintering.
Within the Roman Catholic Church, that uniformity party is
made up largely of a handful of Church administrators who
subscribe to the false vision of Roman Catholic organization
which we described above—an organization fully controlled
from the center, with a single party line to which all sub-
scribe.

Such administrators within the Roman Catholic Church
are at a distinct disadvantage since the Second Vatican
Council for at least two major reasons: first, their vision
conflicts with the spirit, and in some particulars with the
letter, of the documents of that Council. The second reason
is that the Council abandoned the way of anathema sit—that
is to say that the Council did not clarify its teachings, as had
been the custom for over 1700 years, by characterizing
document it took to be opposed to its teachings and then
condemning both the opposed doctrine and those who held
it. Having set aside this device, with its long and sad history,
of clarifying and teaching doctrine by condemnation, the
Council created with absolute inevitability within the Roman
Catholic Church a renewed spirit of plurality within union. By
so acting through the Council, the Church unequivocally set
as its goal a union of minds and hearts in faith and love, but
not a uniformity.

Still, a uniformity party persists, and from its strong
position within Church administration it chose to test the
renewal of the Church's plurality, which Vatican II had
effected, by restating the teaching against contraception in
the form into which that teaching had hardened from the
time of Pope Pius XI. The prohibition was restated in an
encyclical letter issued by Pope Paul VI entitled Humanae
Vitae. Written with full knowledge that Church discipline in
this area had begun to waver, the encyclical attempted to
restore, both in teaching and in practice within the Roman
Catholic Church, the rejection of all means of birth control
other than planned abstinence from intercourse. The effort
was remarkable for its failure; it set an historical precedent: a
fallible papal teaching rejected at the very time it was given by
a very large number of Catholics, both clerical and lay, who
continued in full communion in the Church as they dissented
from the papal teaching. In fact, the dissent is probably a
majority position, at least among educated Catholics. Faced
with this failure, the uniformity party did not give up. They
have continued their effort to restore a discipline which they
think is essential, but they have done so in ways less
publicized than the publication of an encyclical letter. The
Declaration we are considering is one such further step in the
effort to restore a uniform discipline.

It is difficult to imagine that this lesser effort will be any
more successful than the preceding papal encyclical, for the
doctrinal issue is really the same. In other words, if a Roman
Catholic does not accept fully the prohibition of contracep-
tion as the pope laid it out in Humanae Vitae, he does not
share the ground for condemning all instances of premarital
sex, masturbation, and homosexuality as those condemna-
tions are spelled out in the Declaration which Cardinal Sepe
signed, for the theory of nature at stake in both documents is
of one piece. Overwhelmingly, both in theology and in
practice, Roman Catholics have rejected the absolute prohi-
bition of birth control by contraceptive means. Although we
humans are notoriously inconsistent, it should follow that the
same Roman Catholics will reject the absolute prohibitions
against all instances of premarital sex, masturbation, and
homosexuality found in the later document.

Before we turn to the theory of nature, which makes of
these documents a single theological whole, we must clearly
state the other issue at stake, which we have been discussing
thus far without naming it, so that we can prescind from it
completely in what follows. That issue has to do with the way
in which authority will be exercised in both Church adminis-
tration and Church teaching. Will the highly authoritarian
ways in force particularly after the First Vatican Council
continue, or will the spirit of the Second Vatican Council
come to pervade both administrative authority and authorita-
tive teaching within the Church? The uniformity party seems
both to control the central administration of the Church at
this time and to have staked everything on restoring the
status quo ante—that is, they seem committed to a return to
the highly authoritarian ways, both in teaching and in admin-
istration, which characterized in particular the period from
the end of the First to the beginning of the Second Vatican
Council. This issue is perhaps more important to the party
than the doctrinal and disciplinary issues which they push. If
such is the case, then it is notable that these "Questions
Concerning Sexual Ethics" were treated in a mere Declara-
tion from a Congregation and not accorded the status of a
papal encyclical. Perhaps this was done because the steady
efforts to restore authoritarian discipline proceed better
without having the spotlight focused on them, which is the
inevitable result of an encyclical like Humanae Vitae, but also
perhaps because this Declaration is a mere footnote to the
preceding encyclical. At any rate, more than discipline in
sexual matters is at stake: how shall authority function in the
Church? As it did before the Second Vatican Council, or
according to the spirit of renewal unleashed at that Council?

I think that inevitably the latter alternative will prevail,
just as St. Paul’s approach to the older traditions prevailed
during the New Testament times. And just as it took the passing of one generation, particularly the passing of the Jerusalem church, before Paul’s innovative and liberal views prevailed, so it may well take the passing of a generation before the spirit of the Second Vatican Council can renew the Church’s use of authority in both administration and in teaching. I also think that in one sense the spirit has already prevailed, and this is of particular significance for the Seper Declaration.

The uniformity party would like to believe that before the Second Vatican Council we had within the Roman Catholic Church a uniform confessional practice, and they would like to restore that particular uniformity. Uniform confessional practice would mean that if you asked the moral advice of any priest anywhere in the world you would get the same answer. For example, if a penitent asked a priest about the advisability of engaging in acts such as masturbation, he would receive the same response: it is morally wrong. Uniform confessional practice would have a similar effect. Perhaps that is why the Declaration allows so clearly for extenuating circumstances of a subjective sort in the penitent with regard to this matter. Even with respect to the other two matters, it would take a debilitating and inevitably highly publicized investigation of the clergy to produce approximate uniformity in confessional practice. Active homosexuals who practice virtues involved in loving fidelity, which are usually associated with a faithful living-in-love of monogamous heterosexual marriage, are in fact receiving communion in the Church with the understanding and approval of one or more confessors. It is against this reality as a backdrop that persons in and out of the Church should read the Seper Declaration. It is particularly with a sensitive awareness of the struggle over authority that the document falls into its proper place. But, we must prescind from any further discussion of this question in order to explore the other significant issue which would not go away even if the Declaration is not accepted.

The specification of the general theory which concerns us now claims to be based simply on “right reason” (an important term in Thomism), functioning as the human faculty in us all which discerns the purposeful structures of Creation. But, in fact, the structures this “right reason” finds are those once recorded in Aristotle’s biology, particularly as St. Thomas read them in the Latin version during the thirteenth century, which was entitled De Generatione Animalium. There is some controversy over this matter. And, if Seper were correct, all “right reason,” learned that the finality (purpose) of human sexuality is to procreate. If that is the purpose built into our biology, our sexuality, by God the Creator, then we must in some sense choose that purpose whenever we choose to use our sexuality, or we offend the Creator and thereby sin. If there are other purposes for using our sexuality, then they must relate to the primary purpose, which is to procreate, or we are using the other purposes as rationalizations for sin. This is to say that all uses of sexuality must “be open” to procreation in order to be morally legitimate.

This specification of the general theory is perfectly simple and no one need be in any way confused about it: “Right reason,” steeped for centuries in Aristotle’s understanding of human generation, perceives in created reality that the overriding finality (purpose) of human generation is to procreate. Therefore, at the very least in order to use these organs morally, the finality of human generation must not be excluded. Any use of the organs that does exclude their fundamental purpose is thereby an objective evil. The objective evil becomes immoral or a sin subjectively if the person acting is freely performing the act and knows with his or her “right reason” that the act is contrary to the order or structure God has created. No mere psychological or sociological observation can prevail against this conviction, for it is a conviction about how God has created while psychology and sociology are merely observations about how people actually behave, which we have always known is often unfortunate. Only a contrary conviction about God’s handiwork can unseat it. There is no hope of such a contrary conviction’s rising further and becoming official in the Roman Catholic Church until believers and administrators in the uniformity party grasp the step made from general convictions about God’s purposes’ being built into created reality, and the specific way in which we try to determine details about those purposes. In other words, Christian faith, specifically its Roman Catholic form, will, because it is a corollary of faith in the Creator, never give up a theory of nature. What the Church is struggling with is an effort to replace one dated way of specifying what faith gives with certitude only in a general way, with a better way of specify-
ing that general theory which arises with belief in a purposeful Creator.

The alternate conviction about specifics in the sexual area that has spread widely through the Roman Catholic Church, but has not yet persuaded the uniformity party, is that there is at least one other objective and legitimate purpose created in sexuality which does not in all instances function in conjunction with procreation. Some would hold for a range of purposes, but there is widespread agreement about only one such moral purpose capable of standing as an end or goal independent of procreation in some instances. That purpose is to unite two persons in loving fidelity, or the unitive purpose. From an understanding of this purpose, nonprocreative sex can be seen as morally legitimate under specific circumstances, and it may be so seen by “right reason” without discarding a theory of nature. In fact, quite the contrary becomes the case. From such a point of view we can work out better ways of specifying the general theory of nature than the ways we followed when we learned about nature from Aristotle.

Another conviction has spread through the Roman Catholic world that also upsets the moral role assigned to procreation—that is a conviction regarding moral and psychological development. Put very briefly, many Roman Catholics are convinced that moral and psychological development is part of the objective structure of nature in such a way that it is natural to appropriate one’s sexuality gradually. Persons who so perceive the objective order of reality find it impossible, for example, to agree with the Seper Declaration on the question of masturbation. For the most part, they would hold that it is better not to treat it as a serious or significant moral problem as a young person is growing through puberty. Obsessive moral concern about the phenomenon may upset the objective patterns of healthy psychological development, thus hardening otherwise temporary behavior into a lifelong concern. These are but examples of positions which would result from a post-Aristotelian theory of nature. In fact, these alternative understandings of nature are growing widely in the Church, although this fact is not as noticed as it should be because of the impression given by such works as the Seper Declaration. In a scattered way, these alternative convictions about specifying a general theory of nature probably have a wider following than the older, Aristotelian-influenced specifications which Seper used.

Much of this must seem strangely behind the times to readers of the SIECUS Report, and doubtlessly it is. But the Church has had good reason to stay behind the times in regard to this matter of nature and natural law in general, although the conviction continues to grow, both inside and outside the Church, that “right reason” will not sustain the particular specification of the theory in the area of human sexuality which the Seper Declaration exemplifies. The good reasons not only for maintaining a theory of nature as central to moral thinking, but even for trying to extend it and to develop it anew, can be found in the many social crises we face today. We desperately need a sense of objective limits and purposes to ground mutual responsibility, respect, and community in order to meet the crises of imbalance in both our physical and human environments. A proper analysis can persuade “right reason” in these matters. Although he did not use this language, I believe that the work of Ernest Becker (The Denial of Death, Escape from Evil) is an example of such persuasive analysis from a social scientist. The Church provides persuasive examples too.

Arguing from a convincing understanding of nature, and human nature in particular, through the documents of the Second Vatican Council, particularly “The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World,” and through the social encyclicals of the popes from Leo XIII to the present, the Roman Catholic Church has provided a wealth of helpful analysis and moral teaching on the topics of social, economic, and political justice, and war and peace, which teachings in my judgment our age desperately needs both to hear and to heed. It is a matter of great personal sadness that these teachings are neither widely heard nor widely heeded, largely because the time and attention given to the teachings regarding human sexual nature as embodied in the Seper Declaration, which seem to persuade “right reason” far more often when backed by administrative authority than when allowed to stand on their own merits, both distract the public from the much more important teachings and lead the critically informed to turn away from the Church altogether when seeking moral analysis and moral guidance. I pray that this situation will change because I believe that we need the guidance of natural law more now than ever before.