

AMERICAN SEX-LORE

THE CIVILIZING OF HUMAN SEX

© 2016, by James Feldstein. All rights reserved..

This publication may be reproduced, distributed or transmitted in any form or by any means, provided the use is noncommercial.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: A CRITICAL LOOK AT ACTUAL SEX SYSTEMS

CHAPTER TWO: AMERICAN SEX MORALITY AS CULTURAL MYTH

CHAPTER THREE: THE IMPACT OF SEX-LORE ON AMERICA

CHAPTER FOUR: AGRICULTURAL SEX-LORE

CHAPTER FIVE: CIVILIZED SEX-LORE

CHAPTER SIX: ROMANTIC SEX-LORE

CHAPTER SEVEN: STATUS SEX-LORE

CHAPTER EIGHT: CREATIVE LEVEL SEXUAL LAW AND CULTURE

CHAPTER ONE: A CRITICAL LOOK AT ACTUAL SEX SYSTEMS

*“Behold, I give you bitter pills in sugar coating. The pills are harmless.
The poison is in the sugar.”*

The sugar coating covering American sex-lore is its respectability. American sex-lore is coated in traditional and institutional morality, rectitude and definitions. But this sugar coating treats humans as plants. It bases the morality of human sex upon the ridiculous view that human sex is the botanical planting of seed. To avoid falling prey to human sex as farming it is necessary to examine the history of the traditions, institutions and definitions of human sex generated by Western culture in order to see clearly that farming sex is truly poisonous.

A critical approach means finding a point of view that will effectively and clearly identify any disreputable segment of American sex-lore whenever, wherever and however a sinister scrap of sex-lore perverts one’s genuinely moral sexual outlook. The approach must also constitute a source of correlation for the disconnected segments of sexual folklore. Unless they can be tied to one insight, the separate pieces of sex-lore may not be recognized as being sex-lore. Just as all the pieces of the known Universe fit into one big bang and can be interpreted and understood as parts of the big bang; so also, the pieces of American sex-lore require an historically elaborated sex-lore root or roots from which the disjointed pieces derive. This requires a critical approach that can not only interpret Western sex-lore history but also synthesize the findings.

There are several historical aspects of cultural lag that need to be examined. While some of these aspects may not be the offender, they nevertheless must be examined; because no proper understanding of contemporary American sex-lore is possible without the background knowledge of Western culture that these items exhibit. In addition, the critical evaluation system employed must encompass these

historical acts. Note well, however that critical judgment of Western sexuality does not mean picky picky judgment. It means acutely accurate judgment.

The Critical Model

The problem is: does American sex-lore constitute some kind of whole with orderly parts? With a little bit of fudging the answer is yes. The critical model that works is *individual self emergence* doctrine applied to the historical and cultural development of Western sexual notions and morality. The self emergence model was formulated by a psychologist named Abraham Maslow. Maslow, along with other contemporary third force psychologists, studied healthy people. Unlike Freud who analyzed sick people and their psychological sicknesses, Dr. Maslow studied healthy people with an eye to determining what psychological health is. He came up with the now famous five motivational levels of developing individuals. He called his theory “self-emergence”. Dr. Maslow proposed his five nature-given levels of predominant motivation as the inner driving forces of individual human self development. Dr. Maslow called these levels “needs”. As one level is more or less reliably provided for, the next level makes itself felt as the dominant encompassing motivation. These needs do not replace each other as do Freud’s sex levels. The levels or plateaus of self emergence are metamorphic. The higher levels co-opt, transmute, and incorporate the lower levels.

The five motivational levels identified by Doctor Maslow, from the most biologically fundamental to the most conscious and human motivation, are:

The need to survive. Survival need is identified as a physiological need. It is satisfied by items such as food, clothing, shelter and sex. *Survival* relationships are mutually parasitic relationships.

The need for security. Security needs are satisfied by control. Fulfillment is two sided; dependent and independent. Dependent safety need fulfillments are those provided by others, such as parents protecting their children. Independent

satisfactions are those provided by self. Independent satisfactions require control over self and control over environment strong enough to remove perceived threats. Sustained and reliable self control removes the fear factor from the sudden and the unexpected which are sources of fear. *Security motivated* relationships between self and others are generally dominance/submission relationships.

The need to belong. In terms of individual human development, the need to belong triggers movement from the security of the home and family to the world outside. The need to deal with the world outside the family is a movement toward independence and individuality. Personal identity needs denote a move to freely chosen affectionate and loving, equalitarian relationships. Given the necessary secure ego, belonging to a group of “peers” involves the exercise of personal freedom and ability to share self with others. The hallmark of beginner peer groups is copy-cat behavior. In order to fit in, a person must look like the others, dress like the others, behave the way they do, like the things they like, despise the things they despise, etc. Teenage peer groups, in consequence, tend to be gender groups of all girls or all boys. Love and affection, as well as their possible expression in sexuality, are generally looked upon by society with ambivalence and are customarily hedged about with many restrictions and inhibitions. The restrictions and inhibitions on peer groups were called by Dr. Maslow “taboos on tenderness”. However, one of the consequences of same sex peer groups is the fact that the self image and identity of an individual member derives from same sex paradigms.

The need for Esteem or Respect. Esteem need is fundamentally the need to shine *as an individual* within a group. As the need to establish a stable *position* within a group, the need for respect is the need for **social status**. The need for recognition is the need that impels careers and vocations. It fairly well marks the end of dependent human behavior and represents the arrival of unique behaviors dictated by one’s own individual talents and skills. It’s result is greater unique,

personal identity as distinct from cloned group identity. The need is fulfilled by recognition from others of one's personal accomplishments and contributions as distinct from group accomplishments.

The need for self expression. Dr. Maslow called this the need to create or be creative. The nomenclature refers to the fact that human behavior at this level is idiosyncratic and self fulfilling. It refers to individualized behavior that constitutes life for the sake of living and growth for the sake of growth. This level marks the joy of living, the joy of being alive. Behavior, motivated at this level, always adds to self identity and self governance. [See: Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality, 3rd ed. rev. Robert Frager, with new material by Ruth Cox and Robert Frager...et al.(New York: HarperCollins, 1987)]

Since cultural evolution is a form of conscious self emergence of a group as distinct from the individual; the thought occurred that Maslow's theory of individual self emergence might shed some light on the history of Western culture by way of being a workable historical framework. Roughly, the comparisons are the following:

LEVEL	INDIVIDUAL	CULTURAL
SURVIVAL	Sex according to one's loins	Sex defined as botany
SAFETY	Sex according to one's fears	Sex caged by marital laws
BELONGING	Sex according to one's heart	Sex driven by Romantic love
ESTEEM	Sex according to one's head	Sex as status in society
CREATIVE	Sex according to individuality	Sex as a personal function of citizens

Freud also compared individual development with cultural development. He identified three stages for each.

In the individual: **1. Auto eroticism** or self arousal; **2. love of another viewed as a "object"** - basically *use* of another ; **3. Sublimation**, the reorientation of sexual aims toward psychically related, but non-sexual aims. In other words, an

alleged inner drive to turn sex into non sex.

Within civilization: **1. Pre-civilized promiscuity**, free exercise of non-procreative sex; **2. Suppression of all sexual impulses** except those that are procreative; **3. Suppression of all but artificially caged legitimate or lawful marital sex**, causing retardation of sexual development and impulses because of the late age at which children in our complex society attain independence and self-sufficiency.

Maslow Applied to Historical Western Culture

Maslow's theory of self emergence, when applied to the development of Western culture, shows quite clearly that the cultural progression of Western sex identification advanced from being viewed as a *function of being alive like grain and potatoes*, through being viewed as something dangerous to society that society had to control, to idiosyncratic creative personal *human living*. Although it became recognized as a *conscious* form of relationship in distinction from non-conscious plant reproduction; human *safety sex* [legally identified moral and immoral sex] remained viewed strictly as an irrepressible and coercive instinctive animal urge that had to be controlled. In America, cultural sex-lore is just now reaching the recognition level. The initial result of applying emergence theory to American sex-lore is immediate exposure of the fact that American sex-lore, *from a survival need view*, is the doctrine of **human sex as farming**. Everyone has heard that sex is the planting of male seed into a female. Few, however, have recognized that such a description is a *survival* doctrine of sex; and that it is the source of the assertion that human sex is for reproduction only. The reason is clear. Only reproductive sex causes the survival of the race. Food is a survival need. Farming is production of food. Hence, farming is a survival activity. Maslow's survival need reveals, immediately, that sex as the planting of male seed is a sex-lore of survival and that it can be interpreted and critically examined as such. In addition, sex as planting

seed, when looked at in emergence terms, is instantly revealed as a doctrine of biological determinism, a doctrine of fixed non-evolving human sex which preempts any form of individually developed idiosyncratic sexual identity. Nature rules, and neither nurture nor experience nor freedom has any place in such *botanical* human sex. All humans, by nature, must sexually function in exactly the same manner as plants. They must reproduce. This is sex viewed as completely formed at birth.

When American sex-lore is looked at in the light of Dr. Maslow's *safety need*; all the *legal and moral assertions* contained in contemporary American sex-lore show up as expressions of security need. The need for security is fulfilled by control. Sex defined as the civil institution and *contract* of monogamous marriage is blatantly a form of social order and social control. Like higher need levels which envelope and incorporate lower need levels, the nature of sex defined as the contract of marriage, is a doctrine that envelops and incorporates the deterministic survival doctrine of sex as planting seed. In consequence, within American sex-lore, the institutional marriage contract for mutual botanical sex is moralized as being exclusively for reproduction and the survival of American society as part of the survival of the species. The marital contract is claimed to be part of a Natural Law of sex which is fixed, unchanging and non-evolutionary. When paraded as Natural Law, the artificial marital contract is deviously used to determine what kind of sex is moral by nature, and what kind of sex is immoral. An *artificial* contract for botanical sex becomes the determinant of the nature of human sex in place of Nature. That is the same as saying that eyeglasses determine the nature of the eyes; and not using eyeglasses to see is a sin. Cultural, safety level legalized sex is not natural. Planting seed is sex defined by farmers and legalized by bureaucrats. Its morality is then determined on the basis that a female is the privately owned farming property of a male. So don't be planting seed in someone

else's property.

Standardized, moralistic security or legalized sex doctrine has, in turn, become the underlay of an additional sex-lore. The newer layer tends to make contemporary American sex-lore a bit schizophrenic. On the one hand, contemporary American civil law sexual morality, because it is treated as a biological absolute and cultural standard; utterly abhors the personal and the idiosyncratic. Sex, defined by civil laws that demand implacable sameness for all, does not allow for individual variations nor artificial interventions and is not for unique personal pleasure nor personal growth. Legalized former sex is for the good of the society. Legal sex is not a personal power that drives the attainment of personal adulthood. Creative sex activity and experimentation is unconditionally taboo. Non reproductive homosexual marriages are a horror. The source of human sex is not nature. It is the government. Human sex, by way of botanically interpreted human nature, sanctified by authoritarian dictum, is solely reproductive. On the other hand, contemporary American sex-lore calls sex the act of love, and love is strictly a private and personal enterprise; and no government has ever been so out of it that they claimed sex is love for the government. The approach to sex as an act of love is a romantic reaction to the stifling upright, uptight moralistic sex-lore that is actually aimed at control, not reproduction. In contrast, Dr. Maslow's theory discloses that sex as the act of love can be interpreted as sex at the level of belonging-need satisfaction. Belonging needs are satisfied by close and friendly personal relationships. In that vein, sex is not only an act of love; but an act of communication. Government controlled sex, however, is driven by Government safety needs; and it shows its ugly head in totally immoral, continuous government intrusions into areas critical to individual self emergence. Government intrusion into the private area of nature given self control for self development is destructive of individual self development and of the

attainment of personal maturity. On the level of *personal sex relationships*, an undeveloped immature personal safety-need to control anything and every one because of a fear of losing a very tenuous and weak self identity exhibits itself as abusive sexual and marital relationships, as well as in jealousy. Sex as love is also the disguise of many a purely sexual liaison.

The question is: did our cultural ancestors actually produce the sex-lore present today in American culture or did our contemporary American society author all of it? No one can identify exactly when or where each piece of each set of lore originated. But there are some things we do know about the influence of our forefathers whose written records begin about the year 3000 BCE. We know that some heavy duty concepts, including some about sex, formulated by our Sumerian ancestors in response to the needs of a farming society did carry over into contemporary American culture. These items include some of our mathematics, the art of phonetic writing and some religious doctrine that filtered into Judaism and hence into Christianity. There is not a lot of direct evidence that our Sumerian farmer ancestors invented males seeding females, but it is rather likely. The plant lore of human sex is definitely based upon fertility rites. In addition, there is no question that the neighbors of the Sumerians, our Jewish religious and cultural ancestors, possessed an agricultural sex doctrine. We know that from the Bible. We also have some evidence that certain Far Eastern farming cultures contain a sex-lore of males planting seed in females similar to our Western version. In addition, we have the actual Babylonian Code of Hammurabi which indicates, among other things, that the Babylonians had a legal system of private possession, including private possession of farmland. From that same Code, we know they considered *women and children the personal and private possessions of husbands and fathers*. We also know that almost all of our philosophically ordered, legally structured, safety oriented sex-lore derives from Greco-Roman-Christian sources; because we

possess in their own extant writings the agriculturally based, moral and sovereignty concepts they formulated about sex. The additional fact that agricultural sex-lore was an underlying carry over into Greco-Roman-Christian security sex-lore is obvious from the sex concepts that were coerced by civil law into socially safe structures. The concept of marriage as the *only* “*natural*” reproductive form of sex is a derivative of the biological determinism contained in the botanical, agricultural sex-lore. The etymology of words such as “semen” and “hysterectomy” is another clue that our agricultural/safety sex-lore was formulated by our Greek, Roman and Christian ancestors. The roots of words such as these are Greek and Latin.

The institutionalizing of botanical sex myth turned farming sex into the legalized contractual institution of marriage. Marriage in America today is a bilateral man-made contract by which most males think their bride vowed to be his private property. At least she vowed to obey him. Sadly, this bilateral contractual monogamy is thought to be the very definition of sex itself. The rise of urban, civilized [civil means legal, and civilized means established under law and order] society in contrast to rural agricultural society, created a situation in which legal systems define and govern the nature and use of human sexuality. Farmer sex became ‘city’ sex, and primitive ‘Eros’ became civilized ‘ethos’. Because of the connection between human sex and sacred rituals, the ethical control of human sex was assumed by the Christian religion; although most secular bureaucrats assume the same paternal attitude, as is evidenced by the many sexual laws existing in this country. As a reaction to this highly ordered autocratic and artificial control of sex, a new form of sexual folklore developed which focused entirely on the individual and the affectionate dimension, rather than on the intellectually organized social purposes of human sexuality. It was called the **Age of Romance** and human sexuality was ‘romanticized’. The Romantic myth says that the heart rules. Love is all, does all and solves all. Love in this context is a feeling of tenderness and

emotion and sex is the strongest of the positive human emotions. so love and sex are the same thing. The act of sex becomes the act of love and the sacredness of human sexuality is found in the cult of orgasm. Modern biology hasn't helped a whole lot. The definition of human sex as the *urge to pass on one's genes* perpetuates the myth that the sole nature and purpose of human sex is reproduction.

By the time the doctrines of sex as a bond of belonging arrived, printing had also arrived; and the doctrines of love sex were spread all over Europe and then to America. These mythical doctrines are still available, and are still read by many an American. Romance novels are a dime a dozen. Western sex-lore, it would seem, was formulated by farmers, codified by lawgivers and utilized by lovers. In view of the above considerations, emergence theory applies admirably as a synthesizing and critical view of historically generated Western sex-lore; but a caution is appropriate. Although at least three levels of American cultural, sex-lore can be discerned as enduring today and can be identified as part of today's culture in terms of emergence theory; using Maslow is an "a-priori" approach. In consequence, Dr. Maslow's theory must be viewed as hindsight and not as an absolute foresight or predictor of sex to come.

1. The Survival Level of Western Culture

Physiological or survival need level existed as a focus of culture when Western society and culture was just seeing its origins in the agricultural societies located in the Fertile Crescent of the Mid East. The Tigris-Euphrates valley provided the environment necessary for the development of primitive agriculture, while the surrounding desert formed natural boundaries. By 5000 BC this form of culture had spread across the Fertile Crescent from the Persian Gulf all the way to Egypt. Around 3500 BC this Neolithic culture reached Europe. The Neolithic culture was founded on the domestication of animals and the development of

agriculture. Neolithic people were food producers who tilled the soil and kept flocks and herds. They developed knitting, spinning and cloth weaving. They made pottery and built houses of sun dried mud. Agriculture made possible a settled mode of existence, the growth of villages, and the development of true social institutions such as family, religion and primitive government. Without doubt, the development of farming, the invention of cloth weaving and the building of homes indicate that the predominant concerns of the Neolithic culture were food, clothing and shelter which are Maslow's physiological or *survival needs*. The survival stage of our Western culture consisted of its agricultural beginnings. These farming cultures gave rise to the sex myth of human sex as plant botany. Plant botany applied to human sex is seeding/fertility sex operating under intractable, no deviation allowed, sacred reproductive laws of Nature.

2. The Security Level of Western Culture

When the original thrust of culture toward facing the necessities of life was successful, humans turned toward consolidating their gains. Successful agriculture that produces a surplus also allows for expansion of tribal and kinship organization. It allows for much greater concentrations of people devoted to non agricultural pursuits. It provides the basis for the rise of cities and city life. The beginnings were the ancient city-states which are considered by historians as the beginnings of true civilization. The successful survival arrangements of agricultural culture also allowed for a surplus of people who could devote themselves to the job of organizing the social body. Successful economies or accomplished survival needs, gave rise to politicians and philosophers as well as to scientists and engineers. Second generation culture became devoted to bureaucracy. Life, once devoted almost entirely to surviving, became oriented to the development and preservation of organization. At this point the roots of our Western culture became oriented to law and order. Agricultural humankind became

civilized humankind. History books call it the rise of civilization. The accomplishments of Near East agricultural societies became the roots of Western culture. Egyptian civilization as well as the city-states of ancient Greece such as Athens, Sparta, Corinth and Miletus were consequently formed. The founding of Rome followed thereafter. With these events came Alexander the Great, Plato and Aristotle, Julius Caesar and Cicero; as well as Roman Law, Civil Law, Law of Nations and Natural Law. All of this is considered by historians to be the development of Western civilization as based upon civil law. Thus the *security oriented* phase of Western culture was the ‘civilizing’ period of our culture

The safety or security level of Western culture existed when the focus of Western society was on the development of ‘civilization’ via the great Greek empire of Alexander the Great and subsequently the Roman Empire. Their focus was on integrating subject peoples into the Empire and hence was oriented to creating civil law and order. The Romans created the security of social organization on a large scale far beyond tribal setups. The Hellenistic Greek empire carried the strong externally oriented, get the facts of the world around, point of view that has become the Western ‘scientific’ point of view of humans relative to the Universe. Hellenism, particularly with its background of Socrates, Plato and Plato’s student and in turn tutor to Alexander, Aristotle, gave us the attitude of learning about Nature by examining it. The Romans were a bit more oriented to control of their empire and gave to Western culture ‘lawmakers’ and ‘lawyers’. The two cultures and empires together gave us, at least in origins, the highly conceptualized legalized version of agricultural sex-lore that I call *civilized sex*.

With a great deal of oversimplification, we can say that Neolithic man formulated an agricultural sex-lore, the Greeks organized this agricultural sex-lore into a philosophical framework, and the Romans built a protective body of law

around it creating civilized or legalized plant sex. Western *civilized sex* is plant sex operating under contractual marital sex created by allegedly ‘intractable’ laws of humans, built upon the intractable laws of Nature. The entire complex of agricultural sex-lore, encased within civil law and legal social structures, was then synthesized in the Middle Ages into the Holy Roman Empire and institutional Christianity. While incorporating **Roman contractual** or marital plant sex, the Christian Church added a few twists of its own relative to legal plant sex in order to render it ‘holy’, botanical sex. The Church turned ‘domesticated’ agricultural sex into ‘sacramental’ sex; and it turned Roman-made artificial law into God’s natural law.

3. The Belonging Level of Western Humankind

The breakup of the Holy Roman Empire and the rise of industrialism destroyed the monolithic, collective culture which endured through the Middle Ages. Urban society acquired a complex heterogeneous cultural identity composed of more particularized and personalized meanings which came from the many different groups and individuals comprising urban society. The trend toward contemporary personalism was marked by the rise of democratic political forms and an Age of Romance. Although the complexities of Western culture have increased immeasurably, and while there has been progress and regress, the transition to modern culture began with the Renaissance. Closely following, and part of the transition, are the Protestant Reformation, the Age of Enlightenment, and Romanticism; as well as political revolutions leading to the formation of democratic forms of government. The rise of science and technology, the Industrial Revolution and the development of mass public education, as well as mass media, mass communication and mass transportation added their two bits to the mixture. The cultural trend of these developments has been from sacred to secular and from Faith to reason. The trend is toward humanism, equality, individual freedom and

democracy. It is away from cold disembodied, static, hierarchical institutional order; and toward affectionate, dynamic, equalitarian community and communication. The trend is toward personalist interpretations of life and the adult capability of individuals to pursue their own happiness. Personal autonomy and interpersonal relationships are replacing institutional tutelage in everyday life. American life is currently between unquestioning conformity to a pre-fabricated institutional picture of reality and adaptive personal response to reality and to others. The current trend is seen in America's racial problems, student resistance, citizen protests and marches and the revolt in the Churches. It is contained in evolutionary science, existential ethics, communication theory, and the organization man as well as the lonely crowd, the human side of enterprise, self-emergence psychologies and analyses of games people play. From a sexual point of view it is contained in the Women's Rights Movement and the drive of homosexual couples to have their unions recognized as true marriages. America and European countries are focusing on life and humankind itself in order to find fulfillment. Turning to individual human fulfillment is orienting our culture to belonging needs, to love needs, and to interpersonal relationships. At the same time, the conservative over artificial, over organized, excessively utilitarian and paternalistic, institutional safety values are being relegated to a secondary position. The belonging level of Western culture that first originated in Romanticism continues to this day as personalism. Representative government and Democracy as it exists today is part of this picture. Romanticism and personalism have brought with them love, individual choice, communication and equality within contractual plant sex marriage. This created, and is still creating, the lore of *romantic* plant sex. "Romantic" love was basically a reaction to the somber Christian doctrines of the sinfulness of sexual pleasure, and duty and obedience in marriage. Out of the Christian degradation of sex arose the romantic idealization of sex. Love

relationships introduced tenderness and affection into male female relations in contrast to Christian male dominated low female status. It further strengthened desires for love and affection that previously went unsatisfied due to the rigors of feudal life and Christianity.

One aspect of belonging sex is very clear. Belonging sex is not reproductive sex. The purposes and outcomes of belonging sex do not in the least fit “farmer” sex as does contractual marital sex. But even the contractual or marital form of sex does not fit plant reproductive sex very well, because valid marriage can exist without actual reproduction. Belonging sex is an additional step away from sex solely as a matter of mechanical reproduction. The purpose of belonging sex, in fact, matches the Bible far better than does legalized plant sex. The Bible, more than once, says the purpose of human sex is **one flesh or union**. Sex, as symbolic of the union between God and His people, is *unitive*; not *reproductive*. Belonging sex reaches to the level of the purpose of sex. Plant sex and legalized plant sex do not. Plants do not consciously unite, and the law may legally unite; but a legal union is not an intimate blending of two personalities into one as is genuine love.

4. The Esteem Level of Western Culture

Maslow’s esteem needs arise from within as drives to distinguish one’s individualized self within the group. They are matters of career and social roles. Esteem levels of Western culture, particularly in American culture can be looked at as the relation of individual Americans to American culture and society. Esteem needs, within the *individual* are the answer to the question; “What do you want to be when you grow up?” In terms of *culture*, the question of esteem is: what kind of social or legal status is given to belonging sex? When America turned Medieval Western society and culture upside down, esteem levels of society and culture were reached. Prior to this point, society and government were the end and citizens were the means. The American constitution and bill of rights turned this around and said

the construct and institutions of government and society are the means. The citizens are the end. The *individual* human is as important as the entire society. The society is quantitatively more important but not qualitatively more important or valuable. A civil society, as an artificial construct of laws and government, has no separate autonomous value in se, but only in view of its individual members. Each and every individual human member is an end in se, none is a means to the good of the collective. This does not mean that that individuals cannot work for the good of the society. It means that when they do, they do it by their own choice and not by mandate from above.

Opportunity to stand up and ‘do it my way’ allows for personal freedom and recognition of personal accomplishment. In America social roles are not all prearranged and fixed. There is room for a career of one’s own choice and of one’s own making. America is a society whose freedom allows for individual pursuits and outputs. It is a society that recognizes individualized non State designed outputs. The American State even helps the individual get started by providing public education with all of its weaknesses and possibilities for State manipulation as a propaganda machine. Romanticism created a personalist outlook; and America constitutionally and legally ‘institutionalized’ that outlook. This is over and above representative democracy.

5. The Creative Level of American Culture

The ability to be creative is the freedom to do one’s own thing. In that vein, the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights were designed to insure such freedom for each and every individual citizen. The social freedoms enjoyed by Americans and similar Western cultures as well as the right to vote and to participate in government has, in turn, influenced the *culture* of America. Although Federal and State legislators have relentlessly tried to take that freedom away from American citizens and abrogate to themselves the rights and authority that belong

to individual Americans, American culture still grants individual Americans most of their rightful freedoms - but not when it comes to sex. It cannot be said that American society and American culture has attained a totally creative level of sexuality. The inferior status of minorities, homosexuals and women, along with the horror of some in regard to sex education for anyone; indicates that American sexual culture is barely functioning, here and there, at the level of esteem and recognition. American culture, as well as American law, has not yet given up control of masturbation in the individual and “buggery” in the marital bedroom. Being at the dawn of equalized gender based social status; American sexual culture, most assuredly, is not ready to grant individual citizens their Nature given free-will *creative use* of their own *individual sexuality*. Unfortunately, few realize that repressed individual sexuality creates an immature individual who will stay that way. In fact, most people who are deathly afraid of self controlled sex and prefer government controlled sex do not even consider that self controlled, creative *individualized sexuality* might mean a creative person’s choice of no sex at all. The view that government and law must control the sexuality of individuals is due to the fact that American ***cultural sex-lore*** says that any individual allowed free reign over their own sexuality will go wild. Accordingly, American culture is not a source of, nor does it acknowledge or allow, much sexual behavior that would fit into Maslow’s creative level of a *self designed individualized sexuality that fits into, and integrates with all the other factors and variables that constitute a fully and properly formed, mature human individual or person*.

Given the actual past, the elemental description of sex was expressed in farming terms that, in turn, were caged within structured Greek philosophy and Roman law and Christian sacrament. It is agricultural sex that was clothed by law forming it into *legalized* agricultural sex. In turn, it is legal, agricultural sex that became a Christian sacrament. Still emerging, Christian, legal, agricultural sex

became romantic. And romantic, Christian, contractual, agricultural sex is what we consider today as normal and ‘moral’ sex. Today, sex is loving, legal, reproductive farming of females by males whereby we worship God. But the true fact is that American and Christian *marriage* today is basically an *artificial contract* for sex and nothing more. This is demonstrated by divorce which is dissolution of the *sex contract* by a court of law. The construct of marriage as a bilateral legal contract is totally artificial. And the uncritically accepted legal identity of **plant sex**, *when viewed as an appropriate definition of human sex and sexual morality, is poison*. Human law does not dictate human nature or human sex. Human nature and human sex dictate the law.

The critical question

As a former educator, I have a habit of asking people weird questions. In order to force my students to go look at the evidence for themselves rather than accept what I said or what the authors of their textbooks said, I liked to ask my incoming students this question: “Does any of you *know* that one plus one is two?” Of course, the hand of every student would pop up. Then I would say to them: “To know something in contrast to believing it, means that you have had the evidence in hand. If you take someone’s word for something, that is belief. Knowledge is not belief, and it does not come from the testimony of a witness or from reading a textbook. Knowledge comes from seeing, hearing and touching the evidence for yourselves. So if all of you wizards *know, rather than believe*, that one plus one is two; tell me: “**Where** did you see or hear or touch or taste or smell a couple of ones making a two”.

In the same vein I used to ask small children similar questions in order to see what insights the little ones actually had *in regard to reality*. I would ask them questions such as: “why did your mommy and daddy grow up to be so tall and then stop growing?” My favorite question was: “what is the difference between a cat

and a dog?” Interestingly, whenever I asked these questions to a small group of kids, both male and female, it was always, without fail, the little girls who answered. Never the boys. Even at age 5 or 6, the little boys did not want to risk failure because it is not manly. The answers from the little girls, however, in many cases were astonishingly astute. One little girl told me that the difference was cats had whiskers, and dogs didn’t. Another small girl told me that cats could climb trees and dogs couldn’t. Still another said that cats meow and dogs bark; in other words, they naturally speak a different language. But the most astounding answer of all came from a beautiful little girl who told me that the difference was cats had kittens and dogs had puppies. The meowing versus the barking is a partial natural answer; but the puppies and the kittens is a completely correct, *comprehensive* biological answer. **Natural entities** are functional. They, by their very nature, are designed to do something. Making expressive noises, like eating or sleeping, is only a part of the functioning of a cat or a dog; but reproduction represents whole to whole. A kitten corresponds to the entire nature of a cat, and likewise a puppy to a dog. In other words, reproduction is, in fact, the **ultimate corporeal purpose** of an individual cat and an individual dog. We call that purpose preservation of the species. As the little girl already *knew*, **ultimate functions or purposes** are used to define functional entities. For example, the answer to the question, what is an automobile, is this: *an automobile is a self propelled, passenger operated vehicle, designed for transporting people from place to place on the ground.*

Question: Is preservation of the species the sole purpose of an individual human person? Do human individuals exist for the sake of the species? Are individual, human **persons**, by nature, the servants of the species [or the government]? Is reproduction the definition of a human being? If it is, why do we claim that human persons are self possessed and not the possession of some other person or entity? Why do we claim human persons can be owners but never owned

[slaves]? Why do we claim that human individual persons have naturally given, inalienable rights which cannot be removed by the State? Why do we claim that human individuals are masters of their own destiny? Why do we claim that human persons are responsible for their actions? Why do we say that human persons are self governing? Why do we say all these things? We say them because all of us agree that the individual, human person is not a means to some other end. Each individual person is an end in itself. Individual human persons do not *have* purposes, *they are the purpose* of other realities. Human beings do not exist because of, or for the sake of science, art or technology. The reverse is true. Science, art and technology exist for the sake of human beings; and as a matter of fact, these things do not exist for the sake of the human race collectively, they exist for the sake of each individual human person individually. Lastly, no one human being is the purpose of another human being. Each individual human person, as a self possessed entity, is considered to be the equivalent of the entire human race rather than a means to the preservation of the race. The preservation of the individual is equal in value to the preservation of the race.

Consequently; reproduction cannot be the purpose of human sex. If the whole and entire individual person does not exist for the sake of anything or any one else, then no part of the individual person exists for the sake of another person. If the whole is entirely white, then no part of it can be asserted to be red. If the whole is an end or purpose in itself, then the parts of that whole exist only to serve that whole. The heart of person "A" does not exist for the sake of person "B." It exists for the sake of person "A." In the same vein, human sex cannot exist for the reproductive sake of a future human being. Why, then, are human persons sexual? Since the question of sex refers to a *modality* or part of the human *person*; the *whole person* can be asserted as the purpose of any and all of its own parts. Hence, the whole person can be asserted as the purpose of the individual's sex. Why are

humans sexual? For the sake of the person. Individual plants and individual brute animals can be considered slaves of the species; but not the human person. Human sex exists for the sake of the person of whom it is a part. The human person is not the slave of reproduction nor the slave of the species. Sex and reproduction are the slaves of the human person. An individual's sex exists for the sake of its individual owner. Sexuality is the servant of the individual person. Sexuality drives all of self emergence in the form of gender. Sexuality is the servant of the person; because sexuality drives individuals to form unions with other individuals such that the resulting "*genderous*" union or whole is greater than its parts. All human relationships with other humans are "*genderous*". There is no such thing as a human union or group of two or three "*its*". All human social contacts contain gender and some contain sex. Sexuality is the preeminent driving force of our gender emergence and our "*genderous*" social nature. Sex is not present only in intercourse, sexuality is present in our very life force. Our souls are tied to the sex of our bodies.

The Christian way of looking at individual humans as ends in se is to view humans as the image of God. If man is the image of God, then reproduction cannot be the purpose of sex, any more than creation can be the purpose and reason for God's existence. God does not exist because of creation. Creation exists because of God. On a human level, Mozart's compositions were not the purpose of Mozart's life in such fashion that they were the reason and cause of his existence. Mozart did not exist because of his compositions. His compositions existed because of Mozart. Likewise, reproduction is not the reason why human individuals exist. Human individuals are the reason why reproduction exists. The human person does not exist for the sake of reproduction. A reproduced human person or child is not the purpose or final cause of marital sex. A reproduced person or child is the effect of sex not the cause of sex. If you are a Christian, then the purpose of your

existence is not reproduction; but the vision of God in Heaven. The Christian defined purpose of the individual as the vision of God, is one of the reasons why Christianity has never been keen on sex. The individual does not need to reproduce in order to attain salvation. In fact, sex is seen as a distraction and detraction from the attainment of salvation. Be aware, however, that self fulfillment is a selfish pursuit in the best sense of the word selfish. Attainment of purposes is basically self serving. Growth and development are selfish enterprises. Having claimed that individuals, as the image of God, are ends in themselves and that they have no purpose other than full development of themselves to the point of being ready and able to enjoy the vision of God; it boggles the mind to read in Christian literature the assertion that reproduction is the purpose of human sex. The two assertions are absolutely contradictory. Reproduce may be one of the things a Christian couple can do; but it is most assuredly not the reason why they exist.

Need *fulfillment* is the nature of a final cause. Attainment of something lacking or satisfaction of a requirement is the nature of a *final cause or purpose*. Final causes are the actualization of potential, the development of the undeveloped, the perfection of the imperfect, the fulfillment of the unfulfilled. From this point of view, *full development* can be asserted as the purpose of an undeveloped individual. Attainment of full adult emergence can be asserted as the purpose of a newborn child. But once that newborn has attained full adult development, further natural purposes can no longer be asserted; and that includes reproduction. Humans, unlike plants and brute animals, do not reproduce as a form of instinctual need fulfillment. If that were the case, everyone, down to the last individual, would be driven to reproduce the way plants and brute animals do. Humans may be driven more or less by the desire for sexual pleasure; but adult humans are not driven day by day out of a desire for children. The desire for children is not the cause of daily human functioning. Children do not represent fulfillment for many

persons. The instinctive purpose of daily functioning is the need for attainment and preservation of adult competence. Careers cause more people to function than does a desire for children.

For the mature, fully developed people who do want children, children represent accomplishment and giving rather than taking. Humans do not reproduce because they have to, or absolutely need to; and this in itself illustrates that reproduction is not their reason for existing. It is not their purpose. Humans can successfully exist without reproducing. There is a huge difference in the two situations. The heart of the difference lays in the nature of choice. A lot of people think that free will means the ability to multi-function. It does not. Recall that one of the ways in which we express choice is to say that we are *determined* to accomplish this or that. A professor of mine used to explain this by stating that: “you cannot jump on a horse and ride away in all directions at once”. The nature of choice is **to select**, and thereby *determine* which one of many options will be pursued. Free choice is the opposite of anything goes. It is a determiner of action. However, once a determination is made, even if before the choice a person had no need whatsoever of the thing chosen; the thing chosen becomes the equivalent of a need. The object chosen becomes a satisfaction of the choice. Free choice creates an intention or an acquired purpose which, in turn, causes the object of that purpose to become a satisfaction. Many human satisfactions represent vital needs. Food, for example, is one of them. We have no choice but to eat in order to survive. But eating at a restaurant, and eating at this restaurant rather than that restaurant, is not a natural need at all. A restaurant becomes a need by choice, not by implacable nature. The restaurant is not a predetermined natural need, it is a freely determined gratuitous need. Call it a freely pasted, add-on need. So also human reproduction. Human reproduction is not a natural and vital fulfillment of human nature; it is a gratuitous add-on need caused by choice. Reproduction is not

a necessary human need, it is a freely chosen need. Only as the determinate object of a free choice can reproduction be called a purpose of any human individual or human couple. Reproduction is a *freely determined purpose*, not a natural inexorable purpose. But the confusion of naturally given purposes versus freely appropriated gratuitous purposes has bedeviled humans and human sex since the dawn of time. Perceiving reproduction as an inexorable natural purpose is the result of perceiving sex in terms of agriculture. From the point of view of the biological determinism built into seed planting sex; seeds, by nature, are necessarily oriented to a new crop. Reproduction, however, is a naturally required purpose of human sex only if humans are no different than carrots

CHAPTER TWO: AMERICAN SEX MORALITY AS CULTURAL MYTH

What's wrong with this culturally accepted definition of human sex?

Human sex is government permitted male planting of seed in females whom males own by reason of a mutually sworn civil contract for producing uniform good citizens; formulated as morality by the Church, imperially imposed by the State, and punitively monitored by both Church and State.

Your Conscious self or human identity has three sets of meaning in it. **1.** It has the meanings you give to your *biological*, experiential self. **2.** It contains the *cultural* meanings you have selectively adopted, and **3.** it contains the personal *idiosyncratic* meanings you give to your *conscious self*. Self is the collection of all three sets of meanings. The total collection of meanings is the thing you experience as self. Likewise sexuality is not just a little corner of personality. Sexuality permeates the entire organism, the entire personality and the entire lifetime. But

sex is not the whole personality as some would have it. The unique sexuality of each individual is a *tonality* of the three ingredients of personality. Just as self is a collection of experiential, cultural and personal meanings; sexuality or sexual identity is also a collection of experiential, cultural and personal meanings. Whatever identity an individual's sexuality has within an individual, that identity is not a purely biological given. It cannot be asserted that human sex is biologically reproductive and that is all there is to it. The total identity of human sex, as sex, permeates the personality as a total set of bio-cultural-personal meanings. This makes human sex distinct from the sexuality of a dandelion. Biological or plant sex determinism created a sexual morality that, in effect, did not allow personal choice of individual sexual style but only the choice of obey and be saved or disobey and be damned. This is sex looked at as a static finished product from day of birth. Agricultural sex-lore created a concept of human sex that consisted of biological determinism. Civil sex-lore, as based upon agricultural sex-lore, created a concept of rigid fixed unchanging and demanding sexual morality. The truth is that the self is something that grows. This is the reason for speaking of self emergence rather than simply speaking of a one and only template of humanness uniformly applied to everyone. All the previous conceptions of psychology and morality imply a self that is already fixed. They gave you a pre-set pattern. You're supposed to be a given kind of perfect human being. You're supposed to have the will power to be selective about your experiences in terms of this pre-fabricated idea of self. What the self emergence concepts tell you, however, is that the self and intellect and free-will develop in a living manner; and that these are not a pre-formed, pre-categorized, pre-rationalized, pre-standardized self that was within you from the beginning of your life. Your private choices occur because you've given yourself a certain meaning; and whomever you conceive yourself to be, you use in order to select and fashion your experiences and your consciousness of the world around

you. You use this self conception as a selective factor in determining what you will react to and how you will react to it. Self meaning becomes the criterion by which you either accept or reject factors which you discover in your self and in your environment. You do the same thing with your environment. Certain things that you run into in your environment or certain people you will accept or reject in terms of who you conceive yourself to be. In terms of self emergence; selectivity means that the stronger and more defined your concept of yourself gets, the more personal your selections will get. As conscious self grows in strength, as you continually become more aware of yourself in terms of your biologically given spontaneous self and your environment, the less standardized you will get. Your free-will or your will-power is growing all the time. And at the same time your personal selectivity grow more idiosyncratic. You cannot say to yourself I have now achieved precisely the same personality that all other human beings have. You cannot tell yourself that a standard self was inbuilt from the day you were born so you knew from infancy exactly who you must develop into. Perfection, or ideal self, is not pre-set in an original totally defined, inborn, personality. The original self is not pre-designed such that it's exact perfection can be forecast and then used as an ideal or norm of lifetime behavior. An ideal or perfect self which is proposed as a "one size fits all" is an illogical fiction. However what many moral Nazis are trying to do is force you to grow into *their idea* of a perfectly subservient sycophant, while, in fact, you are growing into a self determining unique individual the like of which has never before been seen on earth. Human sexuality, as part of the human being and human self, is in the same position. No one can set down a totally pre defined pre fabricated notion of what human sexuality is and then say everyone's sexual behavior must conform. There is, without doubt, a certain amount of human social environment that has cultural meanings. And these cultural meanings are standardized meanings. In other words, certain things in the

world around you were given meanings by your culture and you simply adopt the meanings as they are. For example: a person in the united states grows up thinking that a marriage based upon plant sex is the only way to handle sex. American sex has a given cultural meaning that was already established for you before you got here. Your culture has told you that the meaning of sex is seed planting contractual marriage and reproduction; and most of the time the average individual will simply use this cultural meaning without examining it. Culture is normally not picked out as an artificial source. However, even the English language is an artificial cultural form of human activity, but most Americans simply accept the English language as a nature-given part of life.

Critical Judgment as the way to avoid the poisonous aspects of American sex-lore

Modern science has come up with a definition of sex. Scientists call sex: **“the urge to pass on one’s genes”**. The definition is intended to be, and in fact is, applicable, in some respects, to all forms of life. It is a definition that pertains to the entire kingdom of plants and animals. It fits everything alive in general, but nothing in particular. It is so generic, even plants can do it. It does not so much as mention *same species* only. When applied to humans, it is an ugly definition. It could be interpreted to be saying that it is the urge of an individual human to mate with a tree today and a sheep tomorrow. It promulgates the notion that human sex is simply an automatic or reflexive biological act like sneezing. Even though human sexuality is not located in a specific part of the body any more than humanness is located in the ear, the “urge to pass on genes” locates sex in the genitals. Unfortunately, however, the definition of sex as the *urge to pass on genes* comes from science; so this definition is assumed to be the optimum expression of the *specific nature* of all forms of sex - including that of humans.

In contrast, the *popular definition* of sex is: “**the urge to merge**”. The urge to merge is a far superior definition of sex when *cognitive* species are involved. The urge to merge implies the fact that sex is a *mutual awareness* between separate individuals that makes them conscious of the merging. The urge to merge implies that the *individuality* of both partners is not only biologically, but also *cognitively, mergeable*; and in calling the impulse an urge the definition recognizes the **reciprocal** biological orientation, attraction and functional power to actually merge. “The urge to merge” implies a cognitive act, not only because it requires *awareness* of another; but also because it implies awareness of the other as an *appropriate* partner. Just as the *urge to pass on genes* does not aptly apply to cognitive beings; the conscious “urge to merge” does not aptly apply to reproduction by non cognitive entities. We do not normally state that pineapples and peas have sexual urges. But a conscious “urge to merge”, when applied to feely chosen human sex, is lacking only in regard to the deliberately chosen dimension of human merging. For humans, the urge to merge consists of mutually coordinated *biological compulsions* of individuals that are *consciously recognized and deliberately utilized in a merger of heart and mind*, as well as in a merger of bodies. The deliberate urge to merge also expresses another truth about human sex. It plainly states that conscious, deliberate human sex is aimed at *merger* rather than at passing on genes. Human sex is a *deliberately chosen union* between mutually attracted **persons**. Human sex is not primarily reproductive. **It is primarily unitive**. Inter-course results in the unity of separate individuals by way of a mutual fulfillment of each other. Food is fulfilling and so is recreation. But there is no greater fulfillment of an individual than another human individual. It is true that in some cases the unity is temporary, but in many cases it is permanent and filling. What human unitive sex does not imply, however, is domination of one of the merging individuals over the other. Domination/subjection between adult humans

is not a genuinely human union of adults, because neither side of the relation involves the good of the partner. Since, the “passing on of genes” comes with a heavy dose of *necessity* to act and do it *without reproductive variance*; anyone who identifies human sex as the “urge to pass on genes” for purposes of species has locked out the intimate cognitive and loving **union of persons**. Note also, that under this generic stereotyping of passing on genes, a *human zygote* is a self governing **person**; because what is allegedly passed on are replicative species genes without any unique individuality. In fact, the assumption that a human zygote possesses, in complete fashion, all the traits that come with the species is one of the greatest mistakes ever made in regard to a true and valid understanding and critical judgment of what a properly formed human adult is. Viewing a zygote as if it were a self formed, self possessed, independent person is about the same as assuming that if a person knows the name of something; that person comprehends the corresponding reality. Look mom: “I can spell *zygote* and I can spell *person*. *Therefore a zygote is a person*”. A real definition, in contrast to a nominal label, consists of genuine intellectual insight into the *core of a reality*. A stereotype is not an essential insight or understanding. It is a label that assumes all the individuals in a collective of some sort are clones. Actually, any reality can be called whatever a person wants to call it. A tree can be called a person, but that does not cause the tree to be one. The difference between knowing reality and knowing a name is the difference between knowing a *verbal definition versus knowing a real definition*. A verbal definition refers to the meaning of the word. Webster’s dictionary is a listing of verbal definitions of most of the words in the English language. In contrast, a real definition is an expression of the essential elements constituting a reality, not the essential elements that constitute a word.

Critical judgment, for its part, does not mean knowing all the answers. **It means knowing how to tell whether any proposed or presented information is**

a label or a real insight or a croc. Critical judgment means the intellectual ability to tell whether purported factual information is on or off track relative to the asserted subject matter. For example, can you tell whether the following statement refers to factual information about reality? “This father-son relationship is orange, weighs six pounds and is radioactive”. Three bits of information are required for critical judgment: **1.** Awareness of the correct subject matter; **2.** knowing what type of answers that a given subject matter yields; **3.** knowing how to proceed from appropriate questions about the subject matter to correct answers regarding the subject matter. This third element means knowing what kind of approach, or key, opens up the subject matter. In more simple terms, critical judgment, in regard to a specific subject matter, consists of knowing where to start, where to go and knowing how to get there.

The verbal or dictionary definition of sex

The verbal or dictionary definition of the word “sex” is “cut”. The word is derived from the Latin root “seco” or “secare” which means to “cut”. The word “sex” is fundamentally the same word as scissors and schism. Humanness is split into male and female; and the word “sex” refers to that split.

The real definition of human sex

Correct subject matter: Critical judgment in regard to sexual subject matter refers to the ability to distinguish genuine information about human sex from artificial moral imperatives, legalities, artificial add-ons, erroneous science and medicine, seduction, non-human or wrong species definitions, cultural fairy tales, and just plain stupidity. Critical judgment relative to human sexual subject matter also includes the ability to properly distinguish part from whole, because confusion of whole and part is one of the most common errors relative to any subject matter. On the one side, critical judgment of sexual subject matter is the ability to see that

human sex is a dynamic part of the *entire* human being. At the same time, it is also an awareness that sex is not the whole human person, but rather, is *a modality of the whole human person* that develops in combination with the development of the whole person. Nevertheless, distinguishing sexual aspect from whole human person does not mean separating body from soul. Human sex is neither a solely bodily duality of male and female, nor is it solely a duality of male or female souls or personalities. Neither is human sex an indecent bodily function that occurs biologically without rationality. Human sex responds to the human will. This clearly demonstrates that human sex is not an irresistible urge. Like eyes and ears, human sex is a power that we use in the acquisition of maturity and in getting freely and intimately close to another human person. Human sex is a gender duality of whole and entire integral human persons.

Correct answers: Critical judgment about sexual answers is the expertise for distinguishing information about healthy human sex from information about sick human sex. Freud, for example, was concerned with sick human sex. Anyone who reads Freud should be aware of that. Critical judgment about sexual answers also includes the ability to distinguish free, independent, individual adult sex from socially imposed, uniform formula sex. And again, the distinction of part and whole pertains. Recognition of correct sexual answers requires the ability to see that *reproduction* is not the whole of human sex, but rather one of several sexual outcomes. Critical judgment about one's own sexuality includes the ability to see that any doctrine proposing reproduction as the sole reason for sex and sexual activity is poison.

Correct method: Correct methodology rests upon the ability to distinguish things designed to function from things that are not essentially designed to do something from within. It is the further awareness that among all the many things that function, some are man-made artificial entities and some are nature-made.

This wisdom about functional and non functional entities, in order to be part of critical judgment, must be accompanied by the knowledge of how to approach each of the three types of reality in order to understand them. Human beings function, automobiles function, but mathematical triangles don't. Consequently triangles cannot be analyzed in the same way as humans, or in the same way as automobiles.

Without getting into sophisticated hybrids like mathematical physics, string theory and non-Euclidean geometries; the basic approaches are quite simple. Pure mathematical realities are non-functional hybrids existing between the natural and the artificial. Mathematical realities are mental static realities made in the human mind by abstracting [leaving out of consideration] or *stripping from natural quantitative entities* all else but their quantity. Just as man-made physical realities like skyscrapers are subject to gravity; mathematical creations are subject to the given nature of the physical quantities that exist outside of the mind. Distilled quantity, *as nature based*, has prefixed attributes that no mathematician can mess with. As static, mathematical realities and their necessities are analyzed in terms of *fixed relationships*. Triangles, for example, are analyzed by determining the fixed, static internal relationships of their parts, and the fixed static external relationships of this or that triangle to all other geometric figures. In other words, mathematical entities have static essences.

In regard to functional *man-made* objects we don't analyze them, we compose them, we build them. We learn about man-made objects by selecting a functional outcome or purpose that we want them to serve on our behalf, and then we create their structural design accordingly. Lastly, we select or make the materials which will adequately serve the function that the structure is designed to perform.

Natural objects are another story. All natural objects are functional and they were already put together by nature. We learn about naturally given objects,

not by putting them together, but by taking them apart and identifying those parts and aspects *absolutely necessary* for the naturally given functions and properties they exhibit. Then we put them back together in our minds and consider that we know what they are. In learning the innards of a naturally functioning entity, the first question we ask is: what does it do, or what is it for? **Question one:** what is the difference between a whale's tail and a shark's tail? **Answer:** a whale's tail is horizontal and a shark's tail is vertical. **Question two:** why? **Answer:** because a whale is a mammal that is an air breather with lungs, and a shark is a true fish with gills that breathe water. **Response:** so what! **Answer:** as an air breather with lungs, a whale must get up to the surface efficiently, effectively and quickly or drown. **Question three:** Which works better for a whale who needs to surface, a horizontal tail or a vertical tail? **Answer:** a horizontal tail. With these things in mind; you, the reader, have the critical facts necessary for solving the reason why a shark, which is not a mammal but a fish, has a vertical tail and not a horizontal tail. The essential thing to be learned here is the fact that *function is the key and the methodology for opening up Nature*. In fact, when referring to the essence or necessary components of natural entities, we don't call them essences. We speak of the **nature** of things. The internal *nature of things* is their *dynamic essence*. The **nature** of something is the core, integrated composite of all and only the *dynamic pieces that must be there* in order for the object to exist and exist as this or that kind of functional being.

Human sex is a natural, and thus dynamic, reality. In determining the essential dynamic elemental structures of human sex, the place to start is the function. So the **first question is:** what do human males and human females do? The fundamental thing they both do as individuals is grow up from dependent infant forms to independent, *self-governing adult forms that we call persons*. The base of human sexuality is humanness, and humanness is more fundamental than

sexual differentiation. The fact that sex refers to two sliced parts of a single whole called “humanness”, means that male and female humans are more alike than different. Humans start as unique sexual individuals who then are reunited and mutually completed by sexual and personal merger. **What does human sex do?** It drives our human development as males and females. It drives our gender development resulting in gender maturity. Gender maturity then drives us *to reunite* naturally whether heterosexually or homosexually. The major point here is that humans cooperate daily in regard to many joint endeavors. But most of these joint endeavors are artificial - including contractual marriage. Sex is not artificial, and it does not result in artificial unions. It results in unions that are *natural units* which constitute the final form of human maturity. The first of these are perfect *unions* which consist of one personality made out of two intimately interwoven personalities. The second of these is *society*, which consists of males and females socially joined into one common “organically organized” human unit that produces all the things needed for the full development of each and everyone in the society.

For purposes of critical judgment we will try to clarify what is cultural and what is artificial within sex doctrines. The order of analysis is: form follows function, structure follows form, and materials follow structure. Once the type and character of the fundamental functioning of something natural is apprehended, if not comprehended; the type and character of the form or design can be understood as a derivative of that function. For example, the human eye is the power to apprehend that range of color which exists within white light. The human eye cannot see ultraviolet or infrared. The function of apprehending white light and its components explains the design employed, and the materials used, in the makeup of the human eye. Nature put the eye together proceeding from part to whole; but in order to understand it, we must take it apart going from whole to part. Human sex is analyzed in the same manner as the eye, with one exception. The eye is a

different kind of human part than sex. The eye is an organ. It is an organic power among many human organic powers. But sex is not simply an organ. Contrary to what the genitally oriented folks might say, sex is not located in a single organ within the human body. The power to function sexually is located within the entire human body. Sex is a modality of each human individual reaching from head to toes and everything in between. Sex consists of the male-female differentiation. Consequently, human sex is not genital to genital union. It is person to person union. Most of the contacts that exist in everyday life are in fact sexual. Males and females relate to individuals of the opposite sex and to individuals of the same sex on a daily basis - for example, at work. These are sexual relationships. Most of them involve friendship and affection. However, they are usually not genital. When they do involve genital sex, these relationships are still person to person unions. They are person to person *unions* via the genitals.

Like our concepts of God, our concepts of human sex still express more about what sex is not, rather than what sex is. Even the sense of touch, upon which sexual merger is based, is scarcely within the reach of our understanding. Although few of us ever reflect upon it, touch between two humans is an incredible happening. Consider the fact that each individual is a separate entity from every other individual. That separation between two individual realities is an infinity. It is a separation greater than the distance from here to the farthest star and beyond. There is infinite *nothing between* the separate realities of two individuals, and yet touch can physically span that infinity. Touch can connect two separately existing persons, and do it in a way that nothing else can. Physically touching someone else makes us conscious of them in the same fashion as they are fundamentally conscious of themselves. Critical judgment, and the entire fund of human knowledge of sex notwithstanding, human sex will always be a matter of mutual contact employing physical, cognitive, and deliberate connection .

Culture, Lore and sex-lore

If our culture affected only the way we Americans think about sex, if our sex concepts remained theoretical; there would be no substantive impact from culturally distorted concepts of sex. That, however, is not the case. Because we shape our lives according to our outlook on life and behave according to our convictions, our cultural sex concepts profoundly affect and actually mold our biological sexuality itself. Moreover, many archaic but common sex concepts affect huge areas of society at large. One of the direct consequences of our traditional, but warped, cultural sex concepts is the notion that women are inferior to men. The source is easy to see. A farmer is more important than his farmland. Since most of our cultural sex ideas are traditional and institutional carry-overs from past generations, they transport the baggage of previous times. This baggage constitutes a form of myth or folklore. Extricating true sex from the sexual mythology inherent within American culture is the intent of this work.

The Nature of Culture

The word “culture” is, at root, the same word as “cultivate”. It refers to the fact that, like cultivating or tilling a field, culture grows and matures in individuals and societies by persistent directing of mind and tastes. Although at times persons versed solely in conventional etiquette and superficial social graces are identified as being cultured, culture refers to the entire aggregate of traditional norms that govern fundamental behavior and learning within the members of a given society. As traditional, culture is a system of inherited ideas transmitted down through generations. As fundamental, cultural ideas contain basic assumptions about the world, the rules for behavior, preferred goal choices and ways of achieving them. Overall, traditional culture for a given society is an outlook about the fundamentals of life and the way to live life that actually shapes the way people do in fact live.

The British anthropologist, Edward B. Tylor, who invented the term, defined culture as: *“that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.”* [[The Software Toolworks Multimedia Encyclopedia, Version. 1.5, 1992 edition, “Culture.” by Charles Wagley, quoting E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 2 vols. \(1871; reprint, 1958\)](#)]. Culture, in other words, is not genetic, instinctive functioning. Culture is learned behavior. Culture is acquired outlook. Culture in the individual is the indoctrinated concoction of beliefs and behaviors that conform to the standard norms of a society. The process of inculcating these conventional norms into the new members of a society, particularly in the rearing or cultivating of children by parents and teachers, is called “socialization” or “enculturation”. Culture, besides being embodied implicitly within social structures, customs, laws and institutions, can be explicitly expressed and described by language. Although the general capability for thought and speech is genetic, a specific language like a specific culture must be learned. Language, like culture, is artificial and man made. Both develop conjointly in a given society. A particular culture and a particular language when created by the same society are more or less symbiotic. They have a reciprocal impact on each other. The culture influences the language, and the language influences the culture. The language of any given society consequently contains and expresses nearly the entirety of its correlative culture. The problem is that while we are young, cultural ideas and goals are sopped up as if they were Nature.

Likewise, in the course of Western history each succeeding generation uncritically ingested the cultural store of knowledge accumulated by previous generations and utilized this information in expanding the frontiers of knowledge. But up to recent times Western societies were unaware that the fund of knowledge assumed from past generations contained not only truth but also truth wrapped in a

previous mentality; truth formulated by previous generations to fit their experience of their time and place. Traditional truth is generally transmitted in culturally relative clothing, yet prior to recent times societies accepted not only the insights of their ancestors but the past cultural clothing as well. The only world that existed for them was the one their culture defined for them, especially in view of the fact that most of the people in these cultures never traveled more than five miles from home. In the light of limited traditional interpretations; they developed somewhat narrow meanings for life. Current investigation, however, has disclosed how critically relative to time and place is the worldview of any given culture. But we, in current societies, do not have to be slaves to our given culture to the degree our ancestors were; nor do we have to accept traditional meanings in their obsolete apparel. We can evaluate previous interpretations of sex that have accumulated in our American society as folklore. We can reflexively formulate valid meanings for sex more in accord with our present life experience rather than blindly accepting and employing meanings that worked long ago and far away but are not pertinent here and now. We are presently in a position to step outside of a restricted cultural atmosphere and from the outside look at American sex in its culturally saturated identity.

Cultural Diversity

Cultural diversity is not a theory. It is simply a matter of fact. The fact is that human cultures vary tremendously. One of the diversities is the presence or absence of written language within a society. Literacy is a genuine and real distinguishing factor between societies. Yet hard as we try, we get judgmental even in our science. We denominate some cultures as “advanced” because they are literate. We denominate other cultures as “primitive” because they are not literate. The term *primitive* is pejorative. Nevertheless we use it to distinguish non-literate societies from literate societies. Our own culture values money and economics.

Some cultures give monetary values scarcely a glance. Our society is monogamous. Some societies are polygamous. Other societies are polyandrous. Our society disapproves of homosexual behavior. Some societies value such behavior and even exalt homosexuals. Our culture does not like youngsters to know about nor engage in sexual behaviors. In other cultures some sexual activity is permissible for children. In contemporary Japan, the age of consent for females is thirteen and “compensated dating” between schoolgirls and older men is considered quite all right. Some cultures can count only to the total of the five fingers on a hand. Our culture can count to trillions and trillions. Our culture tends to push aside old folks. Other cultures honor their elders in supreme fashion. Religion also plays a part in cultural diversity. Some societies, because of religion eschew pork. Our American society is indifferent to what kind of meat we eat. Some societies are matriarchal. Our society is basically patriarchal. The list of actual differences between various cultures could go on and on. The point is simply that significant diversity , *in fact*, exists.

Cultural Evolution

Evolution occurs as adaptation to environment. In order to survive, living organisms must adapt to changing environment or die. Some adaptations, in the course of time, are incorporated into the biological make-up of the living organism. When incorporated into the organism, advantageous adaptations and mutations constitute the evolutionary development of the biological species. But evolution in the broad sense denotes all the historical processes of change and development at work in the Universe. In fact, evolution is the nature of the Universe, historically regarded. Evolution is divisible into three very different sectors – the inorganic or lifeless, the organic or biological, and the psycho-social or human. The inorganic sector is by far the greatest in extent. On the other hand, the methods by which geology changes are so slow as to be almost beyond our comprehension. The

physical universe took almost 14 billion years to get where it is now. Evolution in the biological or living sector is much faster. With the emergence of two basic properties of living matter – self reproduction and species variation – a much more potent method of change became available to living things. As a result, evolution of life was enormously speeded up. The entire evolution of life, from its pre-cellular origins to man, has taken little more than 3 1/2 billion years. Homo sapiens appeared around 250,000 years ago. But then a new and more efficient method of adaptation became available. It consisted of human speech and conceptual thought. The new method consists of a cumulative tradition that is the basis of a social heredity. But human evolution also has a subjective aspect which consists of various perceptions and biases *regarding the very same object*. Cumulative tradition, like all other distinctly human activities, is largely based upon knowledge and purpose. Consequently, biological selection is increasingly replaced by a struggle between ideas and values. Transmission of heredity by way of concept and symbol provides an additional mechanism of inheritance of acquired experience. It is called *cultural evolution*. It was the uniqueness of self-reproducing tradition that enabled the human species to become the dominant species. Since human environment consists mainly of other people, human adaptation is primarily adaptation to other people. As a result, the human race evolves more as an inter thinking cooperative unit, than as an interbreeding biological species. In addition, the human ability to conceptualize means that psychosocial emergence occurs as knowing adaptation in contrast to blind, mechanical adaptation. Humans can recognize various possibilities of adaptation, and can perceptively adjust to environment. Group self consciousness or collective self-image is called culture, and the psychosocial emergence of a human group is human evolution or emergence of culture. [See: Julian Huxley: [Knowledge, Morality and Destiny](#) (New York : The New American Library, 1960), 21-22]

The human ability to conceptualize grows in view of the fund of available concepts. Established meanings become instruments through which new insights are interpreted and filtered. New insights are accepted or rejected because of sentiments, needs, and drives; thus producing a struggle between ideas and values. The struggle has been labeled psychosocial selection. To evolve, the whole of a given culture does not have to mutate. Cultural evolution occurs with mutations in various parts of a culture. For example, an Eastern culture may bit by bit adopt Western dress in place of its traditional clothing; or add a new invention here and there, such as the mass produced automobile. By way of these partial mutations, the culture will ultimately change significantly overall. Within the human arena, Darwin's natural selection and survival of the fittest does not mean selection and survival of the most macho or virile human individuals. What is proper for humans, because our predominant characteristic is intelligence, is intelligent selection or survival of the output of the smartest. There is contemporary opinion that the reason for the expeditious evolution of the human brain is just that, survival of the smartest. Human females are basically the selectors of male partners; and it seems that our female ancestors, in fact, were given to choosing the smartest males, because smart males were better providers than macho males.

Progress

Progress basically refers to technology. Through technology humans exploit the physical world. While evolution means increasingly effective adaptation of an organism to its environment, the development of technology means the exact opposite. Human development of technology means increasingly effective adaptation of environment to the human organism. Homo sapiens learns to utilize the natural environment in ever more advantageous ways. Americans, particularly, view the surrounding physical universe as one big mechanism made to serve the purposes of humankind. Although some folks want to go back to the good old

simple days; technological progress means that humans get ever more sophisticated in their subordination of the physical world; and they do not normally reject new technologies in order to return to some imaginary and nostalgic good old simple days. The relentless progression of technology is what we call progress. Improved technology, however, does not always mean a better or more useful *physical environment* for humans. For example: many cities are now so large, so complex and so artificial, that a good number of people simply cannot cope. Since most of human evolution occurred by way of human contact with Nature, we have an evolved capability and competence for dealing with the natural without being stressed. But the artificial world we have built for ourselves is still extremely young in evolutionary terms. We did not evolve with a comfortable capability for dealing with today's complex electronic environment. We may not be able to return to the good old days; but because biological evolution is not as fast as technological progress, we still yearn for them.

The theory of pre fixed stages

In the youthful days of evolutionary theory, some evolutionists thought they saw several irresistible laws of social progress and precipitously applied these apparent laws to social events. Karl Marx and his laws of socio-economic progress by way of class revolutions are a good example. Certain anthropologists designed schemes of cultural development in terms of an ordered sequence from crude savagery to higher civilization. Lewis Henry Morgan, an American anthropologist, posited such a three-stage ascent of human cultures. The stages were savagery, barbarism and finally civilization. Other anthropologists, because of biased perceptions, postulated that all cultures rigidly passed from stages of original promiscuity, through matriarchal rule, to patriarchal civilization. Current anthropologists, archaeologists, and historians no longer believe that specific cultures necessarily progress through fixed stages. A system of fixed stages

requires a closed construct into which all societies past, present and future must fit. Such a closed system sets a limit to human development. But culture, because of its manifold and complex elements,, and the ingenuity of the human imagination, can be of unlimited diversity. In view of the infinitely diversified combinations of cultural elements that are possible, cultural evolution cannot be crammed into a one-dimensional model. Since human environment is basically a matter of surrounding culture which is freely chosen; no absolutely fixed human culture can be delineated as the teleological norm of all cultural evolution of all cultures. Contrary to the belief of a lot of Americans, no laws of psychosocial emergence or progress have ever been discovered that would indicate a nature-given pinnacle form of culture that holds good for the entire species. This means that the American sex-lore of caged plant sex for humans is not the good old days.

The two facets of culture

There are two facets to culture. One facet is called *material culture*, the other is called *culture structure*. The material aspect of culture is comprised of the physical components of a culture. These palpable components primarily constitute the very day to day life, and day to day demands of life, for a given populace. The material culture includes such things as the population itself, their systems of economics, politics and education, as well as their physical environment and the like. Technology and the progress of technology are likewise part of the material aspect of culture. Since it is the progress of technology, which primarily pressures the lives of the people of a society and creates the greatest demand for change in the lives of those people; the newer demands of actual living and the principal changes in lifestyles are, in consequence, a part of material culture. *Culture structure* is the commonly recognized system of meanings assigned by a society to its material life. Culture structure is constituted by the interpretations ascribed to material culture by a society and subscribed to by its members. These interpretative

systems, because they are an ordered construct, an arrangement of meanings, are called culture structure. Culture structure refers to the architecture of the diverse elements of cultural meaning. Culture structure refers to the complete ordered set of cultural meanings as these coordinated sets of meanings are ascribed to various aspects of social life. Sexual meanings are one of those ordered sets of culture structure. And being rigidly supported by long time institutions, sexual culture structures in America are like lost children.

Institutions

Like the two faces of culture, the word “institution” has two meanings. When culture structures become sacred cows they are called institutions. Any old cluster of ritualistic behavior patterns traditionally assumed to be the only moral and valuable way of performing a given life task is an institution. An institution can be either an agency or a concretized set of rules representing the way things have always been done and the only right way to do them. The term institution refers to an entity or organization that has been established to enforce or to carry out a specific pattern of social behavior. The family, the Church, and the government are social institutions in this sense. As self proclaimed agents of the gods, institutions demand conformity. Most Western institutions, in the sense of traditional social *norms of behavior*, are contained in codes of law. Monogamous marriage is an example of an institutionalized culture structure that reigns in both America and Europe. In America, mass public education is another institution that, due to its required universal application to all American children, behooves teachers to teach *at the level of the lowest common denominator within a class of students*. Institutions, such as American Federal or State governments, when they establish statutes that are invasive of individual human freedom of choice, are pernicious. Such allegedly God-given, but in fact man made evil norms, occur frequently whenever an institution tries to enforce *past cultural structures* upon

radically changed material culture.

Culture and Religion

Even if a religion is claimed to have Divine sources, even if claimed as revealed by a God; religion is never divorced from culture. The reason is simply the fact that we do not live our lives inside of a church. Religious behaviors have to be carried out within a person's society and culture. America considers itself a Christian country with a Christian culture. That means the cultural items held in reverence and considered untouchable are expressed as items of the Christian religion. The divine origin claim, however, is many times a matter of propaganda, or lies, or error, rather than truth. Not everything in America that is called Christian is, in fact, Christian. Dominionist fascism is one of them. Religion, *as a culturally imbedded institution*, is consequently best understood as the tool a society employs in order to make things sacred or profane in the lives of its individual members. According to Émile Durkheim, the father of scientific sociology; the *social* and the *religious* power of sacredness, although usually regarded as separate, wind up factually as one and the same. For example: in America, Church and State are Constitutionally separate. But in fact, American legal good and evil are Christian dictated good and evil. In *secular* Western societies, the sacred is embodied in certain principles, such as individual rights, freedom, justice, and equality. Hence, religion, in the context of culture; is a tool used by a culture to sanctify and preserve its *civil* traditions and moral values as the *normal* manner of doing things.

The pace of cultural progress

Material culture tends to develop at an exponential rate. Each generation more or less doubles the previous content of information, invention and technology. Stuart Chase tells of a farmer who took his horse to a blacksmith to be shod. The farmer agreed to pay the blacksmith one cent for the first nail, two cents

for the second nail, etc., for a total of eight nails in each shoe, or thirty two nails altogether. The bill for the job came to \$4,294,967,295. That is exponential growth. [Stuart Chase, The Proper Study of Mankind: (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1963), 132.] At the same time, belief systems and institutions that give meaning to material culture tend to change at an extremely slow pace. Changes in culture structure rarely change direction, and they show a good deal of inertia. Social trends do not make radical advances or radical shifts in direction. The exponential growth rate of material culture in the face of almost unchanging, institutionalized and sanctified culture structures causes a situation called culture lag.

Culture Lag

The terminology “culture lag” was coined by the sociologist William F. Ogburn. Culture lag is the gap created when a petrified culture structure loses contact with the life of a society. Since culture structure refers to the significance that people impart to their lives, culture lag basically means obsolete interpretations of life and behaviors. Decrepit meanings are ascribed to new elements of life, or new values change the cultural import of traditional customs and norms. Because cultural meanings are often unwarily and uncritically accepted interpretations; it is possible to have a situation in which people have changed, and the circumstances of their lives have radically changed, while traditional, culturally dictated, obsolete behaviors have remained. Traditional cultural meanings can be thought of as a form of sanctified social folklore, and social folklore does not get re-evaluated until it causes significant distress to a population. Over and above the pace of material progress, culture lag is also due to the fact that insecure folks are reluctant to change, because they feel safe and comfortable with their old habits and beliefs. Another significant cause is the vested interests of those whose position and powers in a society derive from a long-standing structure. In other

words, cultural lag is many times nothing more than vested interests.

When culture lag occurs, conflict occurs because new behaviors challenge irrelevant past values. Social conflict then becomes an indicator of culture lag and tends to expose, and sometimes even change, the ossified social lore producing the conflict. However, culture lag was not always recognized as a source of tension in the lives of individuals. In the not too distant past, the presence of frustration in individuals was assumed to be some sort of inner evil within individuals. Even today, there is still a general prejudice against all non-conformists. They are assumed to be always and everywhere delinquents. Some of the resistance of individuals to culture, to institutions, and to society, may be due to viciousness on the part of individuals; but insight into culture lag indicates that it may be culture and society that are the culprits. Adjustment to society is not the ideal it once used to be. Even the psychologists who originally were prone to use “adjustment” as a criterion of mental health are beginning to have second thoughts. According to Abraham Maslow, the resistance of individuals to enculturation in the interests of their own integrity and their own intrinsic nature is, or should be, a respectable area of study in the psychological and social sciences. According to Maslow, the person who gives in eagerly to distorting forces within the culture, i.e. the well-adjusted person; may be less healthy than the delinquent, the criminal, or the neurotic, who may be demonstrating by their reactions that they have spunk enough left to resist the breaking of their psychological bones. [See: [Abraham Maslow, *Motivation and Personality*, 3rd ed. rev. Robert Frager, with new material by Ruth Cox and Robert Frager...et al. \(New York: HarperCollins, 1987\) 55.](#)]

The controversy in the United States over birth control and the use of the birth control pill in the nineteen sixties and seventies is an excellent example of culture lag. From its earliest days the Christian Church has held that the loss or destruction of male “seed” is equivalent to the destruction of a human being.

Consequently, artificially interfering with conception is asserted to be immoral. These culture structures of institutional religion and the corresponding structures of American law ran head on into the material culture of contemporary women and the lives they had to lead in twentieth century America. The doctor who conducted the first large-scale trials of the birth control pill had to challenge institutional religion and State law. The doctor was John Rock, a renowned fertility specialist practicing in Massachusetts, and a devout Catholic. As a humanitarian, Doctor Rock was in favor of birth control. For years he had delivered unwanted babies. He knew the rhythm method of Catholicism was an appalling joke. He felt, from his experience, that the rhythm method was not only unrealistic, but also was damaging to a marriage. Birth control became a public issue because of burgeoning populations in many countries. Numerous countries were making attempts to curtail population growth. In the nineteenth century, various institutional Churches in the United States, along with many State and Federal laws, forbid birth control. The civil laws forbidding birth control, and most other sexual behavior as well, were known as Comstock laws. Anthony Comstock was a truly unbalanced, fanatical Fundamentalist moral reformer who influenced Federal law as well as State law. In 1865, the year the American civil war ended, Congress passed what was called the "Postal Act". The Act dealt with sending "obscene" materials through the mail. In 1873 the Postal Act was amended and became the "Comstock Law". The Comstock Law prohibitions included sending birth control material through the mail. The act was called the Comstock Law because it made Anthony Comstock a "primo" agent of the Post Office with the power to personally enforce the Postal prohibitions. Drunk with power and fanaticism, Comstock went berserk and jailed over 2500 people. To this day, whenever sex laws are discussed, Comstock's name is used in place of bad sex laws and bad ideas of obscenity. A Comstock law is per se an evil law - along with taking a second look at a beautiful

woman.

In America the primary proponent of birth control was Margaret Sanger, founder of the National Birth Control League. In 1916, she opened the first birth control clinic in the United States. For doing so, she was arrested and the police shut down the clinic. Comstock laws, especially in Massachusetts, forbid contraceptive devices as well as dissemination of birth control information. Massachusetts and Connecticut were largely Catholic, and birth control was a crime punishable by fines and imprisonment. These outrageous laws forbid even talking about birth control publicly. To do so was a felony. Margaret Sanger decided the only way to change these laws was to break them. Mrs. Sanger went looking for a birth control pill to replace the grotesque, mechanical and largely ineffective forms of birth control then available. She found Gregory Pincus, a scientist, who discovered that hormones were the answer to a birth control pill. She also found Catherine McCormick, who funded the research of Dr. Pincus. They, in turn, found John Rock who had the authority to prescribe drugs to humans. The drug company, G.D. Searle, which had developed progesterone in pill form but didn't know what to do with it, provided the pills. The scientist and the doctor conducted the first large-scale tests of the pill in Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico was over populated, and consequently had a network of family planning clinics that could assist in the trials. Puerto Rico was also a Catholic country, but it had no Comstock laws. Puerto Rican authorities were delighted at the prospect of the tests and at the thought of a birth control pill. So were the women who participated in the tests. Puerto Rican authorities ignored Catholic doctrine as being irrelevant to their social problems. Catholic Puerto Rican women felt the same in regard to their everyday lives. They were concerned with their health, raising families and day to day money struggles. The realities in Puerto Rico were quite divorced from the antiquated and anti-human birth control doctrine of the Catholic Church. Dr. Rock,

in addition to facing hostile Catholic doctrine, also had to deal with the fact that in Massachusetts Comstock laws forbid any involvement with birth control. He stood to lose his license and his career. Nevertheless, he too ignored irrelevant archaic doctrine and conducted the trials of the pill. On May 11, 1960, the United States Food and Drug Administration approved a pill called Enovid. They approved it as a treatment for menstrual disorders; but everyone knew what Enovid really did. By 1965, over six million women were on the pill.

The pill had a profound social impact far beyond birth control. For the first time in history women were set free to enjoy sex. They were as free as men were. That freedom allowed women to govern their sexuality, their lives and their careers in a way they never before could. With almost 100% effectiveness, the pill allowed women to actually plan their reproductive lives and consequently their careers. For example, women became lawyers because they didn't have to worry about getting pregnant in the middle of a big case. An "MRS" as the sole career for women toppled. Marriage was no longer the only female career. In addition, women established a new kind of relationship with their doctors. They came in with demands on their doctors as to what they would accept, what they would tolerate, and what they would not tolerate. That attitude carried over into American society at large. The pill, in fact, was the major liberator of a generation of women activists. The power of self-governance gave extreme impetus to the women's liberation and women's rights movements. These movements, in turn, caused huge changes in United States culture and society. Margaret Sanger's decision to change Comstock laws by breaking them proved correct. In 1965, the United States Supreme Court, in the case of Griswold v. Connecticut eradicated the last State statute banning contraceptives for married couples. The Court then struck down legal restrictions on birth control for single people in 1972. The National Council of Churches, in 1961, affirmed that birth control could be used to limit family size.

The Council did not restrict birth control to any single method. That decision was left to the discretion of those employing birth control. In spite of the fact that Catholic women use the pill in numbers equal to non-Catholic women; the Roman Catholic Church, even today, bans the use of any method of birth control except the so called rhythm method of abstinence during female fertility cycles. Catholic doctrine is based upon the primitive and highly erroneous concept that anything obstructing the proper *planting of male seed in a female is evil*. According to Rome, male seed is obviously for planting and is the germ that becomes a growing thing. Hence, no one may interfere with its natural outcome, namely, a *crop* of offspring in one's privately owned, spousal farmland. After all, what righteous farmer would ever deliberately misplant seeds in his own field in order not to grow crops? Today, severe culture lag in the United States exists in the realm of politics. The Republican Party is even today trying to kill Planned Parenthood.

Cultural Relativism

Cultural relativism means that no culture contains the absolute fullness of human potential and variety. If any culture did, it would be either Utopia or Heaven. This principle of cultural relativity simply means that each and every specific culture thinks its culture is the apex culture and the only true and moral culture. But the true fact is that every culture is a child of both the place and the time of its formulation. What is taboo in one culture may be exalted in another. The culturally relative values of the individual's own society tend to be seen and applied as absolutes even though they may be the worst values on the planet. The values of native land prejudice the views of the encultured individual. All those moral judgments that an individual encultured in one society makes about other cultures and on the people of other cultures are as relative as wearing trousers versus wearing a skirt. [See: Melville J. Herskovitz, Man and His Work (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), 63.] The same can truthfully be said in regard to

major segments of the same culture, especially in the American melting pot. Within America's heterogeneous religious sub cultures, what is sin in one may be sanctity in another. On the other hand, not all cultural values and behaviors are considered relative. Most anthropologists consider some values absolute. Elements such as slavery, cannibalism and headhunting are considered evil no matter what culture values them. These inherently evil items correspond to the notion of Natural Law.

Cultural ethnocentrism

The anthropologist Ruth Benedict says in one of her books that local custom does not equal human nature. It might be added that neither does past custom or tradition. This statement of Dr. Benedict illustrates another culturally conditioned, prejudicial view of values, norms and behaviors; namely, ethnocentrism. Just as culture lag is a shortsighted, dated view which confuses long standing values with eternal truth; ethnocentrism is a near-sighted, *myopic view* that confuses the local relativity of one's own culture with universal truth. Ethnocentrism is the inability to see beyond the tip of one's own nose. It is a self centered and usually smug view that confuses a geographically restricted local culture with human nature itself and with the world at large. Ethnocentrism is basically the same thing as parochialism. One's own culture, which is most assuredly relative to its own location and its own history, is seen as the absolute standard for all of humankind. Ethnocentrism is the point of view that one's own way of life is to be preferred to all others. Americans are particularly prone to this disease. Even though we Americans are highly infected with ethnocentric disease and feel that our cultural *sex concepts* express the absolute nature of sex and are therefore a universal standard for everyone everywhere; the truth, in fact, is otherwise. Parochialism, however, is a two way street. Some of our Western cultural forms are seen as outlandish by Non-Western cultures. Because of the concept of Natural Law, we have a habit of seeing our

sexual customs as “natural” and the customs of others as “unnatural”. But many others, for example, consider the Western practice of choosing a mate *on the basis of love*, highly “unnatural”. A classic on the subject of *sexual diversity* among geographically dispersed cultures is the book: **Patterns of Sexual Behavior by Yale professors Clellan Ford and Frank Beach (New York: Harper and Brothers, and Paul B. Hoeber, Inc., Medical Books, 1951).**

Cultural lag as folklore

Culture lag injects into the life of a society meanings that do not fully interpret the actual life being led at given time. Culture lag causes retention of formerly significant meanings, although they have lost significance in their contemporary settings. On the popular level of society and culture, as well as among pseudo scientists and unlettered preachers, the semi-conscious, uncritical type of acceptance of these former meanings brings about widespread adherence and deep identification with these out of date meanings. Intractable, obsolete meanings become traditional and classical explanations of life assumed to be valid, yesterday, today and tomorrow. These historically developed cultural meanings are sometimes integral aspects of an otherwise updated culture because they have survived from generation to generation as part of the culture. However, the left over values, in many instances, simply represent debris that confuses present-day insight. A good example of this is the contemporary difficulty with the first Book of the Christian Bible, the Book of Genesis. Certain core truths were and are contained in this Book, but these narrations are couched in a physics and cosmology artificially used in the Book simply to describe the core religious truths. A great deal of confusion has resulted because the culturally relative idiom used in the Book was not, for a long time recognized as such; and among some, is not to this day recognized or admitted as such. Although these traditional explanations of life are not always transmitted in the form of stories so that they could be identified

precisely as myths, they can be considered in the context of myth and popular folklore. Carry over cultural meanings as a collection of popular beliefs form a system of popular folklore. Consequently, the *popularly accepted* contents of outdated culture lag that prevail within American culture are actually folklore.

Myth

Most Americans are somewhat familiar with Greek mythology. Most Americans have heard of Zeus and Cupid. NASA has named rockets after Saturn and Atlas. Hercules got a television series; and everyone knows about Hades. Myths are stories that address the fundamental underpinnings of a society and its cultural values. To some degree myths are attempts to humanize the workings of nature and human life in contrast to inexorable blind fate. Myths tend to interpose Gods who are in control of the workings of nature and life. Nature thereby ceases to be merciless mechanics. Nature becomes Mother Nature. This allows humans to propitiate the gods and change human fortunes. In this way, myths fancifully provide humans with a certain amount of control over nature and human life. Mythical stories seem to be fiction; but they commonly are genuine attempts to objectively explain the Universe and its history. Myths concerning Fate as the cause of unwanted events in daily life are attempts to explain human life and the purpose of life within the context of seemingly senseless bumps in life. One of the unhealthy but major effects of myth within a society is the sanctification of bureaucracy by attributing divine origins to those who hold authority. In many cases, cultural myths represent the core dogmas of the basic religion of a culture. Technically, myths, as long as they remain *unwritten* oral narrations about the fundamentals of human life, are **folklore**. Folklore comprises vintage literature, routines and rituals carried from one generation to the next by spoken word or by inherited practices. Folklore consists of myths, poems, narratives, legends, dramas, proverbs, riddles, anecdotes, jokes, music, dances and other forms; all of which are

considered folklore. Folklore even includes mother's home cooking recipes and her family cures for ailments. Non-technically, folklore refers to the content of the item, whether the item remains oral or has been concretized in writing or in some other form. There is only one particular author of all folklore, namely, "anonymous". In addition to written accounts of Greek mythology, the best recognized folklore is found in the fairy tales of the brothers Grimm. In the early nineteenth century, the German philologist Jacob Grimm and his brother Wilhelm gathered unwritten German folktales from the people who had heard the tales throughout their lives. These tales formed part of the culture of the German people and influenced their behaviors. The Grimm brothers recorded, and perhaps embellished, the German folklore they uncovered. The result was Grimm's Fairy Tales. To the present day, there exists in the United States a large body of oral folklore. One portion of that oral American folklore consists of *tall tales*. Tall tales are exaggerated or even fictional accounts about the heroic deeds of some individual. In the United States, many tall tales recount the somewhat fictional exploits of individuals such as Johnny Appleseed, Billy the Kid, Buffalo Bill, Davy Crockett, Daniel Boone, Paul Bunyan, Jessie James, Casey Jones and Betsy Ross. Folklore gets inserted into the very design and makeup of institutions. It gets infused into the content of laws and into educational subject matter. It exists within the very makeup of these culture structures over and above its extant oral expressions. In the United States, folklore in all forms plays a significant role in the formation of values and attitudes. It imparts cultural values and lifetime behavioral norms, not only to our young, but also to Americans at large. Since lifelong behavior drastically molds both our psychological self and our biological self; even such a strong innate drive as sex can be modified by folklore. Not all of American sexual knowledge is folklore, but a significant portion is. The folklore molding American sexuality is contained within oral traditions. It is contained

within both religious and statutory taboos and precepts. It is also contained within our educational content and within the very makeup of some religious and secular institutions as well as within the assumptions and presumptions these concretized forms of folklore are founded upon. Folklore reaches individuals through conditioning, indoctrination and other forms of social control; and these channels are extremely subtle teachers. For example, folklore is built into language. In English clocks “run”, but in Spanish they “walk”. In Spanish, no one misses a bus, the bus leaves him or her. Likewise, objects lose themselves, dishes break themselves, and automobiles wreck themselves. Folklore is built into family structures such as monogamous marriage, and husbands who have authority over their wives. Folklore permeates American politics, religion and responses to life. Frequently, folklore becomes so familiar it is no longer recognized as folklore. But whether recognized or not; if believed, it will be acted upon.

Rituals

Rituals are rigidly scripted ceremonies. Each participant in a ritual has a specific stylized role to play. Some rituals are communal; but some are restricted to a given gender, or a specific age range, or by the type of activity employed by the ritual. The types and purposes of rituals are manifold. One class of rituals is called passage rites. These passage rituals express the significant transitions in human life such as birth, puberty, marriage, and death. Within American culture, the legal ages for smoking, drinking and voting etc. are passage rites marking the transition from “minor” to “major”. Within Christianity, “confirmation” is likewise a passage rite marking the passage from child to adult. In addition to these life-cycle rituals, other prayer type rituals derive from the character of a given society. In *agricultural societies*, fertility rituals, which implore for a bountiful harvest, are employed at the beginning of the planting season. Related rituals give thanks for the harvest. Other rituals pertain to occasional events such as wars and

catastrophes.

American sex-lore Uncovered

Does the Stork Really Deliver Newborn Babies?

Once upon a time a small girl sat on a living room floor with a notepad and pencil. Her parents sat on a nearby couch. The young girl looked up at her parents and asked: “Where did I come from”? Her off guard, startled parents replied: “Oh, the stork brought you”. The little girl scribbled on her notepad for a moment and then asked: “Where did you two come from”? Her parents, committed to the stork, answered accordingly. The child again scribbled on her notepad and then asked her parents: “Where did grandma and grandpa come from”? Too late to change responses, the parents once more responded with the stork. The youngster again wrote on her notepad and then asked her parents: “How do you spell ascertain”? After her parents had spelled the word for her, the girl wrote a bit and then left the room leaving behind her note pad. The curious parents could not resist sneaking a peak. Written on the note pad was the conclusion: “As far as I can ascertain, there has been no sexual reproduction in this family for three generations”.

What is sex-lore?

sex-lore is one chapter out of the book of overall popular folklore. It is a specific portion of those sacrosanct popularly accepted traditions passed from generation to generation in any given society. Although not transmitted as stories, any inveterate explanations of sex and its place in human life which articulate and prescribe the sexual mentality of a society are herein referred to as sex-lore. In other words, that part of folklore which purports to interpret and give meaning to human sexuality; is called, herein, sex-lore. Whether there is a genuine folklore of sex within American culture is not significant to this work. There is enough

similarity between our American sexual beliefs and authentic folklore to justify the label “sex-lore”. Folklore is intuitive rather than scientific. The belief that all females lose sexual drive at menopause is intuitive rather than scientific. Folklore is ancient doctrine. So is the doctrine that human sex is solely for the propagation of the race. Folklore is organized into a belief system. Likewise, American sex-lore blankets sex life from cradle to grave. Folklore is an attempt to explain Nature. American sex-lore, including much State law, never ceases differentiating “natural” sex from “unnatural” sex. Folklore is passed from generation to generation as tradition. What is more traditional than a virgin bride in a white bridal gown? Folklore contains “orthodoxy”. American sex-lore requires female passivity, with male atop, female below. Anything else is not only unorthodox sex, it is unnatural sex. Folklore becomes incorporated into institutions. Monogamous sex is institutionalized as American contractual marriage. Folklore produces conformity to the group, so does censorship imposed by statutorily defined pornography. Folklore contains taboos. Menstruating women are still taboo. Folklore is connected with religion. American sex-lore finds irreligious sin in almost all sexual activity; because current sex-lore, as dictated by Christianity, is adamant that human sex, by its very nature, is evil. Hence, all sex acts in America must be cleansed by both State and Christianity sanctifications before use. There are, as well, other areas of similarity between myth and current American notions of human sexuality. Myths are thought by some to be original attempts to explain the universe, man, life, death and nature. The sexual ideas we ordinarily use are obviously in the same vein. Myth is normally connected with religion, especially primitive religion. Our sexual notions also place human sexuality squarely within the boundaries of religion, and tend to identify licit sexual behavior with the morally accepted standards of Christian behavior. Sex, because of American sex-lore, is still sacred in our culture. This is probably one of the reasons why the area

of sexuality is the last area of human life to be secularized - even though Martin Luther gave a shot at secularizing sex ages ago. He got rid of the Roman “sacrament” of marriage, and declared that marriage is strictly a civil arrangement. Luther called it "an external worldly thing, subject to secular jurisdiction, just like dress and food, home and field." But few Protestants, particularly among the stunted busy body moralists of everyone except themselves, seem to know that within Protestantism there is no Christian marriage. Purely legal divorce in England was instituted after Henry VIII broke away from the Roman Catholic church, but it was obtained through Parliament rather than through the courts. Every divorce in England required a separate act of the House of Lords. In 1857, the English Parliament established the Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes. There exists one more area of similarity between folklore and some contemporary cultural notions of human sex. Myths include tall tales. It may well be that some of our currently accepted and dearly cherished concepts of human sexuality are precisely that.

Why examine American sex-lore?

The reason for examining American sex-lore is the fact that a significant portion of the sexual folklore of contemporary America is pure hogwash. For example, American sex-lore, slightly exaggerated, says that if a boy masturbates his penis will fall off, he will go insane and besides that, he will get pimples. And then there are the birds and the bees. However, contemporary genius is creating a new perception of the Universe. A new view of humans, of the world, and of the human place outside of the center of the world is emerging. Scientists investigate string theory, the accelerating expansion of the Universe and cosmic evolution. Moralists evaluate quandary or dilemma situations, cloning of humans and the uses of the human genome. Theologians lament the death of God and Bishops worry about priestly pedophiles, while politicians fret over terrorism and probabilities of

hostile reaction.

The contemporary reaction to human existence is generating forms of life beyond the scope of our venerable institutions. In spite of the dogged attempts of our institutionalized society to enforce standardized, average, collective reactions; personalist or individualized modes of response are producing new alliances between individuals and society. Realignment of individuals to society, in turn, modifies the cognate relationship of human sex to society. The arrangement of personal “libido” and social “reality principle” is no longer the regulatory balance Freud elaborated, nor even the correlation our own parents knew. Contemporary life is changing increasingly in the direction of personal independence. Currently, American life is somewhere between the change from unquestioning collective conformity to “anonymous” moral laws and institutional pictures of reality; and adaptive, self generated responses directly to reality itself. The Reformation cut out the religious “middle man”; and now folklore, as the “middle man” between the human individual and reality, is being cut out of the picture. The United States is in the midst of its second “sexual revolution” within the past few decades. The first revolution consisted of a substantial increase in overt consideration, discussion and presentation of human sexuality employing mass media such as movies, television, videotapes and disks. The first sexual revolution moved sex from private peeking to bare public openness. It turned sex into a spectator sport. At the same time the changes in behavior were accompanied by some changes in the evaluation of sexuality by many individuals. Sex was no longer shameful and the old moral codes were criticized, and in many cases discarded, as “Puritanical” and authoritarian. However, these conditions are only symptoms of the more radical change, or second revolution, that is taking place. Previously, dictatorial control over American sexuality has been exercised by the Government and the Christian religion. This partnership between American government and the collection of

Christian Churches had acquired an institutional control over American sexuality which was nearly absolute. That nearly absolute social control is changing. Within the recent history of Western societies a shift has occurred. The control of human *life*, not just human sex, has moved to personal sources. Rites of “passage” have been occurring that consist of individuals rejecting collective, “sanctified” behaviors; and making their own decisions about their moral and sexual behaviors. Much of the institutional control over daily human life long ago passed from the hands of religious bodies to secular governments, but the area of sexuality, always so closely associated with morality itself, stayed until recently under the ultimate control of religion. The religious control of sexual attitudes and behavior is now shifting into the realm of the independent individual, where control is being assumed by individuals themselves. At this point, the United States is the locale of a violent State and Church reaction to the sexual independence being seized by individuals. States, especially the terrified Southern States, are passing laws that challenge prior Supreme Court decisions which give individual sex a bit of space to breathe. Overtly, the major issue is abortion; but covertly the real issue is the fact that Southern women are getting too uppity for their male masters to tolerate.

As most people are aware, the major synthesizer, proponent and defender of traditional anti sexual Western sex-lore is the Roman Catholic Church. Ironically however, the staunchest defenders of restrictive Roman Catholic sexology in contemporary America are the most radical Protestant revolutionaries. These radical or Fundamentalist pseudo Christians are “outside of the mainstream Christian loop”, but they are devoted to Roman Catholic sex-lore. Who would have thought that the followers of John Darby and Cyrus Scofield would turn out to be implacable protectors of Roman Catholic doctrine. In contrast, it is the modest Reformers of Catholicism, the Anglicans, who have adopted female priests, a gay bishop, and are, at the time of this writing, considering recognizing homosexual

marriages.

Sex-lore and *cultural* critical judgment

Anthropological studies have shown that the sexual notions most Americans revere as being basic, universal, natural concepts of sex are not so basic and natural at all. On the contrary, many of the cherished popular notions about the nature of human sexuality are more than slightly primitive and more than a little near sighted. Many adhere to these cultural myths without insight into their true character. They use them the way a child uses words whose meanings he or she knows not. Maintenance of sexual notions previously formulated, but currently not truly grasped and not applicable to contemporary life, even if understood; constitutes American cultural lag in regard to sexual meanings.

Since many of our cultural concepts of sex are totally outdated and should have been buried long ago, the question is: Why weren't they? The answer is that the outdated ideas were institutionalized not only as part of the contents of our culture, but also as the party line of the Christian Church and of its successors to moral dominance, namely the secular States. sex-lore is built into many of the institutions of Western culture. sex-lore has burrowed into these institutions and buried itself so deeply that some of it, like some of the institutions themselves, has hung on long past its day. In addition, neither science nor individuals previously had the wherewithal to find and critically examine the social and cultural sex notions imbedded within our society and its man-made culture. Our culture contains a glut of sexual notions that represent nothing more than cultural garbage. Nevertheless, we still use these archaic formulas and notions of sex that were elaborated by our forefathers using their own life experience. The most basic and dangerous of these sexual fairy tales is *the agricultural notion of human sex* formulated eons ago by our Mesopotamian farmer ancestors. **This sex-lore says human sex is the planting of male seed into privately owned female farmland,**

for the purpose of producing a crop of children to help with the farming.

There are, no doubt, significant valid insights contained within any given system of sexual folklore. But this *agricultural sex-lore* is not one of them. The fact is that each system of folklore is formulated in some place at some time as the workable rulebook for the players then present. The notion that human sex is nothing but plant reproduction is one of the greatest of the wrong rules for the wrong game. Be aware that the Bible does NOT say that human sex is essentially reproduction. Reproduction is not a property of human sex; and hence, reproduction does not properly identify the true nature of human sex. Reproduction is a property of *all* sex. Even a sexless amoeba can do it. The hard fact is that reproduction is not unique to humans any more than physical growth is. What is specifically and uniquely human about human sex is freely chosen loving merger or **conscious and deliberate union of persons and personalities as well as body**. Paul expressed this truth when he said to the Ephesians that the purpose of a genuine human marriage is to make a man and a woman, **“one flesh”**. [See: Ephesians 5:31]

Sex-lore and *personal* critical judgment

People live within, and by, their culture; and like it or not, our American culture and its sexual content *assails the individual*. Current American cultural sex-lore can, and does, severely bite the individual. If it didn't, Freud and his followers would be unemployed. The basic evil of American sex-lore is the fact that it pertains to anything alive, and most of what is alive has no such thing as a free-will that allows for individualized self governance. Humans alone have the Nature given *right to rule their own individuality*. But, American sex-lore, as founded in Christianity and promulgated by American law, says to the individual: Don't you dare take control of your own sexuality. And the fact is, you won't; unless you are able to judge where government authority stops and your rightful God given authority begins.

Valid human sex, because it is a significant part of individuality and adult personality; has to be an individual's sex, marching to an individual's beat and not to the beat of conformist authority. American cultural sex-lore not only disfigures a lot of individuals and their personalities; it is just as effective in severely mutilating an unacceptable number of marriages. In order to attain self-governing sex, harmoniously matched to one's own individuality; it is necessary for the individual to possess *critical awareness* of conformist cultural sex-lore along with an in-depth awareness of self. The ability to accurately judge the right and wrong of American sex-lore for one's self so as to maintain the wholeness of self, is not an ivory tower pursuit. Conscious awareness and construction of self and self-identity is a totally personal project; but critical awareness of cultural sex-lore is a matter of communicable knowledge. This work is an attempt to give the reader the elements necessary for day by day, personal awareness and critical judgment of what American sex-lore is doing to them.

The first of the nasty inbuilt dimensions of American sex-lore is its artificiality. Most Americans mistakenly believe that American sex-lore expresses the naturally given character and essence of human sex. The fact is that all the rules are man-made rules containing artificiality and historical relativity. The source of the priggishness within American sex-lore is not, in fact, the usual culprit, namely Puritanism. The root culprit is the Fathers of the Christian Church who were mired in the teachings of Plato and the Stoics. Digging into the mentality and sexual orientations of those who created traditional Christian sex doctrine exposes the core artificiality and misbegotten nature of Christian sex-lore. Almost without exception; every one of the Fathers of the Church who was influential in formulating Christian sex doctrine was a sexual misfit. Augustine confessed, in an entire book, his severe personal problems with sex. Origen was so sexually warped he castrated himself. The second nasty dimension is a derivative of the first. It is

the reticence of individuals to challenge institutional authority and claim the right to see for themselves what the true nature of human sex is. Individuals are not inclined to unwrap the warped artificiality and relativity of American legal and cultural sexual imperatives; because it seems to be an attack on that which is holy. Jesus, however, said little about sex and marriage. What He did say is that sex was created by God, that its purpose is *one flesh*, and that humans should not be taking apart marriages. He said that since humans should not take apart marriage, divorced people commit adultery if they marry again - except that divorce was okayed by Moses because of hard hearts. [See Mark: 10:2-12] Jesus also said that there is no marriage in Heaven. [See: Matthew 22:30]

As an assist to the brave, the elements necessary for critical evaluation of American sex-lore and its perverted impact on self, are knowledge of:

A. the true nature of human sex - The required element of incisive *personal judgment* concerning what is and is not against the nature of human sex is awareness of the fact that American cultural sex notions are based upon the sexuality **of plants erroneously applied to humans**. Simple awareness of the fact that American and Christian sex-lore is *all about farming and very little about human sex*, should allow individuals to see botany whenever it is present in that which is being handed to them as “natural or unnatural” human sex.

B. the true morality of human sex - The required element of accurate sex knowledge is greater information about the type of morality applied to human sex by our Greco-Roman-Christian forefathers. In fact, there exists more than one type of moral analysis. There are three; the morality of the individual, the morals of marriage, and the morals of society. Each of these three is a different ball game in a different ballpark; and each has its own rules. This work addresses the kind used by our forebears to formulate an unhealthy, squeamish morality of sex that starts by assuming sex, by nature, is evil. In addition, the American sex-lore of marriage,

as well as sex outside of marriage, happens to be the application of *political moral rules* to the morality of the individual. This misuse of power is like applying the rules of football to a baseball game. The fact is that the rules for running a moral government are rules that bureaucrats, as rulers of the body politic, should be applying only to themselves. The solution of the individual to Government intrusion into sexual areas owned by self and no one else is to tell the Government to get the hell out of individual private life and the right of individuals to rule themselves. The appalling fact is that the moral rules for politically producing a proper common good are not only wrongly applied to the sexuality of an individual; the same wrong rules are applied by American governments to almost anything and everything. American lawmakers assume that American individuals are too dumb to govern themselves in an adult fashion. For personal accurate judgment about one's own sexual behavior, there is also a need to see the *historical background* that created American *legal opposition to sex outside of marriage* and to sex that is *non-reproductive*. Be aware that personal relationships are not the same thing as private relationships. Personal refers to the fact that the relationship and the meanings found in the relationship are not standardized universalized meanings; but rather, are individual or idiosyncratic meanings. They are person to person relationships, rather than group to group relationships. Private on the other hand, means the opposite of public. Private versus public is rooted in ownership. If it is considered within *proprietary* reach of government, it is public. When the government intrudes upon private sex, it is claiming *ownership of the individual*. The government is claiming that citizens do not own themselves, the government does. It is denying and steamrolling over "inalienable" rights. Stuff not owned by the government is private. A private function is a function that is not the action or goods of the government. Internal thoughts, for example, are not in the public domain. But a thought or a behavior that is externalized in such manner that it

affects society insofar as society is the domain of government, the behavior is public. Any personal friendship that carries over into *overt expressions* that touch society, as a society, is in the public domain. Human sex by nature is neither marital nor non-marital. But because marriage is a social entity; marriage, is the handle whereby power mad bureaucrats get their hands on individual sexual behavior. In other words, the private moral sexual behavior of American individuals got subjected to statutory, institutional, and censor controls fashioned by warped Christians like Anthony Comstock; because the Government can, and does, control marriage. The resulting, warped and ignorant anti-sexual laws are called “Blue Laws”. How many of you readers are aware that in the 1920’s the Motion Picture Association imposed upon movie makers a “Production Act” which in great part used uptight spinsters who thought sexual frigidity was lewd to censor the purity of movies. To do so, of course, meant the spinsters had to watch every “dirty” movie in existence. The current remainder of that censorship is the rating system of G, PG, PG-13, R and X. (X movies are now labeled NC-17, and *self labeled XXX* movies are really really dirty - and therefore beckon as “must see” movies.)

C. human sex as love - The required element for proper judgment of sex is knowledge of the fact that sex as love is a Romantic fantasy. Sex is not love and Romance; and although these can be magnificent adjuncts; they are not necessary to healthy sex nor are they needed to justify engaging in sexual activity. Critical judgment about love sex also requires knowledge of the fact that the American *dating format* is neither traditional nor particularly natural. Critical personal judgment regarding one’s own sexual behavior requires knowledge of how dating, with its *catch me if you can and playing hard to get* notions got here. It also requires knowledge of how dating is used and what its results are. Believe me, the idea of the dating *game* is no joke. To treat dating as a game is lethal to true love.

The reason is that dating, in the form of a game, is artificial, full of shallow empty promises, and basically motivated by lust. Would you like to have a nice shallow relationship, based upon *gamy* promises as a “till death do us part” marriage? Then play the dating game and read all the magazines that tell you how to artificially sucker your date into wanting another date. Lastly, some knowledge of the imitations of love and loving relationships is required in order to avoid being in love with a fiction. For example, dominance/submission relationships, taking care of another, sycophantic worship of another, and the misguided desire to change a beloved into an image of the lover, are not genuine love. Also required is awareness of the fact that emotional affection is distinct from a deliberate choice to love. In other words, awareness of what constitutes “falling in love with love” is necessary for avoiding a false judgment about love and sex. Other aspects of mistaken love include awareness of mutually beneficial versus mutually destructive relationships, selfish versus unselfish relationships, truly loving mutual sex versus *the use* of a partner, and lastly sexual license versus sexual love.

D. sex as personal accomplishment – The required element is knowledge of the difference between braggadocio sexual prowess versus true sexual accomplishment and commitment. Genuine sexual accomplishment entails the importance, the status, and the role that sex holds in an individual’s life, and in the makeup of an individual’s personality. Knowing what is genuinely important to marriage and to sexual relationships is a must. For example; motivation to marry in view of gaining culturally accepted *social status* is not a path to true love. But if status is what you want and you do not care if you wind up with a ghastly marriage, go to it.

E. sex as self creativity or self emergence – Unlike the sex of all other living things, which *presupposes maturity*; human sex *precedes maturity*. Human sexuality is one of the inner forces that produces an adult and a mature human individual. But if an individual human has no correct experience with, or

awareness of, genuine adult human maturity; that individual's sexuality is going to go haywire. The required element for accurate personal critical judgment is reflexive knowledge of *individual self* as distinct from conformist cultural self. To possess a healthy sex life, each person needs to know who they are; or at least have a correct idea of who they should become. They must have a secure hold on their "ego", otherwise they will not be able to give self to another. You cannot give what you do not have. Adult ego or personality requires that during their lifetime a person develop a significant self-aware, internal self-governing power *that is appropriate to their individual self*; and which integrates all their behavior, including sex, into a cohesive whole. An imitation *external ego* consisting of peculiar and perhaps garish external substitutes such as pins and needles stuck everywhere into their mutilated bodies, or garish haircuts, or total body tattoos, or infantile behavior as external displays of being an individual separate from the crowd, does not hack it. Artificial external egos do not make the kind of "self" that can be deliberately and unselfishly merged with the ego of another.

Where is American sex-lore?

American sexual folklore is not easy to recognize because it is built into our thought systems to such a degree that many in society would deny that our society has any sexual folklore at all. In a way, the message is the medium; and we end up trying to evaluate sexual folklore by using that same folklore as the standard of the critique. However, unbeknownst to most Americans, Americans are wrapped in sex-lore from birth. They eat it, sleep it and breathe it all of their lives. American sex-lore has become a semi-conscious, habituated area of individual thought and behavior so ingrained, most individuals scarcely realize their sexual outlook has been unconsciously molded by secular culture rather than by Christianity or by moral evaluations. They seldom evaluate the sex-lore by which they live, because they do not know that it is there. But it is there, and it does not get analytically

evaluated because it is automatically used as the criterion for evaluating rather than treated as the subject of an evaluation. Mythical sex-lore is unwittingly used as a source of sexual values and as a standard of sexual behavior and sexual evaluations. American sex-lore, however, as an inbuilt part of American culture itself; has the same traits as American culture. The previously mentioned Patterns of Sexual Behavior is a work that explores sex-lore as differing *from place to place*. It is an evaluation that is aimed primarily at exposing the extremely myopic and rather bigoted parochialism inherent within American culture. This work explores American sex-lore that arose from time to time; and above all, those parts and aspects *disconnected from their proper time*. American *culture*, even though somewhat saturated with prudish, falsely labeled “Christian” mores invented, not by Christianity but by self serving bureaucrats; is not a divinely revealed untouchable and eternal word of God.

One would think that the two American sexual revolutions would have struck a blow at culturally lagging American sex-lore. They did, but only to a minor degree. They missed the heart of traditional sex-lore because they, by design, were revolts directed specifically at the sexual taboos and prohibitions of Puritanism. However, the roots of American sex-lore are not directly found in what Puritanism says you cannot *sexually do*. Basic American sex-lore is not found in Puritanism due to the fact that Puritanism is itself infected with the Western cultural definition of human sex as *plant sex*. The source of American fairy tale sex is the inbred cultural notion of **human sex as plant sex**. Puritanism and other priggish American sex-lore are the outcomes of believing in plant sex. The core of American sex-lore, insofar as it is warped, is derived from thinking that human sex is nothing but *farming*. Puritanical precepts are simply a second layer of farming sex. This layer consisting of warped customs, obscene sexual laws, and off base taboos is the result of the fact that these outlandish regulations of human sex

assume that the core nature of human sex is planting seeds for purposes of growing a crop. But even weeds drop seeds and grow offspring, because they have no choice in regard to reproducing. But *uniform necessity* is precisely what agricultural sex-lore imposes. Agricultural sex-lore says everyone must use sex to reproduce, and they must do it in the manner dictated by religious and civil law. But unlike plant sex human sex is not, by nature, unconscious; and it is not aimed at producing a good crop, or a good marriage, or a good America. Human sex, by nature, is a freely chosen activity that, just like learning, is aimed at making the person who uses it a *properly developed mature person* - especially in regard to the proper manner to treat others. American *culture* can be sexually moral and helpful to individual Americans only when the fundamental *human dimensions of sex* are identified by American culture and by religious and civil law.

In order to appreciate the immense and real gap between former sexual ideas and our own current experience, a person must have some insight into the actual life experience and forms of sex that traditional concepts do express. Attaining some glimmer of the actual historical life experience that generated our current American sex-lore will enable us to see how much of it is relevant only to trees and grass. Those who need the security of accepted dependable meanings, no matter what these meanings are worth, had better stay home. The adventuresome are invited, and may even be delighted with what they find.

CHAPTER THREE: THE IMPACT OF SEX-LORE ON AMERICA

Would any reasonable person deliberately wish to be a sexual pervert? Not normally. Most people wish to be righteous. If that be so, it is imperative that the righteous uncover any deformed sex-lore incorporated into their lives. Warped sex-lore is contrary to Natural Law. Warped sex-lore can furtively pervert biologically given human sex. Warped sex-lore is a sinister deadly poison. It can seriously and

permanently damage a healthy human person. But we can't be poisoned with false sex doctrine, can we? Is it not true that everyone automatically knows what moral rectitude is, and everyone knows what the Natural Laws of sex are, and what they demand of us. Everyone automatically knows what a sexual pervert is. Don't they? Do they? Let's take a look at the notions of Natural Law and moral rectitude possessed by our ancestors. Did you know that 'right' and 'righteous' derive from being right handed? The Greek mathematician, Pythagoras, who created a Greek religion, proposed two sources of reality, one good and one bad. He called them the "Limited" and the "Unlimited". Among the Pythagorean religious distinctions of good and bad that followed from the Limited and the Unlimited were good light versus bad darkness, good male versus bad female, and good right versus bad left - from which came evil *left handedness*. In our historical, Greco-Roman Christian culture, right handed people were considered intact and moral; while being left handed meant you were a born monster, a mistake of nature, and were immoral by nature. Left handed people were just as misbegotten as hunchbacks, those with cleft palates, those who were cross eyed, or those with any disfigurement. According to traditional Natural Law theory, left handers were unnatural and therefore evil. The Latin word for left is "sinistra" from which comes the word "sinister". The Latin word for straight is "rectus" from which comes the word "right". Left-handed people were sinister. Right-handed people were straight arrows. All the terms such as "right", "upright", "righteous", "righteousness", "rectitude", "rectify", etc., come from the notion of good right handed. According to Western moral tradition, right handed people are, by nature, moral; and left handed people, by nature, are immoral. Because being right handed was perceived as morally upright by reason of Natural Law, while being left handed was seen as evil by reason of Natural Law; many parents forced their left-handed children to use their right hand. Being right handed was, and still is, thought of as being more

natural and preferable to being left handed. Even though it may cause dyslexia or psychological problems in a child, some parents force right handedness on their left handed children even today. After all, according to folklore versions of Natural Law, someone who is left-handed is, by nature, a sexual pervert.

Sex lore that is easily perceivable

Sex-lore that appears as a fairy tale or an ancient myth is fairly obvious to see. For example: once upon a time, there was a rebellious young lad who masturbated constantly in spite of prohibitions and punishments from his parents. He continued time after time until one day his masturbation caused incurable priapism. Now all his friends constantly ridicule him for his perpetually bulging erection. Do you know that Mother earth has inexhaustible fertility and is to be worshipped as the procreative principle of all life? Dumuzi-abzu is the god of fertility. He is the source of young within mother earth. Inanna, the storehouse of dates [the fruit], is his companion. Because of them, fertility ceremonies can cause what they symbolize. Sympathetic rites that imitate fertility can magically cause real fertility in humans as well as cause a good crop and a bountiful harvest. Ritual marriages, ritual prostitution, sacrifices and phallic symbols imitate fertility and can produce actual human fertility as well as good farm crops. Menstrual blood can rust metal, make animals that eat it go mad and sour good wine. Witches can cause impotence and miscarriages. Vasectomies maintain and even restore male potency because they prevent loss of virile seed. In the sexual act, females must be below and males atop; otherwise the female will lose the seed implanted in her and the intercourse will be sinfully unproductive.

Not so visible lore that influenced Judaism and Christianity

Babylonia is one of the original sources of our American culture. The Babylonians had many myths that foreshadow certain narratives in the Christian

Bible and other Christian beliefs. The lore may be obvious, but its influence on our beliefs and culture is not. One famous Babylonian myth is called the Epic of Gilgamesh. Gilgamesh was a ruler of Uruk. He was so superior to ordinary men that he had no human companion. To supply a companion, the gods created a sort of complimentary wild opposite of Gilgamesh, called Enkidu. A harlot is sent into the wilderness to bring Enkidu into captivity. Enkidu is seduced by the prostitute and as a result he can no longer communicate with the animals, and he realizes he is naked. Enkidu becomes a companion to Gilgamesh, but later on, Enkidu becomes sick and dies. Gilgamesh, in an effort to revive Enkidu seeks out Utnapishtim. Utnapishtim is the sole survivor of the great deluge and knows the secret of eternal life. Utnapishtim tells Gilgamesh that the secret of eternal life is a plant living underneath the waters of the earth. Gilgamesh dives to the bottom of the waters, gets the plant; but loses the plant to a serpent that eats it. Consequently, serpents have eternal life, but not humans. Do you recognize Adam's need for Eve as well as Eve's role in temptation and original sin, the loss of innocence, the awareness of nakedness, the arrival of human death, and the serpent in the Garden of Eden? How is it that this Babylonian myth, which blames a harlot for the then current condition of mankind, significantly influenced Judaism and subsequently Christianity? The influence is obviously there. Some of the influence is probably due to the fact that Abraham, the father of the Jews, was a Babylonian.

Sex-lore that parades as science

Freud

Science itself has been caught up, at times, in culturally conditioned ideas of human sexuality. One of the prime examples is of course Sigmund Freud and his school of followers. The vocabulary of Freud reads like a lesson in mythology with its "Oedipus complexes", its "Narcissism", and its "Eros". The difficulty lies in the fact that Freud's picture of the human race was conditioned by his own culture.

Freud had a bad case of ethnocentrism. Freud's idea was that sexuality is a *biological instinct* in the individual - which means genital sex is not susceptible to rational control. He labeled this biological instinct the *libido*. A characteristic of the libido is the gradual buildup and sudden decrease of excitation. Because eating, drinking, and elimination share a common pattern of excitation, Freud regarded them as basically sexual, or libidinous. In addition, Freudian stages of psychosexual development from the oral stage in infancy, to the anal stage in the second and third years of life, mark the progress of the libido from the oral to the anal and finally to the genital zones. Clinical observations led Freud to believe that any sexual ideas unacceptable to the conscious mind were repressed and became part of the unconscious. He argued that all children develop an *Oedipal complex*, in which they are sexually attracted to the parent of the opposite sex and become rivals with the parent of the same sex for the love object they share in common. Sometimes these repressed sexual ideas emerge in a disguised form in dreams and in neurotic symptoms. Libido, insofar as it makes itself heard in the human mind, Freud called the "*id*". The individual and his conscious libido the "*id*" exist within a surrounding culture, and culture [assumed to be apex and eternal] dictates how the individual may employ his "*id*". Culture for Freud was a reality check or *reality principle* authoritatively governing the libido and its counterpart the "*id*". But apparently the only culture Freud knew about was his own, and that culture was a sexually restrictive culture. Consequently, the only relation Freud saw between libido and reality principle was that of a rather repressive restriction of libido. So Freud called the demands of libido, as repressed into the unconscious, the "*id*". Freud saw this tension as the absolute natural universal relation between a bio-sexual individual and culture - and the winner is culture, because the government owns the individual.

On this basis, Freud began to theorize. Repression of instincts and sexual

renunciation produces culture. Sexual repression and suppression are necessary for the development of culture. Culture is the result of *sublimated* sexual energy. What Freud seemingly did not know is that many societies have developed a high degree of culture, not by restricting sex, but by utilizing it in all its forms. Freud also claimed that the most powerful and pervasive unconscious ideas underlying *hysteria* were sexual. He had probably been reading the Hippocratic corpus, which said that women are hollow and that the womb randomly moves up and down inside them. The womb could move up even as far as the windpipe. The Greek word for womb is "*hysterikos*" from which come words such as "hysterectomy" and "hysteria". The Freudian connection between hysteria and sex is apparently a womb stuck in the windpipe. Note that Freud's idea of hysteria pertains only to females because only females have wombs. Hence, for a male to become hysterical, as in cases of what was called battlefield "shell shock", was a disgraceful and cowardly matter of faking it. That makes today's "post traumatic stress" to be a fake.

Freud concluded that the cause of life-long hysterical neurosis was the sexual experiences of infancy. He came to the conclusion that sex problems are a significant cause of neurosis because his culturally biased clinical observations connected *neurasthenia* with masturbation and wet dreams, and anxiety with early withdrawal and its consequent frustration. Freud said that sexual perversion was infant sexuality carried into adult life. Along with other shortcomings, another problem is that Freud's view of human development was a replacement theory rather than a cumulative theory such as that of Abraham Maslow. For Freud new foci of psychological development drive out and replace previous focuses. For Maslow and other modern third force psychologists; new focuses envelop and improve on previous focuses. Maslow's view is akin to seeing that human development is like the *metamorphosis* from caterpillar to butterfly. Human

maturation is a *transformation* of old into new. Freud described autoeroticism or masturbation as bad because these sex impulses are arrested at fore-pleasure. There is no proper climax, and thus no relief of the built up tension. According to Freud, nocturnal pollutions [wet dreams] are also deliberate masturbation because dreams are left over drives and wishes from the previous day. Dreams, said Freud, derive from *conscious* orientations not simply from biology or physiology. After puberty more truly sexual ends emerge so that fore pleasure is now a step left behind in the rise to further pleasure. So you had better give up foreplay, because it is as bad as masturbation

What is true in Freud's analysis is that rigid control of the sex instinct is necessary to the development of the sexually restrictive, authoritarian, legalistic *societies* of Western culture. But paternally institutionalized society is not the absolute character of human culture. Freud's point of view was highly ethnocentric and relative. The true cause of sexually induced anxieties in Western culture is not the conflict between "id" and "superego"; it is the conflict between Nature given libido and perverted man made repression of sex found in Western culture.

Other medical sex-lore

Albert the Great, the teacher of Thomas Aquinas, said that weak male seed produced females while strong male seed produced males. This was a continuation of the Greek sex-lore that a female is a "misbegotten male". Interestingly, contemporary medical science indicates just the opposite. It is the male who is a "misbegotten female".

Preformation

During the Middle Ages the *botanical* concept of human male *seed* was taken to its illogical limit. A Dutchman named Antoni Leeuwenhoek made some of the first microscopes. A couple of his contemporaries aimed one of his microscopes at sperm cells. They claimed they saw that every male spermatozoon

contained a little fetus rolled up inside it. Within the spermatozoa of this rolled up little fetus were other little fetuses all rolled up; and they, in turn, contained other little fetuses in their spermatozoa. In other words, all future generations pre-existed in a fully formed fashion in the present sperm of a male. This assertion is a child of the ancient doctrine that male seed fertilizes the female while the female simply supplies food and surround for that seed. These geniuses did not know of female ova. Culturally dictated observations such as these led to the doctrine of *preformation*. This theory claims that all parts of the adult are fully present at conception. They are just tiny. Consequently, all living development, including human development, consists solely of growth in size. There is no such thing as true gametes, and no such thing as metamorphic growth. Caterpillars cannot become butterflies, and impregnated eggs cannot turn into animals. The little human within male sperm, like a maggot, simply feeds on the female egg.

The doctrine of preformation, because it views male “seed” as containing fully developed humans, is applied to a zygote and used as a false argument for no abortions from day one of conception. It also makes for a specious argument against evolution.

Epigenesis

The doctrine of preformation did not die easily. In fact, many a fundamentalist believer still thinks this myth explains why evolution does not exist. After being discredited in its original form, it existed in the form of part to part transfers from parent to child. Given that the whole fetus did not pre-exist, the scientists of the eighteenth century said that each organ of the parent contained a tiny replica of itself which was transmitted to the embryo and which then grew into the same organ in the fetus. The doctrine of preformation as the transfer of a whole human or the transfer of a human piece by piece was put to rest by Caspar Wolff in the eighteenth century. His meticulous experiments with chicken embryos showed

that the embryos developed adult parts during development. He demonstrated that true metamorphic growth occurred in embryos, not simply growth in size. The fact of metamorphic embryonic development was called *epigenesis*. Epigenesis has now been confirmed a thousand times over. Today we have day by day pictures of the gestational metamorphic development of humans within the womb.

Recent biology

Max Huhner, in commenting on the assertions of Freud, says: *“There is hardly an organ in the body whose functions may not be deranged through reflexes from the genitals arising therefrom”*. Huhner also goes on to say: *“I also, cited cases to prove my formula that illicit connection equals venereal disease”*. Carrying things even further, Huhner says: *“frigidity is normal in modestly reared girls up to their marriage, and it is not abnormal to have it persist for some time after marriage”*. [Max Huhner: [Disorders of the Sexual Function](#) (Los Angeles: Marvin Miller Enterprises, Inc., 1965.)] The German, Richard Kraft-Ebbing, one of the well respected pioneering sex researchers of the late nineteenth century, taught that masturbation coarsens the mind as well as inducing neurosis and impotence. Others saw masturbation as a rash expenditure of semen and consequently a loss of virility.

In keeping with the idea that females are infertile and barren, males who could produce an ejaculate were considered fertile even if they could not get an erection. Females got blamed for all cases of failure to become pregnant as long as the male ejaculated, even if the ejaculate had to be pushed in with fingers. The male got blamed only if he was totally impotent. If a male was impotent and could not produce an erection, these doctors recommended tying of the male two “vas deferens” in order to preserve male “energy” and thus restore male masculinity and potency. Tying the vas deferens stops semen from being included in the ejaculate, but does not prevent the other materials, such as those from the prostate, to be

ejaculated. In terms of nineteenth century medical sex-lore, a vasectomy [cutting the vas deferens rather than tying it] does not prevent male fertility; but it cures impotence. Before the medical profession identified third stage syphilis, insanity was thought to be the result of any and *all non-reproductive* sexual activity. Some doctors proposed that all sexual activity is dangerous because blood goes to the head, and that means any sex of any kind at any time can cause a stroke. All sorts of medical evils were attributed to “unnatural” sex particularly to masturbation and sodomy. One nineteenth century medicine man whom the reader might recognize is the Seventh Day Adventist Dr. John Harvey Kellogg, the brother of Will Keith Kellogg who created vegetarian, “anti sexual”, *cold* breakfast cereals. Dr. John Harvey, along with many a nineteenth century medical doctor, attributed exhaustion, disappointment in love, grief, untrustworthiness, disorder of the passions, use of tobacco, piles, pimples, infantile paralysis, rheumatism, shifty eyes and a host of other nasties to masturbation, all of which led to insanity. One might think it was the work of religious zealots, but it was the medical profession of just a few years back that made male children wear a metal lock-on codpiece to bed and padlocked girls in a “chastity girdle” in order to prevent masturbation. There was a group of doctors who specialized in “orificial” surgery. “Orifice” is the Latin word for opening and in a sexual context generally means the vagina and anus. Some of these medical wizards went as far as female circumcision, which is removal of the inner and outer labia of the vagina. The radical “orificial” surgery for males was castration. The more common procedure was circumcision. The doctors thought that the necessity of cleaning an uncircumcised penis would encourage masturbation. Jewish tradition aside, circumcision is still prevalent today even though the medical profession recognizes and admits there is no medicinal reason for circumcising all males.

Female menstruation engendered other medical horrors. Some considered

menstruation itself pathological. It was a curse resulting from Eve's role in the garden of Eden. John Harvey Kellogg wrote a work called Plain Facts for Old and Young. [Burlington, Iowa: I.F. Segner and Condit, publishers. 1879] In it he wrote that menstruation makes women more susceptible to morbid influences and serious derangements. These are not old fashioned ideas. In 1970 a physician friend of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey claimed that women could not be leaders because of periodic problems with their thinking. Some gynecology textbooks are still condescending and paternalistic. The medical profession also sought to keep women in their place; namely, in the home. Women allegedly are, by nature, destined for motherhood. They are fulfilled only by reproducing, mothering and attending to their husbands. With this cultural crap firmly entrenched in their brains, the medical profession went through some incredible hoops trying to prevent women from getting an education. The medicine men used menstruation as the handle. Unaware of the nature and role of hormones, a German doctor claimed that menstruation was mechanically triggered by the nervous system. Menstruation apparently is a muscle twitch. This claim led to the following theory in regard to female education:

Menstruation is caused by the nervous system

@ education stimulates the nervous system [the brain]

ERGO: education and menstruation both stimulate the nervous system

@ the female body cannot do two things at once

ERGO: the female cannot menstruate and be educated simultaneously

@ one cannot get rid of menstruation

ERGO: female education must go.

From this point of view came assertions such as the following. Education will cause women to become sexless eunuchs who have destroyed their maternal instincts. It will cause them to lose their soft femininity and make them coarse and

masculine. They will have loud gusty voices and use profanity. Education will stunt their development as females. It will stop the growth of a woman's pelvis. It will cause women to be flat chested. Along with difficult childbirths, education of women will cause nervousness, headaches, mental diseases, inflammation of the brain and insanity. Others wrote that hard study takes away a woman's beauty, causes hysteria, anxiety, digestive disorders, fuzzy eyesight, and really bad cases of "PMS". It also kills sexual desires. If women are allowed a bit of education, it should be in home economics only. Along with keeping women suppressed by males, the medical profession correspondingly protected its clientele and trade by going after midwives. They got rid of midwives by having laws passed in almost every State outlawing midwives under the false accusation that midwives were performing abortions. The anti abortion laws did not stop abortions as the Kinsey report well documented. What it did do, however, was force women to get abortions under back alley conditions. Of all the women who died as a result of pregnancy, around 20% to 30% in fact, died as the result of an inept abortion. This material on medical profession inanity is based extensively upon the following book. [[Vern and Bonnie Bullough, Sexual Attitudes: Myths and Realities \(New York: Prometheus Books, 1995\)](#)].

Incidentally, it was a group of black female math geniuses working for NASA who created much of the math necessary for the American space program. And it was a female who created and programmed the computer for the capsule that took America to the moon.

Recent Legalities

Many States, pre-conditioned by traditional legal codes and by sexually repressive Christianity, heeded the pseudo-scientific declarations about masturbation and other "unnatural" sex acts. They passed a profusion of laws making any and all non marital, non procreational sex illegal. The legal, catch-all

term for vague allegedly “unnatural” sex acts is “buggery”. In 1973, the United States Supreme Court in Roe v. Wade squashed State laws forbidding abortions in the first trimester, but allowed the States legal control during the second trimester for purposes of health care. The Catholic Church, along with ultra conservative Christians, is ferocious and sometimes vicious in its opposition to that Court decision. The ultra conservative Christians included both Presidents Bush, father and son. President George Bush Junior, who in November of the year 2003 fostered and signed a new anti abortion bill, encouraged some of the more liberal members of the Supreme Court to retire so that he could appoint anti abortionist, ultra conservatives to the Court. In November of the year 2003, the ultra conservative Republicans in congress created a sleep-in session of congress in hopes of tiring out democrats who were against approving the appointment of several anti abortionist ideologues to various Federal Courts. In a bit of bold faced hypocrisy; the Republicans, in the year 2005, wanted to change congressional rules in order to forbid filibusters. Ridding congress of filibuster rules was motivated by Republicans who saw it as a way to stop Democrats threatening to filibuster against a new Republican attempt to load the Federal Courts with anti abortionist demagogues. The hypocritical Republican extra curricular unapproved sleep-in was okay; but a filibuster by Democrats, even though within congressional rules, was not. The anti abortionist segment of fanatics also includes a bunch of sadistic madmen and women whose slogan is: “abortion is killing and if you don’t stop it, I’m gonna kill you.”

The term “unnatural” sex is an ancient and fuzzy catch-all euphemism for any and all non-procreative sex. It was used out of sexual ignorance as to what is and is not natural sex. It was also used, as some claimed, in order to avoid upsetting the common person’s tender sensibilities about sex; and to avoid teaching them about sexual perversions they otherwise would not know about. Sex outside

of marriage is one of those allegedly “unnatural” sex acts that the power mad bureaucrats wished to stop.

Gender differentiation

Biological difference between human males and human females is a fact. That distinction is called sex. Over and above the biological calling toward being male or female, the differences between males and females caused by cultural factors applied to that biological difference is called *gender*. Sex is a biological given. Gender is an acquired, conscious self-identity. Gender is one of the dominant components of a person's self definition. People consider themselves male or female; and in most, but not all cases, genitals and gender self identity match.

The social influences involved in gender development vary from culture to culture. Gender identity varies accordingly in various cultures. Much depends upon the stereotypes of masculinity and femininity prevalent in a given culture. Other influences derive from general sexual conventions such as taboos on various types of sexual activity and outlooks on youthful sexual behavior. Gender differentiation, however, does not result in the sharp male-female separation pre assumed by traditional sex-lore. Gender differentiation is more a spectrum, a continuum, whose poles are totally male and totally female; but whose intermediates are not so sharply divided. Among humans there are males with many so called female characteristics; and many females with sundry, culturally stereotyped male characteristics. From a cultural point of view, there are biological males who are, by cultural standards, effeminate; and there are biological females who, by cultural standards are masculine. Whether these views are nature based is highly questionable. Some individuals, whether biologically male or female, adopt behaviors culturally identified with both female and male gender. These people are said to have an *androgynous* or blended gender identity. Contemporary sociology

and psychology recognize that many so-called totally male or totally female characteristics are not naturally based at all. They are strictly the result of social conditioning, such as skirts for women and trousers for men. The extreme male-female differentiation rooted within traditional American sex-lore causes our culture to impose the requirements of that radical sex-lore onto male and female children. Girls must play with dolls, and boys must play with guns. In the process, a great deal of individual orientation and identity gets crushed. At the same time the lore of male superiority gets enhanced. These extremist sex roles carry the myth of male superiority over females such that the fiction of male superiority actually gets forced upon those who are encultured by our society.

In ancient democratic Athens, which is one of the sources of our current American culture; women were relegated to the domestic sphere while only men were allowed to participate in public life. In modern industrial societies, increased demand for all types of employees has produced an expanded involvement of women in the public sphere, even in jobs traditionally considered male. This participation has produced the concomitant phenomenon of increased male participation in the domestic household. The result is a growing flexibility of gender roles and a somewhat closer social equality between the sexes, but the sex-lore demanded biological inequality remains.

Social heterogeneity and gender

Divisions of labor create specialization and specialization produces more efficient and effective performance of a given function. In terms of life, the complexity which arises from dividing functions into specialties allows for more perfect forms of life. The word “organism” implies this heterogeneity. The more complex the organic structure of a living organism, the higher its form of life. The same holds for culture. The greater the heterogeneity of a society, the greater is the richness and vitality of the culture. Human society is not a pile of sand pebbles on

a beach, nor is it a colony of cloned asexual bacteria. It is true that frightened bigots would love to render the United States an homogenous white man's Country. These white Aryans, who are terrified of anyone different from themselves, do not understand that homogeneity is the hallmark of the inanimate and the dead, while heterogeneity is the hallmark of the living. Every molecule of water is H₂O, and consequently water is not a living substance but an inanimate chemical. In contrast, every organ in the human body differs, causing the human body to be alive.

The fact is that the wealth and power of the United States derives from its cultural heterogeneity, and sex and gender are part of that heterogeneity. Enculturated biological sex results in gender differentiation while contributing to the attraction that draws diverse beings together. Sex differentiation naturally causes a systematic collective by providing a nature-based complexity of members and functions which in turn helps to produce a systematic social organism. If sex is not seen as a sharp division of male versus female, but as a continuum; the possibilities of social organization are greatly increased from those that currently exist in most Western societies and cultures. As it is, the only sexual organization culturally allowed in the United States is contractual, monogamous, heterosexual marriage. Homosexual marriages, which would add heterogeneity to the institution of marriage, are currently forbidden in most cases. But the basic fact remains that biological sexual differentiation, which gives rise to cultural gender differentiation, is a natural source of social heterogeneity and organization - and thus is a potent source of life giving heterogeneity.

Gender and social interaction

Over and above self identification, gender identification of others is also a necessity. Personal interaction in a society requires the mutual ability to anticipate co-relative behavior. We base our own behavior relative to others on the

anticipated reaction from them. The ability to foresee how someone else will react to our presence or to our behavior depends upon the predictability of their reaction. Learning what to expect from other persons in reference to ourselves is one of the dimensions of enculturation. If we say “good morning” to someone we meet, we usually expect that they will reply in kind. If we come to a four way stop sign while driving and another car arrives at about the same time, we expect the other driver to stop. Being able to determine what to expect from others is one of the factors that allows us to live together in society. Because gender carries prescriptions for behavior with others, we need to know the sex of the person or persons with whom we are interacting. People generally use indicators such as dress, facial appearance, and nonverbal cues such as demeanor and mannerisms to determine another person's sex. These cues don't always work. In order to prevent sex discrimination, Federal Equal Opportunity proscriptions forbid asking job applicants their sex. Human Relations personnel are told to determine the sex of an applicant by “eyeballing” the person. If the person is hired, it is then okay to ask them their sex. Someone did a consequent study and discovered that 48% of the time, the “eyeballing” was in error.

Stereotypes as sex-lore

The dictionary says that a stereotype is anything undistinguished by individuality. As already noted, simply because you have a name for something doesn't mean you know what it is. A name can be a label for a collective wherein you don't distinguish individuals or admit variation. For example, all females are soft, passive and gentle. All males are strong, aggressive and tough. Anyone else whose gender identity doesn't match such preconceived gender stereotypes is literally a weirdo. Although gender is many times used as a group stereotype, it differs from biological sex differentiation in the fact that gender identity is actually individual identity. Leaving aside organic structure versus hormonal biological

conflicts in some individuals, biological sex identity is essentially a single overall division of the entire human race. Biological Sex is a group distinction. Gender is just the opposite. Gender differentiation is not a group distinction. It is an individual distinction. Some overall form of female gender is not the self identity of all females; and some overall form of male gender is not the self identity of all males. Each individual female and each individual male has a distinct and unique gender identity. What is female gender to one biological female may not be female gender to the next biological female; and so also with males. Failure to realize that *gender is individual* causes many a social problem. Sexual harassment can be one of them. Even in cases of proper attempts to become acquainted, what one person accepts as flattery, the next may reject as abhorrent. Within the dating game, any male who thinks his favorite come-on will work with every woman, because all women are the same, is headed for a nasty comeuppance.

Historical sex stereotypes

The Witch

Why do we call women “charming”? A charm is a magic spell. Its result is someone who is enchanted or spellbound. Are women charming because they are bewitching or in other word witches? Do all women bewitch? Whom do they bewitch? Most medieval and early modern Christians believed in demons. Many Christians still do. Medieval Christians, however, also thought that the Devil could possess humans or mate with them such that their offspring would be humans with the preternatural powers of the Devil. Women who allegedly had sex with the Devil and whose female offspring possessed diabolic powers were witches. Male witches are called “warlocks”. They were believed to worship Satan instead of God, and in consequence of being seeded by the Devil were given magical powers of sorcery by Satan. Around the fifteenth century in Europe, witchcraft became punishable by death. Thousands upon thousands of alleged witches were tried by

being hogtied and thrown into the river. If they floated and survived, they were clean. If they sank and drowned they were proven witches. In most cases no test was required. If someone called a woman a witch, that assertion alone proved it; and she was burned at the stake or hung. In sixteenth century America, the town of Salem became famous for its witch-hunts. Since women, following Eve, were assumed to be weaker in both body and spirit than men, they were assumed to be more likely to succumb to the enticements of the Devil. The upshot of this stereotype was the presumption that most witches were women. Over eighty percent of all accused witches were women. As the song says, women will cause men to be “bewitched, bothered and bewildered”. However, the song does not say that men should kill women for being charming.

The Temptress

Greek civilization, one of the parents of our civilization, gave us the notion that women, because of their allure, are disruptive forces that distract men from greater pursuits. The Greeks considered the development of civilization as a triumph of male intellectuality over the sexual enticement of women. Judaism, the parent of Christianity, also gave us disruptive women. The Greeks gave us Pandora who opened the forbidden box and brought plagues and unhappiness to mankind. The Jews gave us Eve. Early Roman law, which is a major basis of Western law, described women as children, forever inferior to men. The Roman “patri potestas” (the power of the father) conferred on husbands life and death authority over their wives. This ultimately produced marriage vows of the kind that demanded wifely obedience as well as sexual duty to husband. In early America, the law in most places was a Puritan derivative of English law. Under that law, wives and children were basically a man’s possessions the same as any other goods. Women who married gave up their family name and embraced the family name of their husbands. They still do. Nearly two hundred years after the arrival of the Pilgrims

in America, the Napoleonic Code replaced nineteenth century French law which at the time was a mixture of Roman Law, Catholic Canon law and customs. The Napoleonic Code well nigh repeats the Roman “patri potestas” in its subjugation of married women to their husbands. State law in Louisiana is a derivative of the Napoleonic Code. So is the law in Quebec Canada. In the sexually regressive United States, it was not until 1974 before women were allowed autonomous opportunity to obtain credit cards in their own name.

As a sort of variation on the stereotype of women as dangerous to the exalted life of their male superiors, European culture of the Middle Ages developed courtly love. Courtly love is a fairy tale sort of love. Courtly love makes women the objects of male devotion and Romantic love. It is the love of the noble knight who, as his lady's obedient servant, is prepared to overcome dragons and suffer any hardships to win the favor of fair maiden. Fair maiden, of course, was always married to someone else, so courtly love was, of necessity, dangerous, illicit and clandestine - and thus very very desirable. The notion that a woman is a Romantic prize has persisted to this day as a dimension of the relation between American men and women. The notion is part of the dating game. Males woo women. Women do not woo males. Male pursuit of females dominates the current American notion of courtship, except that the two stereotypes of women as dangers to be tamed and prizes to be won are now combined. Overcoming dragons has become the male sexual conquest of females themselves. Sadly, many American women *play the game of conquest*. Their role is to play hard to get; but in the process *they become viewed as prey*. The game itself is not a natural given, and women are not male prey. But because of the dating game; almost every guy in America thinks that prey is the nature of a woman. Let's go big game hunting, shall we?

Some contemporary female stereotypes

The most pervasive and long lasting stereotype of women is that of pure nurture source as distinct from, and correlative to, the male life imparting force. Males are the source of new life, and women are the nourishment and caretakers of new life. There is some natural basis for the stereotype. Women, in addition to co-authoring life, do provide their own bodies as sources of sustenance for the fetuses they carry. They do provide mother's milk. These biological facts, however, give rise to particular forms of assumed group identity ascribed to women. These group identities, such as child caretakers and homemakers, are presented as naturally linked to women's biology and physiology. The nurture stereotype, for example, has a causal impact on the areas in which women are given jobs. It is no secret that the vast majority of women who work are still employed in clerical positions, retail sales, and service jobs. Women are automatically identified as secretaries, bookkeepers, and typists. Women, on the basis of the stereotype, also make good waitresses, cooks, nurses, hospital attendants, cleaning women, and hairdressers.

Mother Earth

The nurturing aspects of feminine biology long ago caused a comparison between women and earth. The comparison originated in ancient agricultural societies. The similarity between the earth which vitalizes and supports crops and women who gestate and nurture children was inescapable from a farmer's point of view. This agricultural comparison produced another dimension to the female stereotype. Mother earth, with her seasonal rhythms, was considered sacred. Some of that sacredness is still associated with women. This, in turn, leads to other stereotypes. Women are untouchable, women are pure, women are delicate, etc.

Women on a pedestal

During the nineteenth century the survival of children increased because of better health conditions. At the same time the usefulness of children as a family labor force declined because of the industrial revolution. Child care then became

important in and of itself rather than as a means of creating a family workforce. As a consequence, motherhood among the middle classes developed into a special vocation. Children were to be sheltered from the inconsiderate world outside the family; and this led to the conclusion that women, as their guardians, also were to be insulated and isolated. While the upper classes indulged in a licentiousness that only the rich could afford, the middle classes developed a rather severe form of feminine priggishness. This strait laced, uptight attitude came later than Puritanism and was not a derivative. It is what we call prudery. During this age of Victorianism, some married women wanted have an impact on society; but their husbands said no. To satisfy these wives the husband put their wives on a pedestal and made being a wife into being a goddess. This raised being a wife to great status. She reigned over the household, he reigned over the political world. Thus creating the doctrine of separate spheres. In order to be a goddess, however, the wife had to be white and middle class. No other race or class of women were included. In fact, most wives were not on a pedestal; but were under the thumb of their husbands. The goddess image did not effectively hide the fact that most wives were slaves to their husbands. With their civil rights filtered through a husband who was lord and master, wives had fewer rights than single women. So the goddesses thought if they were of such superior quality, they could rectify the wifely inequality plus do a better job of running a society that was immoral due to being unequal. This situation helped spawn the drive for women's suffrage and social reform for greater equality of the sexes within and without marriage. Working class wives in lower classes, however, could not help the women's movement because they were too busy having children under the decree of their husbands. What they needed was a way to curb the number of children they were having. Legal and political acceptance of birth control was hastened by the depression which made birth control a necessity. It is not very smart to have a lot

of children when the only thing a parent has to offer is starvation. Nevertheless, sex is one of the few pleasures that the poor have, so they have children anyway. This bane of working class women caused the issue of birth control to enter the social arena. Enter Margaret Sanger. After gaining the right to vote and after the pill was invented more women, including the lower classes, began to seek work outside of the home. A woman was no longer a wife by nature, she was a woman by nature. The need for women in the workforce, increased exponentially by reason of WWII, and women answered the call. But women were not paid on a par with men, because they were viewed simply as fill-ins for men until the men returned. And when the men did return, the women in the workforce were unceremoniously told to get lost. They should get married as their natural destiny.

Women are not females, they are ladies. Propriety is the standard. Women were sent to finishing schools to learn it. Proper women simply did not do what the licentious rich women did. Women were genteel, which in fact meant idle. Women were models of higher morality and delicacy of feeling. Women were chaste and virtuous. They were to be protected from the gross and the vulgar. Morals became manners, and women who knew how to dress and to act properly became egotistical showpieces for husbands or even lovers. Women remained inferior to males but heaven forbid they should complain. After all, they were on a pedestal.

A woman's place is in the home

Our word "economics" comes from the Greek word "oikos" meaning household. Another Greek word, namely "polis", is the Greek word for city. From the word "polis" we get words such as "politics", "policy", "police" and "metropolis". Traditionally there were three areas of moral science. The moral science of attaining individual self governance was called "ethics". The moral science of family management was called "economics"; and in spite of the fact that today's politics are far from moral, "politics" was the science of moral

government. Under this tradition, the realm of men was the “polis”. The realm of women was the “oikos”. Women were to be learned and skilled in the moral science of home economics. This moral doctrine of separate spheres, along with the nurture archetype, resulted in the stereotype that “a woman’s place is in the home”. Even today women are seen as predestined for homemaking. Women are to learn from their mothers how to cook and clean the house and how to care for children.

Women must be married

As childlike, women must be married in order to be watched over, supervised, protected and cared for by a husband. It’s a disgrace for a woman not to be married. It means a woman is not attractive and has no value! Since her whole identity and value derives its worth from male appreciation, not being appreciated and desired by a male is degrading. A woman not only must be married, she must be married by age twenty five. Women over twenty five have lost their chance. They are no longer marriageable. Canon Law, or in other words Roman Church Law, called unmarried women over twenty five “superannuated” and granted them special legal privileges designed to help them get married. Superannuated women are a disgrace to their families. As single but female, they are not capable of establishing an independent life of their own without the supervision of a husband. They will remain a burden on their family and dependent on their father for life.

Women as teachers of the young

Female nurturing includes the idea that women have a natural, maternal instinct for instruction of their own young. That notion gets expanded into the assumption that women should be teachers in elementary and perhaps middle schools. Men, on the other hand, take over the instruction of children once these offspring arrive at the age when they start dealing with the world outside the home.

Hence the correlative stereotype that men alone should be the professors of colleges and universities. Even today, most elementary and middle school teachers are women rather than men. The opposite is true in higher education where men dominate the teaching field. Women are also stereotype victims in regard to areas of instruction. Women instructors are concentrated in such fields as education, social service, home economics, nursing, and library science. Far fewer women among college and university teachers are instructors in the physical sciences, engineering, agriculture, and law.

Women as unconditional lovers

The female nurture archetype also contains the stereotype of unconditional mother's love and conditional father's love. The home is the extension of the mother's womb. Women who are caretakers of the very young must love their offspring without condition because the offspring have nothing to offer in return. The very young are totally needy and consequently are total takers and users rather than givers. This fact gives rise to the sex-lore that all females who love someone else always love them unconditionally. Once the young have been nurtured and instructed by their mothers to the point of having a basic understanding of self and the world around, once the young have acquired basic self control as well as recognition of, and return appreciation for, the unconditional love given them by their mothers; it is time for their fathers to take over. The warm, comfortable, protected world provided by the mother must now give way to the cold cruel world outside the home.

The correlative paternal stereotype is the male who expresses love for his offspring *only if they perform*. Paternal love is not unconditional. It must be won by achievement and attainment. The notion is that the father is the source of the growth and expansion of juvenile capabilities insofar as these must now be used for dealing with the world outside the home. The need to win the father's love by

pleasing him with evermore daring deeds drives the young to stretch their powers and faculties. The consequent stereotype is that male love can be gained only by performance. Note that these correlative stereotypes, among their many applications, get affixed to male-female relations in the game of conquest. Perhaps this ingrained notion of conditional male love is the reason why so many women play the game of conquest. They mistakenly believe that the only way to gain true love from a male is to perform – sexually. Since unconditional love is greater than conditional love, all agree on the basis of sex-love that women are better at love than men.

The weaker sex

Physiological tests indicate that women have a greater tolerance for pain than men and are more resistant to several diseases. Insurance companies, with their actuarial tables, are well aware that women live longer than men. Yet women are still considered weaker by nature than men. They are seen as unable to perform work requiring muscular demands. Women are not made for dangerous or dirty jobs. Labor laws based upon this stereotype precluded women from many jobs. Women were considered unable to work long hours, so laws preventing them from working more than an eight hour day or from working at night excluded them from many supervisory jobs. Some labor laws also precluded women from operating heavy equipment or from doing work that required heavy manual labor.

During World War II, a new bomber plane was developed, called the B-29. The B-29 was the successor to the B-17. When originally introduced to replace the B-17, the B-29, faced high resistance from military pilots. It had acquired a reputation among male test pilots as a cranky aircraft that was dangerous and hard to fly. When first tested, its engines caught fire because the cowlings were too tight. A couple of Boeing test pilots perished. Moreover, the front wheel of its tricycle landing gear made the B-29 tricky to land. Colonel Paul Tibbetts, the man

who dropped the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, was given the task of overcoming the opinion of military pilots that the B-29 was a killer. What Colonel Tibbetts did was find a couple of fairly petite WASPS [Women's Airforce Service Pilots] named Dora Dougherty and DeDe Mormon to fly the B-29 around to all the bomber air bases in order to demonstrate to a bunch of supposedly manly men, that these diminutive women could handle the giant aircraft with ease and competence even without a co-pilot. So much for female weakness. Masculine pride took over from there, and male objections to flying the B-29 evaporated. But even so, most airline pilots, today, are male.

Male imposed ideals of feminine beauty

Anticipation of reactions from others operates in areas other than stop signs. Some persons, both men and women, within our competitive culture, fashion themselves, their dress, their demeanor and even their personalities in reference to others of the same sex as either exemplars or as competitors. However, in keeping with the idea that they are the pursued, while males are the pursuers, many women have tried to fashion their bodies according to what they think men will like. This thinking plays a huge part in both bulimia and anorexia among women. Women are the victims of the persistent idea that women must shape themselves identically to please men rather than individually to please themselves. The stereotype is the belief that there is only one form of physical feminine beauty and all women must conform or they will not be attractive to men. The correlative stereotype refers to men. All men like a single type of shapely feminine beauty. Historically, however, feminine beauty, as dictated by men, has been through several different shapes of the day. There was a time when the so called "full figure" was the rage. Today, advertising, which almost never can be trusted, has helped create a contemporary image of female beauty. The plastic surgeons have assisted. The current resulting image is one of extremely thin body, and big breasts. The drug companies and their

diet pills will take care of the thin bodies. The plastic surgeons take care of the big breasts.

The use of cosmetics

It is “de rigueur” that contemporary women enhance their looks with cosmetics. That requirement goes as far back as prehistoric body painting. Contemporary American usages derive from European customs. Feminine beauty in medieval Europe decreed that a woman's skin should be as white as the lily, and that her cheeks should be as red as the rose. Commoners used wheat-flour powder on the skin; and beet-juice rouge on the cheeks. For those who could afford it, ceruse was the skin whitener of the day. Ceruse, however, is white lead and everyone knew it. Ceruse could not only ruin the complexion but also cause baldness. If used long enough, it could kill. But women used ceruse because they wanted to attract men. Other medieval cosmetic tidbits contained such things as mercury compounds and sulfuric acid. Today’s problem ingredients are carcinogens. During the Victorian age demand for cosmetics dimmed; but advertising saved the day for cosmetics in America. The salvation of the cosmetics industry in America was testimonials by famous beauties. This ploy restored the use of cosmetics to the realm of the respectable - and profitable. Why are women’s clothes far costlier than male clothing?

Intellectual inferiority of women

Because of the stereotype that women are by nature the teachers of the very young, and the minds of the very young don’t indulge in deep thoughts; women were considered small minded and small souled. sex-lore asserts that the mind of a woman needs to match the mind of a small child else they cannot communicate. Consequently, even contemporary American woman are not considered contemplative generalists like men. Their minds are not thought to be speculative. Women are not acute thinkers. They are not fit to be scientists, especially

theoretical scientists. Although they can be small time politicians, women can never be great diplomats. Furthermore, no women will ever be a great composer. Women, says sex-lore, are not magnanimous, not great souled. Women are “mini animus”. They are petty and they are superficial. Intellectually, women are simply gossips and nagging nit-pickers.

Mistresses

The stereotype of a mistress is the notion that a mistress is always sexier than a wife. Of course, the forbidden is always the most tempting. Hidden deep inside this female stereotype is the assumption that no man ever loves his wife so deeply and truly and permanently that he cannot be seduced by an out of bounds female. Today, there are television series that exploit this notion. Courtly love, carried over from Medieval days, dictates that a woman, in order to be sexy, must be forbidden fruit; and Courtly love decrees that as such she is irresistible. Hence, males are not to blame. Increased sexual arousal has always been a product of illicit sex, so a mistress almost always carries a heightened sexual allure for males. That allure is invariably assumed to be more powerful than a man’s love for his wife. Current advice to wives who wish to revive or to enhance the vitality of their marriages is to dress and act like a mistress or a prostitute. So much for true love. Apparently genuine love can never withstand a sexy secretary.

Avoiding stereotypes

All of the above female characterizations are stereotypes; but the reader is cautioned not to conclude that all such outlooks and careers for women are evil and are to be avoided by all women. The destructive notion to be avoided is the stereotyping which says that all persons must follow all of the stereotypes all of the time. Freely chosen rigid conformity of a female to the entire image contained in any stereotype is the greatest evil of stereotyping; because stereotyping of self, by self, is a greater evil than being stereotyped by another. Stereotyping by another

destroys their ability to understand and interpret those they stereotype. Stereotyping of one's self by one's self destroys individuality and the ability to acquire a unique identity that is the basis of a person's ability to govern self.

Historical Examination of Western sex-lore

In order to appreciate the immense and real gap between former sexual ideas and our own current experience, some insight into the actual life experience and forms of sex traditional concepts express is necessary. In attaining some glimmer of the actual life experience conceptualized by our sex lore, we might be enabled to see how useless some of the lore currently is. We may be able to see why contemporary efforts to apply traditional sexual concepts only tempts us to believe that sex has no meaning at all.

CHAPTER FOUR: AGRICULTURAL SEX-LORE

The overall Weltanschauung

Social atmosphere or culture contains a world view. That world view has been given a German name which translates simply as worldview. That name is "Weltanschauung". For the individual, a "Weltanschauung" infused by culture is basically a frame of mind. Since the "Weltanschauung" of any given culture is all that is known by that culture relative to human possibility; the view of life and the outlook on sexuality conceived within the framework of a specific cultural "Weltanschauung" is sexual outlooks within the members of that culture that are limited to the "Weltanschauung" of the culture. There is an obvious focus on Christianity in the following sexual summary of Western history. That focus and use of the terms "Christian" and "Christianity", should be interpreted as the non religious *cultural* "Weltanschauung" of Western civilization; because Christianity is the background format of Western civilization and of American culture. European and American cultures, even though secular structures, are Christian in

design. However, within the Christian “Weltanschauung” there exists a malignancy. That malignancy is a male bias which has existed from the beginning of the plant sex fairy tale. The entire progression of Western culture from Sumerians to Jews to Greeks to Romans to Christian Ecclesiastics was by way of a male fraternity. All the laws and philosophies were for men only. Athenian democracy was for men only. When Plato and Aristotle talked about virtue and virtuous people, they were talking about males only. Women were without nobility and value except insofar as they served noble men in noble causes. Throughout the entire history of Western civilization until the women’s movements of the present, women were considered to be the instruments of male functioning. Women were simply robots to be used by men. As noted, the basic concept of male superiority originates in agricultural sex-lore. When a man plants seed in a woman, he is *using* the woman. He is simply planting seed in a farmland that he owns. The word *use* refers to a situation in which the natural functioning of an instrument is diverted from the intrinsic purposes of the instrument and made to serve the extrinsic purposes of the user. For example: the only thing a hammer will do by reason of its own nature is fall to the floor because of gravity. When a hammer is *used as a tool* to pound a nail, the ability to pound is the innate ability of the carpenter, not the hammer. Slavery is ultimate *use* of one human being by another; and women were halfway slaves of men from the very start of Western culture. Women were not considered precisely as slaves of men; but they were considered *to exist for the purposes of men*. They were considered to be mere tools that men could use to attain their male objectives. These purposes were the nurture and raising of children and management of the “oikos” or household. The function of women was to serve men as the economists of the family and the family estate. The total universe for women was the household. Only men lived in the Universe at large. Many of the historical references that follow presuppose the extant, allegedly

“Christian” Weltanschauung and the standardized *pseudo Christian* image that human sex is the planting of male seed in a woman who is private property and belongs only in the home. The most that can be said of this wretched notion is that human sex *defined as the sex of plants* is one of the worst ideas humankind ever came up with.

Agricultural Roots

Sumeria

While industry may be the basis for some contemporary societies, agriculture is the original basis of all early civilizations. Agriculture allowed formerly nomadic people to settle down and establish permanent villages because agriculture gave them a reliable food supply close at hand. Being settled in one place made it possible to domesticate animals and to erect permanent housing structures. With survival assured, a community could support a variety of workers who were not farmers. These people were able to develop technologies, mathematics, writing and government. Such developments led to the shift from tribal farming communities to civilly structured towns. Historians generally agree that Western civilization originated in the “fertile crescent”. The fertile crescent is an arable region in Iraq. Originally it was called Mesopotamia. Western culture arose in the southern part of Iraq in the area near the Persian gulf. That part of Mesopotamia was called Sumer. The inhabitants were called Sumerians. The Sumerian Mesopotamians were followed historically by the Akkadians, the Babylonians and the Assyrians. The fertile crescent arcs westward through contemporary Syria and Lebanon, south through Israel and down to the Nile valley of Egypt. Settled farming originated in the crescent about 9000 years ago.

Agrarian societies that lived within the Fertile Crescent developed the notion of private property and tended to emphasize it, because ownership of farmland constitutes a method for identifying one’s own crops. Private ownership then

becomes wealth. A farmer owns wealth in the form of land, herds, wife, and the right to use the labor of his children. A farmer who accumulates wealth can also use it to buy the labor of others. All of this, in turn, requires some form of community recognition and recording of who owns what. Possession within an urbanized community requires social certification. In early Near East cultures, when Church and State were, for the most part, the same; social certification was simultaneously civil and religious authentication and legitimization. Socially authenticated possession, when applied to botanically perceived sexual unions, became the socially authenticated construct of marriage *as an acquisition of a female* as private property, that is recorded in a public document. *Agricultural marriage* became the husband's socially authenticated and registered deed and title to his wife. A man holds and owns his wife in exactly the same manner as he owns his farm and his cow. Marriages are arranged and occur because women are bought and sold by their own families in conjunction with the families of the groom in the same manner as any other property transfer. Marriages were not romantic. They were arrangements. They were business deals involving transfer of property. Social recognition, when granted to the wealthy, creates not only authenticated possession but also social status. Inheritance, which transmits that elevated status, creates lines of hereditary blue bloods. The resulting social stratification of married or single appears at the very beginnings of agricultural communities. Social class or status, along with divisions of labor, give rise to complex societies. Although still dependent on agriculture for a sufficient food supply, complex societies are heterogeneous social entities composed of social classes and of diverse professionals such as priests, bureaucrats, engineers, lawyers, and accountants, as well as skilled technicians, craftsmen, and others such as merchants and slaves. Agriculture, however, requires mathematics. The Sumerians studied the movements of the moon, sun, and planets so as to calculate the seasons. Knowing

the seasons correctly told them precisely when to plant and when to reap. These observations resulted in the first calendars. Accurate methods of land measurement, necessary for determining exact boundaries of farm fields, were developed at the same time. Measurements of volumes for seeds planted or grains harvested were also invented. Measurement of volumes was later applied as measurement of value, because commodity and money exchange became common.

Early cities differed from primitive farming settlements. They were not farms and they were not a tribal collection of family owned farms. They were temple towns which contained the growing variety of social classes and non-farmers. Temple towns were erected around the temple of the local god. The temples themselves were built upon towers called ziggurats. Public buildings and marketplaces were arranged around these shrines. The temple towns grew into city states, which are considered the basis of the first true civilizations. City states were governed by “omnipotent” rulers. The food surplus provided by the farmers supported these rulers and their bureaucracies. By 4000 years ago, the Akkadian conquerors of the Sumerians had produced great city states containing literate societies. The world's first great city was called Bab-Ilu, the “gate of the gods”. The Bible calls it Babel. We know it as Babylon. Other Sumerian cities included Nineveh and Ur. All of us are familiar with the story of the tower of Babel. The Babylonians tried to build a tower to heaven, so God made the builders unable to understand each other. From this story come our English words “babble”, “babbling” and, unknown to some, the word “baby”. Babies cannot speak intelligibly. Babies babble. The word *infant*, in turn, derives from the Latin for someone unable to speak, so infants are speechless and babies speak babble. The Babylonians were the founders of our algebra and astronomy. The Babylonians developed a refined base ten arithmetic that was positional. We in America today use the same type of decimal notation. The Babylonians also created a sexagesimal

or base sixty system of counting. The Babylonian sexagesimal system appears in our astronomy and in our time keeping. We count sixty seconds to the minute and sixty minutes to the hour. We measure circles in divisions of three hundred and sixty degrees; and we count three hundred sixty five days to the year while the Babylonians counted three hundred and sixty. Calendars, measurements and bureaucracies, in turn, require record keeping; and record keeping requires writing.

Picture writing seems to be the original form of writing. Socially *standardized pictures* represented both sounds and physical objects. We call the Babylonian pictograms *cuneiform* and the Egyptian form *hieroglyphics*. These writing formats became increasingly stylized until they no longer portrayed physical objects. Pictogram significance shifted from the physical object to the sounds of the human voice such as the vowels: A, E, I, O, and U. The pictograms came to signify the sounds of spoken words rather than objects. The result was phonetic word writing. The invention of phonetic word writing allowed the Babylonians to write down their laws. The Babylonian Code of Hammurabi was formulated around the 18th century BCE. It is considered to be one of the first great law codes in the world. The Code was inscribed on a huge column, or stele, which is preserved today in the Louvre in Paris. The Code contains laws concerning commerce and crime, and it sanctions private property. Along with civil matters, the Code also addresses families, marriages, and divorce. As a preamble to contemporary American religious views, the Babylonians considered their law as having come from God. The stone pillar on which the Code of Hammurabi is written shows Hammurabi receiving the Code from Shamash, the sun god. Calling law divine makes for excellent social control by rulers. Enforcement by conscience beats enforcement by whip every time. *“A state which should rely upon force alone would soon fall, for though men are naturally gullible they are also naturally obstinate, and power, like taxes, succeeds best when it is*

invisible and indirect". [Will Durant, [Our Oriental Heritage](#), vol. 2 of [The Story of Civilization](#) (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), 31.] Just as Christians are indoctrinated by the Church to believe that ecclesiastical precepts and pronouncements are Divine Law, so also the Babylonians were indoctrinated to believe Hammurabi's laws came from the sun god. Consequently, the Babylonians considered illegal actions that damaged the society to be *sins* and transgressions against the gods as well as *crimes*. They believed such actions would be punished by the gods as well as by the earthly rulers appointed by the gods. The Babylonians also had an outlook close to that of Original Sin. All persons were considered sinful, and all suffering was deserved punishment. Each Babylonian was considered to have a personal, protector god [our guardian angel concept]. Miserable Babylonians were expected to confess their sins and failings to this personal god, who would act on their behalf relative to the great gods. The Babylonians may have babbled, but they were babbling the same things as Christian doctrine.

At one point in Babylonian history, every woman prior to being married, had to go to the temple of Mylitta and have sex with a stranger. The same ritual was practiced in Phoenicia. The ritual seems to be a throwback to orgiastic worship. Without having sex with a stranger in the temple; a woman was not eligible for marriage, perhaps because the ritual was perceived as making her fertile. Because legal marriage was not worshipped as being the biological nature of sex as our contemporary culture considers it, non marital sex was prevalent; and many couples lived together without being married. Like high school girls who sport their boyfriend's class ring to show to all that they are going steady, Babylonian girl friends wore an olive made of terra cotta to indicate they were concubines. The prostitutes who plied their trade within the temple precincts were considered sacred prostitutes. Their equivalents in the wine shops were considered secular prostitutes.

The patriarchal family was the basic component of Babylonian social organization, and authenticated marriages were arranged by parents. Instead of an engagement ring given to the woman, betrothal existed in the form of an economic exchange. A *dowry* or reward was offered and paid by the father of the bride in order to draw a suitor. The dowry amount supposedly was calculated to represent the cost to the groom of maintaining his bride. In exchange the suitor paid the father a *bride price* that represented the costs the father had incurred in having and raising his daughter. The bride was simply a commodity which was accompanied by costs of maintenance. Monogamy was the rule, but concubinage was acceptable. Babylonian marriage was not only a contract, it was a written contract. There was no official *standard value* of a female used in these purchase agreements. Her specific value and costs were written out in the betrothal contract because each individual female came with individual costs and these matters had to be negotiated on a case to case basis. A man's children were his heirs, but his wife was not. A wife could not inherit or own property, because she was property. A wife, because she was a piece of property, could be used to pay a man's debts. In fact, a man could sell his wife into slavery, if necessary. If a wife objected to being continually pregnant she could be drowned. The double standard was standard. Adultery by a woman carried a death sentence, so did careless homemaking. For a husband, adultery was nothing but a bit of frivolousness. If a wife was barren, a husband could divorce her; but had to provide alimony in some cases. The Code also permitted wives to divorce husbands for misdeeds such as desertion or cruelty. As is evident from the Code, the Babylonians considered sex, marriage and family as legal and social matters subject to the rules and laws of government. Sex, marriage and family came under Babylonian law and government; because women and children were matters of private property and such ownership required social recognition and authentication. A man's title to his wife had to be on record with

the government or his woman was not his wife. The Code considered beer a more important commodity than women. The Code allowed the death penalty as a punishment for those who sold watered down beer. But husbands who sold their wives were good as gold. The Code of Hammurabi greatly influenced the development of Near Eastern civilization for generations after it was written. It remained the law of Babylonia for centuries even when Babylonia had been conquered by others. The Code of Hammurabi dates from the 18th century BCE. Approximately 1100 years later a Chaldean king ruled the capital city of Babylon and its related kingdom, Babylonia. That king is known from secular history but he is also mentioned in the Old Testament book of Daniel. His name was Nebuchadnezzar II. Nebuchadnezzar II is the ruler of Babylonia whose 650 foot ziggurat topped with a solid gold altar and an ornate bed upon which a woman slept each night for the pleasure of the gods [the priests] has been identified as the possible tower of Babel. Nebuchadnezzar II was also the king who built the hanging gardens of Babylon which the Greeks considered one of the seven wonders of the world. During the eleven centuries between Hammurabi and Nebuchadnezzar; Hammurabi's law, while remaining, had become less sacred, less severe and less corporal. The Gods no longer judged the accused by way of some ordeal. Survival of an accused adulteress after she was tied up in a bag and tossed into the Euphrates to drown was no longer used to prove her innocence; and monetary fines had somewhat replaced an eye for an eye. Ultimately, the Code reveals that the Babylonians had progressed beyond survival agriculture and arrived at blanket forms of social organization for the various components of a complex society. They had reached the initial stages of *cultural security orientation*. Except for the status of women and the basic structure of marriage, however, the other forms of social control over sex, controls such as its morality, that prevail in contemporary America are more an outgrowth of combined Greco-

Roman-Judeo-Christian moral control and sex law than direct carryovers of Babylonian sex laws. The primary Babylonian carryovers within the realm of American sex-lore are the survival oriented, farming definition of human sex along with marriage as a socially recognized *contract for the male possession of a reproductive female*.

Cyclical time and sacred sex

As the Sumerian farmers integrated their planting and harvesting with the seasons of earth, the cyclical nature of the seasons was impressed upon them time and again. Spring and summer returned repetitively after fall and winter, and the same old planting and harvesting had to be done again and again. The impression created by the repeating seasons, caused the Sumerians, and with them Greeks and Romans, to conceive of time as cyclical. Non evolutionary cyclical time was part of the “Weltanschauung” of Western civilization until Christianity arrived. The early Christians, as exemplified by Augustine; had to see time as linear, because of the belief in a second coming. If time is an eternal repeat, the world is eternal and is not headed toward a future final judgment. Nevertheless, in spite of the belief of a future coming of Jesus and a world judgment; many so called Ultra-Conservative Christians are stuck within eternal cyclical time. The pseudo Christians trapped within an eternal universe are called “Creationists”; because they refuse to accept Darwin and evolution which are built upon linear time. In conjunction with planting and especially harvesting, the Sumerians and other agricultural societies developed some mythological explanations of the cyclical process. The times of planting and harvesting became times of religious rites, ceremonies and celebrations. Apparently because things go bump in the night and because the forces of nature produce new life, ancient folk interpreted the world around them as full of living beings. Every tree, rock, brook and meadow was alive. Each natural object was a small time god. The earth was also alive. The earth was a big

time god. The earth was Mother Earth. Scientists call this view of nature, *animism*. Within the context of animism, sexual orgies became part of the planting and harvesting rituals. The idea was that ceremonies such as these had magical power to produce what they signified. In this case, the orgies signified, and were intended to create, a bountiful harvest. Earth based superstitious religion composed of magical, orgiastic sex was the original connection between sex and the sacred. Ultimately, a bit of orgiastic sex in the temple supposedly made a barren woman fertile, but not very marriageable. The males of the later days of early civilization wanted fresh, never before planted, female virgins as their brides; because prior children clouded the issue of inheritance. But a barren woman already a wife, might increase her value by a shot at an orgy.

Israel

Hebrew Rabbis set the rules for sex within Hebrew marriages. The rules were *for men only* regarding how they must treat their wives. All of the rules were based upon male ownership of women. For example: the number of times a husband must engage in sex per week or month so as to constitute proper care of his wife was set in stone. The wives had no say in the matter. Reproduction was the purpose, that is why polygamy was allowed. Fear of the allure of women, starting with Eve, was prevalent within Hebrew society as in the entire Western world. This outlook produced lore about the ideal good woman versus the baddest *wife*. Along with Eve as the bad woman, Christianity has the virgin Mary as the good woman. In the case of Christianity; the folklore comparison, along with the teachings of Paul, resulted in the view that celibacy is superior to marriage.

Within the Fertile Crescent, as it arced from Mesopotamia through Syria and Palestine down to Egypt, were other sources of Western culture. The approximate area now called Syria was inhabited by a Semitic people called Canaanites. The area which today is roughly Lebanon, was called Phoenicia. Our alphabetic system

of writing probably came to us from the Phoenicians via the Greeks and then through the Romans. South of Phoenicia and stretching all the way to Egypt, the land west of the Jordan river was called by the Greeks, Palestine. Palestine was known to the Jews as Israel, the name given to Jacob. [See: **Genesis 35:10**] Of the three regions, Israel has had the greatest impact on Western culture because of the Jewish religion. Christianity is built upon the Jewish Religion. Judaism still comes to us through the Bible. The *Christian* Old Testament contains all of the Jewish Bible plus some apocryphal books.

The first five books of the Hebrew and Christian Bible are called the Torah or the Pentateuch. The Torah, which includes the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, contains most of the ancient Hebrew religious and moral precepts. The Ten Commandments are contained in the book of Exodus and repeated in the book of Deuteronomy. [See: **Exodus 20:1–17 & Deuteronomy 5:6–21**] Details of other commandments and ceremonies are contained primarily in the book of Leviticus. **Genesis 2:18-24** describes the parading of all animals in front of Adam which opens his eyes to the fact that he had no helpmate like the parading animals did. God then creates Eve from a rib of Adam. The final verse, **Genesis 2:24**, says that: “**Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh**”. And **Mark 10:7-8** repeats it. This passage is treated by almost all Christian denominations as describing the origin of, and justification for Christian marriage. But because of plant sex-lore, the “**one flesh**” is obliterated and replaced by reproduction. Marriage, as plant *reproduction*, is used by Fundamentalist Christians against homosexual marriages. But there is a slight problem. Marriage, *conceived of as plant reproduction*, cannot be the proper meaning of this passage; because Jesus **does not refer to reproduction** when He explains what this Biblical definition of marriage really means. Jesus says it means that the purpose of

marriage is “**one flesh**”; and He says the result of the “**one flesh**” is the fact that the **union of flesh** cannot be taken apart. This is not a statement from Jesus that children are not to be taken apart and sent back to nothing. Furthermore, American law, if the separation of Church and state is to be observed, must not be based upon Christian Scripture because that violates the Constitutional separation of Church and State. There also happens to be another Christian version of these Biblical passages concerning marriage. It is a Gnostic version. [Gnosticism is considered to be an heretical version of Christianity.] The Gnostic rendition of the creation of woman is even more hateful of women than the Eve version. The Gnostic version begins by stating that when the animals were paraded in front of Adam, he mated with each female animal but couldn’t get any satisfaction. That is why he complained to God about lack of a suitable mate. This heretical description of Adam’s sexual learning process was probably devised as a justification for the bestiality practiced by shepherds. I am reminded of the comment made by the Jewish comedian, Lewis Black. He said Christians do not understand the Torah. The Torah, according to Lewis, was given to the Jews in order to stop the Jews who were wandering in the desert from going to Moses wanting to marry their camel. Eve, said Gnosticism, was the *third try* on God’s part to create a suitable mate for Adam. The first helpmate given by God to Adam was a female called **Lilith**. While God had made Adam out of the dust of the earth; He made Lilith out of filth instead. The result was a demoness. From Adam’s sexual unions with Lilith came a bunch of demons that afflict the human race. Because Lilith did not like copulating with Adam from a supine position, which she perceived as making her inferior to Adam; she objected to that form of intercourse. When Adam tried to force her into adopting a prone position, Lilith got angry and left him. Lilith is many times depicted as a hairy night monster perhaps like a succubus or nightmare who copulates with men while they are asleep. Solomon thought the queen of

Sheba might be Lilith because the queen had hairy legs. On his second try, says the Gnostic myth, God built a woman, slimy organ by slimy organ, right in front of Adam. The whole procedure so disgusted Adam that he couldn't mate with her at all. God took back this slimy Eve, and she hasn't been seen since. On the third try God got it right. This time he put Adam to sleep before building Adam a mate. God also used a rib from Adam instead of filth. The rib contained the correct architecture for a human. The result was the Eve we know. God made her beautiful, and He adorned her with jewelry before awakening Adam. **[See: [Hebrew Myths](#) by Robert Graves and Raphael Patai (New York: Doubleday, 1964)]**

Until the arrival of Romanticism in Western culture, almost all marriages in the world were arranged by parents. Marriages were alliances of families and dynasties rather than unions of lovers. Marriage was economics, not love. Ancient Israel was not an exception in regard to male ownership of females, arranged marriages and other aspects of ancient marriage such as the double standard and a woman's "place". Marriages were arranged by the Jewish fathers of the bride and groom. Jewish girls were considered fit for marriage at age 12 and boys at age 13. The arrangements made by the fathers of the bride and groom were contained in a contract, the *betrothal contract*. Hebrew betrothal was a highly formal and stringently binding contract *for title* to a woman. The future transfer *of the bride herself* was not the wedding. It was the execution of the already existing marital contract. The consequent transfer of the bride was not the making of another contract. Hebrew ceremonies celebrating the execution of a contractual betrothal by turning over the bride to the contractual groom had more the character of consummation than wedding. The "wedding" or "welding" had already been done by the betrothal contract. One of the results of the fact that there was no Jewish *wedding* contract is the further fact that there is no specific Hebrew word for

marriage in the Old Testament. The execution of a betrothal marital contract consisted of the festive transferring of a woman from her father's family to the family of the groom, along with delivery or exchange of dowries and bride prices and anything else contained in the economic betrothal contract. To make this turnover a festive occasion, there was usually a week long feast which consisted of a lot of boasting and a lot of drinking. This weeklong wedding celebration which occurred when the betrothal contract was executed and the bride was actually turned over to the groom was simply called a "feast". It was not in fact, and it was not in Old Testament terminology, a ritual which caused a Jewish marriage to exist. What made a Jewish marriage exist in its finality was the turnover of the already betrothed [married] bride, not the feast. Since the Old Testament had no word for a wedding ceremony; the Old Testament uses the general noun "feast" or "**mish-teh**" when referring to the execution of a betrothal contract. **Genesis 29:22** describes Jacob's 7 day marriage ceremony to Leah as a "**mish-teh**". **Judges 14:12-18** describes Samson's marriage to a Philistine woman as a 7 day "**mish-teh**". Furthermore, males did not leave parents in order to marry. Women did. They became part of the groom's family. The **Genesis 2:24** passage treated as Christian marriage actually says that *a man* should leave father and mother *in order to have sex with a woman, not marry her*. The whole point of this passage in the book of Genesis is that Eve was *an apt sexual mate* for Adam. Monogamy, in ancient Israel, was the accepted form of marriage; but a reading of Scripture indicates that there was a great deal of concubinage. The woman's place, culturally then as now, was in the home; having children and running the household. Within the past history of Western culture; women were always subject to father or husband. In their absence, a woman was subject to her own oldest son. As a background to male dominance of females, the Jews clearly conceived of their monotheistic God as a male. The resulting double standard was pervasive and

noxious. Men could divorce wives simply by drawing up a bill of divorce and giving it to their wife for an uncleanness that the husband determined. **[See: Deuteronomy 24:1]** Inheritance was through the males. Sons, not daughters, inherited property. To keep property from falling into the hands of illegitimate heirs, Jewish grooms were highly vigilant regarding the virginity of their betrothed women. Men could demand that their brides prove their virginity; and if **“virginity not be found in the damsel...the men of the city shall stone her to death”**. **(Deuteronomy 22:20-22)** If the betrothed groom was wrong about his bride’s virginity, he had to pay her father 100 shekels for defaming her, and he had to marry her with no chance for later divorce. Not much of a penalty when compared to a non virgin being stoned to death. The Book of Deuteronomy lists the ten commandments. Deuteronomy contains the commandment against coveting a neighbor’s possessions. **“Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house, his field, or his manservant, or his maidservant, his ox, or his ass, or any thing that is thy neighbour's”**. **(Deuteronomy 5:21)** Notice that a wife is listed along with a neighbor’s other *possessions*; the neighbor’s house, fields, servants, oxen, asses etc. Since women were the property of males, any violation of her virginity was also a violation of her husband’s property rights. Fornication with an unbetrothed virgin meant a shotgun wedding and a fine of 50 shekels paid to the father. **[See: Deuteronomy 22:28-29]** The main impact of the Old Testament upon current American notions of sex, however, is found in the fact that almost all descriptions and expressions of sex and sexual activity are couched explicitly in terms of agricultural sex-lore. The Old Testament, and especially the book of Leviticus, is full of the language of male seed and of barren or infertile women. God slew Onan for spilling his seed but not for the assumed reason of wasting seed. Onan spilled his seed so as not to have children that would be identified as his dead brother’s children. The Biblical focus

on male seed has caused many an American to think that *agricultural sex-lore* is God's Biblical purpose rather than God's tool. They think God inspired the writing of the Bible solely in order to tell humans that contractual reproduction via male seed was the only moral form of sex. But human males are not the reason for the Bible. **The Seed**, not males, is God's Biblical purpose and reason for creation as well as reason for the Bible. Most, Hebrews, in consequence, are aware that male seed has importance in the Bible, only because of its relation to **the Seed**.

The origins of monogamous marriage

Contrary to Western sex-lore, *marriage* is not a natural given. Marriage is a man made construct, and this causes the question of why mankind constructed it? Contemporary philosophers and moralists can concoct all sorts of justifying reasons; but none such concoction looks at the historical roots and reasons for marriage. Prior to the invention of marriage, people were free to mate whenever and with whomever. It does not take a genius to realize that even under normal and natural constraints; sexual desires, whether those of a female or a male, are not going to produce locked in monogamous sex. Mutual true love might do it, but sex - not a chance. The philosophers and moralists, in their efforts to justify marriage, have proposed that exclusive, long-term mating derives from the long-term needs of children. That argument fails historically, because prior to the creation of marriage, children were well cared for by their mothers along with help from the mother's family and the mother's clan; with the mother's family and clan providing all needed male influence. In contemporary America, lots of women still do it that way; and divorce adds to the situation. Many a divorced woman has returned home to live with her parents bringing her children with her. Actual historical evidence indicates that marriage was concocted at the same time as the invention of private property. Before the invention of private property, there was no such thing as a wife who was private property. But the laws, customs and

available written records of nearly all primitive Mid-East societies from which Western culture derives treat marriage as a form of private ownership of females by males. Western marriage, in its original format, was simply a form of private property. Pushed to its extreme, marriage was a form of slavery; and, in fact, many a female slave was a “wife” to her master. When life was labor intensive, marriage was an ownership artifice that provided males with cheap slaves in the form of wives and children. Betrothal arranged by a woman’s father was the “dating game” at that time. When their husbands died, women were *bequeathed* to male progeny as property - except when they were strangled or expected to commit suicide in order to follow their husband into the next world.

The secondary impact of marriage as male private ownership of women pertains to the status of children. When the notion of private ownership is conjoined to the notion of sex as a male planting seed in a female possession, the lore of illegitimate children arises. Children born of the father’s own seed in the father’s own field [his wife] are possessions of the father; but children born in the father’s own field [his wife] but not from his own seed, are weeds. The lore, like marriage itself, is a form of property protection. Illegitimacy was created in order to keep inheritances away from children not seeded in the father’s privately owned wifely property by the father. Hence the lore that marriage legitimizes children; and outside of marriage, children born of adultery or born out of wedlock are bastards by nature. The lore of no sex outside of marriage overrules reality and says that children are not really offspring of their biological mothers. They are offspring of their fathers only. If the child doesn’t come from the seed of a husband, the child is not a genuine offspring of either father or mother. Children were offspring of their mothers and pertained to their biological mothers only if their mother was married to their biological father at the time they were conceived. The dictionary says that a “bastard” is a “fake”. Apparently, bastard children are

fake children who appear out of nowhere and have no biological parentage. Blame the stork.

The cheap slavery that constituted early Western marriage raises another question. Wives and children were economic assets representing wealth. The more of them a man had, the more affluent he was. If one female slave is good and she can produce a plethora of child labor; why not two or three or many wives? Why monogamy? The answer is that monogamy is not part of the historical origins of Western marriage. Polygamy is. Although low sex ratios, namely the existence of more women than men in a society such as among the Romans, play a part in polygyny; historically, monogamy was a poor man's ignominious situation. A man was monogamous only because he couldn't afford several wives; or perhaps because several wives were beyond his capacity to manage. The historical progression from polygyny to monogamy, like the institution of marriage itself, occurred on the basis of property. In the case of monogamy, it was a matter of inheritance. Just as males were loath to have their wealth inherited by a bastard, they were also loath to have it broken up into itty bitty portions among their numerous male progeny. This attitude created the notion of a primary heir. The primary heir to his father's wealth, power and social position was usually the eldest son. The rank of primary heir, in turn, produced the status of chief wife; normally, the mother of the eldest son. Because chief wives were usually highly protective of their eldest son's position and didn't want competition from the sons of other wives; they convinced their husbands that the other women should not be absolute wives, but rather concubines. This meant that only the children of the chief wife were legitimate and possessed claim to inheritance. That setup, in turn, meant that the chief wife was the only true wife. In consequence, Western marriage became monogamous; and formerly sanctioned concubines ultimately wound up as secret mistresses. Monogamous marriage, however, did not exist as the exclusively

accepted final form of institutional marriage in Western culture until Christianity adopted it as the official party line. That did not happen with ultimate finality until the Council of Trent in the 16th century. According to Ford and Beach, monogamy is currently a cultural preference of only 16% of known cultures.

One of the reasons monogamy became Church practice is because the Church couldn't castigate adulterers without first proving that they were married to someone other than their sexual associate. This is hard to prove when more than one wife is allowed. A man could claim; "that was not adultery, that was one of my wives". Although some medieval theologians, like Peter Lombard, addressed the issue of sacraments; the early Medieval Church had no official marriage rites in spite of its possession of warped Augustinian sex doctrines. Christians living within different political territories and units were married under the various forms of civil ceremony established by their own hometown society. The solution to variable and multiple forms of marriage consisted of constricting the ceremony of marriage to a single religious form; namely, sworn mutual consent for lifelong exclusive plant sex as the sacrament of marriage. Christian **sacraments** are signs or symbols that are considered to produce the effect they symbolize. The symbolism of the sacrament of marriage was declared to be the **union** of Christ and His Bride, the Church. There is only one Jesus Christ and professedly only one true Christian Church. That equals monogamy in terms of Christian marriage. It also equals indissolubility of marriage, since Christ is not going to abandon or divorce the Church. Once a singular ceremony was officially adopted by the Church as a Christian rite, the married state wound up in Canon Law as a legal matter; and love and sex were reduced to a set of duties and obligations. In this historical progression, the reality of male and female relationships was replaced by the artificial construct of a legal marital contract; and real life blood parentage was replaced by the artificial construct of legitimacy or legal parentage. A critical look

at sex-lore helps identify the realities of sex that are nature given, in distinction from the legalities and moralities of sex that are man given.

The false notion that planting seed is the nature of human sex

There is an ancient Latin adage that states: “*Post coitum omne animal triste*”. The adage was probably coined by celibate monks. It literally says: “*After sex, all animals are sad*”. Since plants have no consciousness or conscience, the adage does not fit the egregious non-cognitive agricultural version of human sex. Apparently, what it means to cognitive beings such as humans is that after human sex, all humans are repentant - so don't do it. That has to be a myth.

Plant **seeds**, by the way, are not the male gametes [a reproductive cell with only half of the DNA that the offspring will receive] of plants. **Pollen grains** are the male gametes, or at least, that is what they become. A plant seed that is ready to grow when planted, is actually ***an already fertilized plant zygote***. It has a full compliment of *male and female DNA* just like an already laid chicken egg. Consequently, the notion of human male “seed” goes wrong from the very start. Male “seed”, the human male half of a new human, is a *gamete with only half DNA*. It is not a *zygote*. And contrary to botanical sex-lore, male seed does not equal virility. Seed is the *feminine part of sexuality*. However, due to the erroneous identification of human male gametes or spermatozoa as fertilized female plant seeds, most of the observable results of planting actual plant seeds in the ground became attributed to human males alone. The ancient agricultural view of human sex as the planting of ready to go fertilized plant seed, is based upon ignorance of the female gamete or egg. The farmers who invented this view of human sex knew that dirt did not contribute half of new life to a seed, so they ignorantly thought human sex was the same. Women were solely dirt for male seed; although some kindlier males thought the female contributed her blood to the seed. Incidentally, the word *sperm* does not equal the word *semen*. Sperm(atozoa) are gametes

contained within semen which is the fluid. Sperm means something scattered, such as a farmer simply throwing seed on the ground instead of manually planting each seed in a specific spot. When applied to the male gamete, sperm contained in semen are something from a male sprayed within a female vagina.

Pseudo scientific views of human sex

Masturbation

The “scientific” definition of masturbation is: *every sexual act carried out without the cooperation of another person*. Note that manipulating someone else’s genitals is excluded from this definition. But the “scientists” who concocted the above definition saw so called “self abuse” in a lot of other things most people would never suspect. Since Freud declared that bowel movements are sexual, this means that a bowel movement by females as well as males is masturbation. Self acclaimed “scientists”; i.e. pseudo-Christian “witch” doctors, also determined that there were such things as unconscious masturbation and cryptic masturbation. *Unconscious masturbation* includes nail biting, sucking, skin scratching, bed wetting, and fidgety spells in children followed by sleep. Since parents disapprove of overt masturbation, children supposedly learn to disguise it in the above types of behavior. According to fairly recent medical doctrine, hair stroking is *cryptic masturbation*, so is fainting or the “sweet swoon”, because it is a hidden orgasm. Also included are using the sewing machine, psychic onanism or fantasy, physical contact such as wrestling and foot ball, nose picking and the handling of other bodily openings along with, douches, smoking, massages, sunbathing, pornography, “religious experiences” and some compulsions. Pain is cryptic masturbation because it is a prolonged form of fore pleasure; or in other words, pain is another instance of a hidden orgasm. *We have the tendency of increasing our sense of gratification through development of inner resistance. Anything that we may attain with ease loses its charm for us*”. Translation: forbidden fruit is

always tastier than the acceptable. [Wilhelm Stekel, Auto Eroticism, trans. by James S. Van Teslaar, M.D. (New York: Grove Press, Inc., Evergreen E-288 ed. 1961), P 197] Then again, masturbation is also covert homosexuality because it is same sex, sex.

There are two allegedly “scientific” types of masturbation: *physiological and pathological*. The first is treated as a normal stage in psychological development usually given up in favor of heterosexual interests and sublimated by physical and mental diversions. The second, which is a disease, is compulsive; and it is practiced when opportunities for heterosexual adjustment are not present. This indicates neurosis, the existence of latent or manifest “*paraphilia*”. Paraphilia refers mainly to masochism and sadism. Even official medical literature on masturbation is largely misleading. In many cases, its content is backwards. If the discussion of masturbation is within a medical work, it many times uses the word “perverted” and stresses imaginary *moral* effects. If the discussion is religious, it stresses imaginary harmful *medical* effects. For example; a pamphlet from the U.S. Public Health Service says: “*self abuse may seriously hinder a boy’s progress toward vigorous manhood*”. In other words masturbation is *self abuse* [immorality] that will stunt your masculinity. Apparently, masturbation by females has no effect on self development. Others proclaim that everyone masturbates, and that those who don’t are the neurotics. Instead of masturbation causing *neurasthenia* [a fuzzy term invented by early psychologists meaning any kind of chronic fatigue and depression], *lack* of masturbation causes it. Neurasthenia allegedly results from abstinence caused by guilt or scare. Strong emotion underlies masturbation. Abstinence frustrates this irresistible emotion and results in neurasthenia. If you examine the literature, scientific *neurasthenia* turns out to be anxiety neurosis, compulsion neurosis, hypochondria, dementia praecox, cyclothemia [mood swings], depression, melancholia, and possibly suicide.

Allegedly, some who think that masturbation is physically harmful will try to use it as self punishment.

The hereditary game

Current zoology looks at sex as the urge to pass on one's genes. This description is quite mechanical; but, according to current scientific lore, if it isn't mechanical, it isn't scientific. In these terms, sex is neither plant life, nor a matter of morals, nor Romantic. "Scientifically" defined sex gets reduced to a primal instinct or an overpowering motor function, and is analyzed as the transmission of hereditary characteristics. The urge to pass on one's genes is depicted in terms of DNA and the unfolding of the double helix DNA molecule. For most scientists, sex equals heredity. Heredity is the transmission from one generation to the next of factors that determine the traits of offspring. Under his notion of males seeding females; Pythagoras, claimed that the father's seed is the source of all traits in an offspring. In order to explain the formation of particular organs, medicine men of the Middle Ages said that each organ of the father produced a specific vapor that was contained in male seed and when the seed was planted in a woman these fatherly vapors caused a one to one formation of organs that were identical to the organs of the father. Apparently no one realized that these Medieval geniuses had just denied the existence of females - because a father's organs are always totally male. At any rate, the vaporous notion that accidentally meant women did not exist was subsequently converted to a theory of one to one organ *particles* that were transmitted. The particle notion arose from the "animalicules" that people were imagining they were seeing in Leeuwenhoek's microscopes. Along with the change from vapors to particles, the concept of male seed as motionless botanical or plant seed was converted to the concept of motile seed or spermatozoa; because the microscope revealed that the "animalicules" were squirming around. The ultimate assertion that these reproductive "animalicules" were already completely

formed humans, organs and all, led to the doctrine of preformation.

Other biologists, during the Middle Ages, studied ovaries in female animals. They postulated that perhaps “eggs” from a female also contributed hereditary material to the offspring. A few of them got carried away and said that all genetic material was in the egg and that sperm simply energized the egg. This energizing notion was a takeoff on Aristotle’s view of human fertilization. Aristotle’s view was considerably more subtle than the gross notion of a male planting a full and complete life form into a female where it fed off of female nutrients. Aristotle had postulated that the female, as the supplier of nutrients, provided the matter or “**material cause**” of an offspring; while the male was the “**agent cause**” who infused life into the body supplied by the female. In other words Aristotle had claimed that women were **factual causes** of babies - which is a denial of the seeding concept. Aristotle had claimed that women provide the *body* of the offspring, while the father provided the *soul*. The biologists who claimed all heredity came from the female were called “ovists”. The ovists then claimed that whatever nasty or undesirable traits showed up in the offspring were due to the female. Females, for example, were held responsible for not producing male heirs. Henry VIII got extremely perturbed with those of his many wives who would not give him a male heir.

Inherited ancestral traits versus newly acquired traits

John Baptiste Lamarck

In 1759, the year in which colonel George Washington married Martha Dandridge Custis, Caspar Wolff introduced *epigenesis* or gradual development within the womb. However, the concept of *inherited traits* still fell in line with the non-evolutionary cyclical notion of time and of re-production. Inherited traits were those that had always been there in the family tree. All inherited traits were fixed and were from ancient ancestors. They would stay in the family tree by reason of

cyclical repetition. But approximately 50 years after Wolff's proposal of epigenesis was published; Jean Baptiste Lamarck, proposed, what in fact, was a theory of evolution; and he proposed it prior to Darwin. Lamarck's 7 volume work, published in 1815, was called Natural History of Invertebrates. In the work, Lamarck, referring to the classic classification of plant and animal kingdoms, said that this ladder or progressive scale of species resulted from three factors:

- ◆ interaction of an organism with its environment,
- ◆ changes due to use or disuse of bodily organs and limbs,
- ◆ the inheritance of acquired traits.

The assertion of *acquired traits* was a claim that changes in an individual could be transmitted to offspring. It was a claim that not all inherited traits are ancient, unchanging characteristics perpetually transmitted from ancestors. It was a claim that characteristics formed during the lifetime of one's immediate parents could be passed to offspring. For example; on the basis of use or disuse, a parent who was into body building would pass on muscular strength and bulk as an hereditary factor. An American paleontologist, Alpheus Hyatt, who founded what became the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, adopted Lamarck's idea of individually acquired, but inheritable, characteristics. He then applied the notion of acquired traits to the development of the species. Hyatt reasoned that if individually acquired traits could become inherited traits, then that principle must also apply to the species. Ancient ancestral traits had to be traits acquired during the historical life of the species. This idea led to his, not quite logically warranted, additional conclusion that individual development repeats the development of the species. The existence of acquired traits in both individuals and species, of itself, does not conclude to an exact match between the processes of historical acquisition and the processes of individual acquisition. His principle that "*ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny*" included the notion that the historical life of a species

went from youth to old age and finally to extinction. **This treatise on sex-lore** uses Hyatt's type of overview, but does not claim any necessary relationship between individual and species development. **This analysis** looks at the development of only part of the human species, the Western part; and it uses actual similarities not predicted necessities. One other difference is the fact that Hyatt's principle goes from race to individual. The individual copies the race. This work goes from individual to race and says that Maslow's description of individual development might shed some light on the development of human sexual doctrine within the Western world.

Darwin

Lamarck's theory of acquired, transmissible traits implied that *all acquired traits* would be passed down. But some individuals develop traits that are exactly the opposite of those acquired by other individuals. What happens if both timidity and boldness are passed to the same individual? This flaw in Lamarck's theory concludes to individuals who would be composites of contraries and contradictions. They would be schizophrenic, ambidextrous, giant little people. In 1859, Darwin published his book, On the Origins of Species By Means of Natural Selection. Darwin's theory differed from Lamarck's theory in its ability to distinguish which acquired traits would and would not be passed down. Those traits that worked to maintain and improve life would be transmitted; and those which didn't work would die out along with the individuals who possessed them. Darwin called the result on an individual of an *effective* acquired trait "*survival of the fittest*". When applied to the historical development of an entire species, traits that worked allowed their possessors to survive, and *only those who survived got to reproduce*, and only those who reproduced transmitted their acquired traits. That process Darwin called "*natural selection*", and in due time, said Darwin, natural selection would change the face of an entire species. Natural selection could cause

the initiation of an entirely new species. But like the shortcoming in the doctrines of Lamarck, Darwin's theory did not explain *how* acquired traits occurred. Both Lamarck's theory and Darwin's theory assert the existence of acquired traits; but neither theory properly explains how those acquired traits get acquired. Both theories also assert that acquired traits are passed down; but neither theory properly explains precisely how they get passed down. Lamarck's principle of bodily use and disuse doesn't quite cut it. Lack of curiosity may produce ignorance, but it does not necessarily produce stupidity; and a father with a fat head does not necessarily produce a kid with a fat head.

Mendel

Gregor Mendel was an Austrian Priest and monk who investigated trait inheritance. He did not know much more than Lamarck or Darwin about how characteristics were transmitted; but he did uncover some patterns of inheritance that were a step along the way. Mendel studied peas. He studied their height, shape, color, coating, and pods in terms of paired opposites; short-tall, green-yellow, etc. By cross pollinating paired opposites, he determined which characteristics showed up where and when in offspring. He developed the following **principles**.

(1) hereditary factors (genes) must exist; (2) two factors exist for each characteristic; (3) at the time of sex-cell formation, the hereditary factors of a pair separate equally into two gametes (law of segregation); (4) the gametes bear only one factor for each characteristic; (5) hereditary factors for different traits sort independently of one another at gamete formation (law of independent assortment); and (6) gametes join randomly, irrespective of the factors that they carry. Mendel asserted three laws of inheritance as part of the principles:

Segregation, which says that when *sex cells or gametes* [$\frac{1}{2}$ of DNA] are formed, only one set of paired characteristics is kept by the gamete;

Independent assortment, which states that traits are inherited independently of other traits. In other words, color does not interfere with height or shape, and shape does not interfere with coating or pods, etc. This law had to be modified by what is called “linkage”. Genes located next to each other on the same chromosome do get passed on together;

Recombination and Dominance, which says that characteristics, segregated within male and female sex cells, will unite in the process of pollination to form a single trait in the offspring; and further, one side of the combination will dominate the other and show up as the visible, working trait in the offspring. Mendel’s laws point directly at sex cells as the carriers of transmitted traits. They indicate that sex gametes transport an entire segregated bundle of an individual’s antipode traits, and that offspring get two bundles, one from the mother and one from the father. The offspring’s traits are the resulting combination of both parents. These combinations, in turn, represent a form of genetic variation. Mendel never claimed it, but his conclusions about variations resulting from bi-sex is one of the first scientific indications of the survival value of duo sex in contrast to asexuality. In 1865, Mendel’s results, titled Experiments with Plant Hybrids, were published in an obscure journal. At the time, they did not make the hit parade.

Hugo de Vries

About 16 years after Mendel’s death, a Dutch genetic botanist, by the name of Hugo De Vries [1848-1935] was working on plant heredity and variation as Mendel had. He, along with two other independent researchers, discovered Mendel’s work. All three acknowledged Mendel as the discoverer of hereditary laws; but De Vries was the genius among them. De Vries, the foremost botanist of his time, proposed theories on heredity and variation in plants, and rediscovered Mendel's laws and the phenomenon of mutation. In 1877 he was appointed the first lecturer in plant physiology at the newly established University of Amsterdam. De

Vries published (1889) one of the most important books in the history of genetics, Intracellular Pangenesis, which proposed the theory that "pangenes" carried hereditary traits in plants. The term *mutation* was first introduced by De Vries in the early 1900s to describe changes appearing in the evening primrose. Mutation describes an alteration of genetic information in an organism, involving changes in the genes or chromosomes. De Vries's mutation theory states that the variation seen in many traits among members of a given population is the result of changes that have occurred in the individual organism's hereditary material. In 1903, De Vries published his study of the phenomenon of variation and plant mutation called; The Mutation Theory. The Mutation Theory is the book that brought him fame. The winner of 11 honorary doctorates and 7 gold medals; De Vries retired in 1918, actively contributing to scientific research until his death.

Cells

The first *microscopes* were constructed by a man named Robert Hooke. He invented one around the year 1600. While studying cork under his newly invented microscope, Hooke, a mechanical wizard and geometry professor saw that cork consisted of many "little boxes". Hooke then coined the word "cell" way back in the year 1665 as a reference to the boxed cells of monks in a monastery. Over the next 150 years, all botanists and biologists came to recognize the cell as the basic unit of life. Cells have certain properties. Along with being the most elementary unit of life, most cells are small, although some are relative giants. All of us are familiar with chicken eggs, and chicken eggs are big cells. Each cell is enclosed in a thin membrane that keeps it together and separates it from all else, including other cells. All cells have extremely similar biochemical makeup; and all cells are offspring of previous cells either by asexual division or bi-sexual fusion. Several major types of animal cells may be distinguished, including absorptive, secretory, nerve, sensory, muscle, and reproductive cells. All must arise during

morphogenesis from cells that are less differentiated.

Chromatin and Chromosomes

By the late eighteenth century, microscopes were good enough to display chromatin and chromosomes within a cell nucleus. Staining assisted in the ability to distinguish sub-cellular structures. Chromatin are relatively large, tangled thread like structures found in the nuclei of cells. They got the name chromatin because they showed up well when stained. “Chromatos” is the Greek word for color. The difference between “meiosis” [gamete formation of a cell with $\frac{1}{2}$ chromosomes] and “mitosis” [cell cleavage with reproduced cells having all the chromosomes] was observed in the eighteenth century. This observation included the fact that both forms of cell reproduction involved chromatin strings condensing into distinct structures called chromosomes. By the 1920s, biologists knew that chromosomes were the primary genetic vehicles and that sections of a chromosome carried genetic traits. Those sections of a chromosome that can be identified with a transmitted trait are called genes. Genes behave according to their location on chromosomes. In summary, genes are parts of chromosomes, and chromosomes are separate packages of condensed DNA or chromatin.

Prior to the identification of nuclear chromosomes as the principle carriers of heredity, biologists thought that heredity was transmitted via the “mitochondria”. Mitochondria are one of several sub-cells or organelles within cells. Within the cell there is an organelle called the nucleus of the cell. The nucleus is the brains of the cell. Within the cytoplasm or jelly like portion of a cell that surrounds the nucleus; there are other sub cells containing ribosomes, Golgi apparatuses, lysosomes, centrioles, and mitochondria. Each organelle has a specific function. Mitochondria produce cell energy in the form of a chemical. Mitochondria are unique. They duplicate on their own and not as part of the duplication of the rest of a cell. When a female egg is fertilized by a spermatozoon, the mitochondria of the male

spermatozoa are not allowing into the egg. This means that only the mother's mitochondria is received by the fertilized egg - whether the zygote is male or female. This maternal inheritance allows for following a maternal family tree way back in time; because exactly the same mitochondria shows up descendant after descendant. One tracing of mitochondrial sameness landed on an African Eve who lived somewhere between 140,000 and 290,000 years ago. This Eve, however, is not the absolute Eve; because there are multiple lines of mitochondria. Each of these mitochondrial types can be traced back to an Eve who is the first of her line; but who is not the first of all mitochondrial lines. Like mitochondria, *the male Y chromosome changes little*. The current world-wide form of a slightly mutated Y chromosome has been traced back to a common ancestor, or Adam, who lived in Africa some 90,000 years ago.

The association of chromosomes with hereditary units was not established until 1902, when Walter S. Sutton observed that chromosomes were present in pairs in the regular cells of a grasshopper. In the formation of reproductive cells, which occurs only in the testes and ovaries, only one member of each *pair* of chromosomes enters a sperm or egg. During fertilization, the subsequent fusion of sperm and egg restored the normal cell chromosome number. Sutton quickly saw that the pairing of chromosomes, their separation in the formation of spermatozoon and egg, and their subsequent rejoining during fertilization paralleled the movement of the "hereditary units" in Mendel's experiments. First, some combinations of genes have adaptive value and need to be inherited as a package. Having them linked closely on one chromosome is one way of ensuring this. Second, genes with related functions often need to be activated simultaneously; their proximity allows them to be activated by one common switch mechanism. Third, the packaging of genes into units facilitates the orderly production of daughter cells in cell division. Although most traits of the body are determined by

genes in chromosomes located within the cell's nucleus; chromosomes also exist in the cytoplasm or body of a cell outside of the nucleus. A botanist by the name of Karl Correns found that certain of a plant's chromosomes are transmitted from one generation to the next by means of the egg, not the sperm. Later research determined that certain traits associated with the *mitochondria* are also transmitted only through the female. The Ovists were partially correct. A woman's genetic material, the egg, does contain chromosomes that are not in the nucleus, and hence do not recombine with the male chromosomes that are in the nucleus of sperm. Only the female chromosomes in the nucleus of the female egg do. Female eggs contain a great deal of cytoplasm and numerous cell bodies. Male sperm, however, are virtually devoid of cytoplasm and usually carry no cell bodies.

Humans have 23 pairs of chromosomes. One of the pair is from the mother. Its paired chromosome is from the father. Of the 23 pairs of chromosomes, 22 consist of male/female pairs that basically match. Pair 23, however, do not match. This pair of chromosomes determines the sex of an individual and the body structures that go with each sex. Human females have two sex chromosomes labeled X chromosomes. Human males have one X chromosome and one Y chromosome. The sex chromosome inherited from the mother is always an X, because both of the sex chromosomes of a female are always X. The sex chromosome inherited from the father can be either an X or a Y chromosome. The male Y chromosome does not have as many genes as does the X chromosome. This difference is the reason for saying that a *human male is a misbegotten female*, instead of the sex-lore claim that a female is a misbegotten male. Inheriting a Y chromosome means being born a male. There is no such thing as a male with two Y chromosomes unless the person had no mother. Since human reproduction involves three X chromosomes to a single Y chromosome, odds are the offspring will be a female.

Mutations of genetic DNA

In 1953, James D. Watson and Francis Crick unraveled the structure of the DNA molecule. DNA consists of two chains of chemicals joined crosswise like rungs in a ladder. The connection chemicals that constitute the rungs are called bases. The ladder is twisted up like a corkscrew. The corkscrew structure of the DNA ladder is called a double helix. Gene mutations are classified according to changes in DNA caused by: substitution, deletion, addition, and transposition. Four different bases constitute the DNA molecule: Cytosine (C), Thymine (T), Adenine (A), and Guanine (G). Some mutations occur in nature spontaneously. The causes of spontaneous mutation are not yet completely clear. Some mutations occur through errors in DNA replication; others may result from cosmic and terrestrial radiation or from the exposure of individuals to physical or chemical agents in their immediate environment.

Embryonic development

Modern biology, with pictures of human uterine embryonic development to prove it, distinguishes four types of embryonic development. The initially fertilized egg, called a *zygote*, first develops by way of **cell division or cleavage**. It splits into halves, then fourths, etc., each division causing smaller and smaller cells, but no enlargement of the zygote. At the end of this stage, the cells, which by then have formed a hollow ball called a *blastula*, begin to move around. The fertilized egg or embryo undergoes **cell migration**. Cell migration is considered ended when the three types of germinal tissue, called ectoderm, mesoderm and endoderm are formed. The transformation of the cells of the blastula into the three specifically different types of cell is called Morphogenesis. Morph is a word meaning form or type. Genesis means the initial generating of new kinds of cells. Morphogenesis results in the formation of shaped structural or integral parts such as arms and legs.

It also results in a top and bottom, as well as a left and right. While morphogenesis results in structural or integral parts, Organogenesis results in the generation of organs or functional parts. Organogenesis, or the formation of organs, occurs by way of **cell differentiation**. Specialized tissues with a specific structural formation become organs. The final type of embryonic development is simple growth. **Cellular growth** is the result of additional protoplasm being synthesized within a cell.

The *embryonic* stage is considered to end at the end of the 8th week; because at that point, all the structures of an adult are discernable. Starting at week 9, the developing human is called a *fetus*. Scientifically speaking, *infancy* is the subsequent period from *birth* until about age two. The two year period is based upon the fact that these two years are a period of “super” growth and development. During that time infants teethe, learn to walk, learn to speak, and develop emotional attachments. But under sex-lore, infancy stops when the infant can make articulated vocal sounds that are knowing attempts at vocal communication. When those attempts appear, sex-lore says the *infant* has become a *baby*. Underlying the lore is the fact that newborn infants can suckle and coo at almost the same time because their voice box has not moved down from its original position in the throat. Around age one, when the voice box moves down the throat in order to allow an infant to make the vocal noises that constitute speech; this causes an intersection between windpipe and stomach pipe. Under these new conditions, breathing and swallowing become markedly either/or; but never both. Try to do both simultaneously, and you will choke. As a trade off, the infant can now make articulated sounds. This is the point at which folklore says an infant becomes a “baby”. The word “baby” is a takeoff on the tower of Babel. The baby “babbles” articulately, but has nothing intelligible to say. Around the age of two, when the baby has acquired some intelligent ideas and begins to use actual words to say

intelligent things, it is no longer a baby. It is a child or young human *person*.

Although they seemingly do not realize it; the Christian Fundamentalist claim that a newly formed zygote is a human person is a claim that the human soul is not spiritual. If a zygote is a person, the human soul has to be there; but if the human soul that makes the body a person is present when the body is not fit for a spiritual soul; the zygote personal soul has to be made out of the materials of the body. For sure God would not be putting a newly created spiritual soul into an unfit body. If a fertilized egg or zygote is a human person, then the human soul gets there by way of natural forces. That means the human soul is no greater than the soul of a chicken. The claim of “person”, although offered in “Christian” support of anti-abortion, is actually anti-Christian. It denies that God has to create the human soul as a true immortal spirit and infuse it into a human body that is fit to hold it. It is a denial that the human soul can exist independently of the body. It is a denial of a possible afterlife, a denial of Heaven and Hell, a denial of the validity of religion. On the other side of the coin, if it is assumed that God infuses the human soul at conception; God is thereby claimed to be putting the truly spiritual human soul with its powers of intelligence and free will into a body that has no brain that can hold these powers. It is a claim that God is so foolish He puts square pegs into round holes. It is a claim that God puts an immortal soul unto unfit material. The true Christian fact is that a newly conceived body does not become a person until God infuses a truly spiritual, immortal soul. When that infusion occurs is a matter of conjecture, although the Medieval Church said it occurred at about 40 days after conception. **[See: Medieval Handbooks of Penance: translation of the principle *Libri Poenitentiales* by John T. McNeill and Helena M. Gamer. (Octagon Books Inc. New York, 1965) P 184, #24]**

CHAPTER FIVE: CIVILIZED SEX-LORE

Male dominance, so well established in the later stages of agricultural societies, set the stage for new forms of social organization. Agricultural society provided, not only the physical setting for urban civilization, but set the tone for family life and future interpretations of human sex. In most cases, that tone was a patriarchal society; and male designed, institutional sex. Agricultural sex-lore was assumed more or less bodily into the lore of Western urban civilizations. Civilizations such as the Greek and Roman civilizations simply added their bit to the pre-existing agricultural sex-lore thereby producing another layer of sex-lore atop the agricultural sex-lore.

In the Roman Empire, just as military service to the “polis” was carried out via the State construct of the Army; reproduction was a legally required service to the “polis” whose execution was carried out via State constructed legal marriage. Rome, particularly, designed legal marriage to be the instrument of reproducing citizens. It was the same as saying; “You must have children, and do it the way we tell you. Nature may have other reasons for sex and other ways of reproduction besides this one; but planting seed is the way you will do it”. The agricultural approach made reproduction the purpose of marriage. The Greco-Roman purpose of marriage was the “mass” production of encultured, citizens. These encultured new citizens, in turn, were at the absolute service of the State. Monogamy was the form of marriage; but sanctioned custom allowed males to frequent formally accredited prostitutes.

Greece

The Greeks had a common language and history; but, isolated by terrain, they developed separate city-states. Two Greek city-states, Athens and Sparta, became predominant; and had the greatest influence on Western culture.

Sparta

Sparta acquired its preeminence by conquering and enslaving neighboring

Greeks. All other Greeks considered this dishonorable. Only Sparta enslaved other Greeks. Nearly every slave in other Greek city-states was a non-Greek. The majority of Greek slaves, no matter which city-state they served, were assigned to the farming upon which these city-states depended for survival. The somewhat mythical Spartan lawgiver, Lycurgus, thought he had formulated the legal structures of a perfect society; but, in fact, he created a collectivist warrior society. His laws, some of which Adolph Hitler greatly admired, included the murder of imperfect male infants. They also included compulsory homosexuality for males. The homosexual requirement for males, along with the fact that males were required to live together in military camps, left Spartan women to each other. The word "*lesbian*" describes most Spartan women, but it didn't come from the life style of Spartan women. The word "lesbian" derives from the Greek island of Lesbos which gave to the world the female love poet Sappho. The prolonged absence of males also left Spartan women the opportunity, which they capitalized on, to more or less enjoy a public life that contemporary feminists might envy; that is, if contemporary feminists wouldn't mind living under the life and death power of 5 male Ephors. A minority of Spartan inhabitants were citizens. All Spartan citizens possessed an actual contract with the government which made them citizens and which laid out their rights and duties as Spartan citizens. Their duty was absolute submission to the dictates of their military rulers and to the demands of a totally militaristic social order. The Spartan rulers did not allow the people to contradict them. The word Spartan in our contemporary American language means self imposed austerity as a form of self discipline. Christians call it penitential asceticism and self denial. The lore of asceticism claims that renunciation of worldly pleasures will cause attainment of a higher degree of intellectual capacity and self awareness, along with possessing a higher degree of spirituality. This lore is the lore of bi-partitioned human persons. It is the lore of a

higher rational soul grudgingly housed in a base animal body. Therefore, spirituality consists of beating the Hell out of one's own body. However, the greatest carryover of Spartan lore into contemporary American culture is the notion that citizens are absolute possessions, subordinates and servants of the State. In spite of the American constitution and its assertion of an inalienable right to life, there are more than a few American politicians who think and attempt to act otherwise. To die in defense of Country is one thing. For a two-bit bureaucrat or self appointed citizen guardian of public morals to personally assert life and death authority over someone else is quite another.

Athens

Athens, in many ways, was a much more sophisticated city-state than was Sparta. Around the 5th century BCE, the citizens of Athens revolted against their ruler and established self-governance. They called this self-governance democracy, which means rule by the people. At that time Athens, as well as most city-states, was not actually very populous. Unlike American *representative democracy*, Athenian democracy; because of the meagerness of the population was direct. It was also strictly male. Together, all the males made the political rules for Athens. Women were not part of Athenian democracy. Athenian democracy had an additional characteristic. Athenian democracy required and demanded that male citizens participate. Voting and serving in office were not matters of choice. With all its shortcomings, however, Athenian democracy allowed people to follow their interests and talents. The result was that Athens became a super power and a scientific, literary and artistic giant of its time.

Greek Culture

Logos Versus Mythos

Democracy is the high profile carryover from Greece preserved in our American culture. Most Americans are aware that democracy originated in ancient

Greece. However, there is much additional Greek originated carry over into modern American. That carry over is the source of Western science and Western technology. Some ancient Greeks were the first to seek rational explanations for what they observed, rather than blindly accepting their traditional mythology as the true explanation of the Universe. The comparison with Athens usually made is a comparison to the far Eastern Asian cultures. The far Eastern cultures are described as having a contemplative outlook on the Universe, and an inward view of human life. The Asians simply accepted nature. They did not want to change it or harness it. The inward view of human life adopted by Asians was based upon the principle that human bliss comes from disconnecting one's self from the cares and woes of daily life. The great Greek thinkers, Socrates, his pupil Plato, and Plato's pupil, Aristotle, took the opposite point of view from that of the Easterners. Humans do not have to live at the mercy of the Universe. Nature is there to be studied and can be understood, as well as perhaps harnessed. Humans are possessed of intelligence and free will and are obligated to take charge of their lives and create their own bliss; not by withdrawing from the cares and woes of life, but by dealing with them. The great Greek thinkers said, in effect; our Greek mythology is fine, but we don't really think it provides an authentic, accurate picture of what the Universe actually is. We need to examine the Universe and Nature closely to determine, *in fact*, what they actually are; and to determine, *in fact*, how they work. Instead of swallowing myths, we need to use our intelligence to determine the real truth. Some later writer came along and called that point of view Logos rather than Mythos; or in other words, logic rather than myth. Modern science rests upon this Greek idea of the human ability to decipher nature by rational methods.

Logos had a very precise meaning for the Greeks. The Greek notion of Logos was a necessary correlative to the concept of a human rationality that could understand the Universe. In the fashion of Werner Heisenberg's uncertainty

principle, human rationality or logos could not comprehend the Universe if the Universe was not intelligible. Logos for the Greeks meant the inner *order and intelligibility* of the Universe. The Greeks not only thought that human intelligence could figure out the Universe; they also realized that in order for the human mind to understand the Universe, the Universe had to contain a rational order which the human intellect could detect. The Greek idea of Logos denoted that the functioning of the Universe was ordered in such fashion that it was intelligible to humans. The Greek concept of a Logos intrinsic to the Universe and open to the human mind is the foundation of the concept of Natural or Nature-given Laws. The intrinsic Logos of the Universe is also the observable natural effect that Aristotle used to argue inductively to the existence of an unchanging, Prime Orderer of the Universe. Some Greek thinkers identified this internal Logos of the Universe as a universal consciousness which, so to speak, operated the Universe and gave the Universe its intelligible order. It was a pantheistic concept of Aristotle's Prime Mover. The human mind was then perceived as being either an actual fragment of that Divine or universal consciousness, or at least a copy of that intelligent consciousness which shared knowledge of universal order. Greek Stoicism was based upon such ideas.

In the New Testament, John calls Jesus the **Word** or **Logos** of God. Deliberately copying the language of the Book of Genesis which is the Bible Book that describes creation; John says; "***In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God***". (**John 1:1**) When John said: "**in the beginning**", he was comparing the uncreated Logos of God with the created Logos of God. John's point was that Jesus is the infinite internal Logos of God Himself, and at the same time is the Logos or design according to which the Universe was built. Jesus was the causal Logos of the Universe Who put Himself within creation. Jesus is Incarnate Logos; and creation has a created logos derived

from the Incarnate Logos. John's point is that Nature has an intelligible logos because it is a finite copy of the Divine Logos. So how does a person learn about the Divine Logos? By studying Nature as well as the Bible.

The process by which the Greeks turned mythos into logos is laconically described as follows. Socrates asked whether all that stuff about the gods was true. His student Plato replied that the magic stuff was not true; but there was a separate world of essences out there just like the world of the gods, and one set of those independent essences was *human souls*. Plato's student, Aristotle, called Plato's theory of independent essences poppycock. Aristotle said that the world of essences is not some separate world. It is merely ideas in men's heads. Those ideas in the human mind about the essence or nature of things in this world got there because the human mind simply distills or *abstracts* those essences from the information about this world's entities provided to the mind by the senses. Aristotle was also the personal tutor of a Macedonian named Alexander; and Alexander was the man who spread Greek ideas to most of the known world. Greek culture, insofar as it was spread outside of Greece, was called Hellenism. "Hellas" is the Greek word for Greek.

Alexander the Great spread Hellenism by building Greek type cities in lands that he conquered; for example, he built and named after himself, the city of Alexandria, which still exists today and is located in Egypt. Ptolemy Soter, one of Alexander's former generals, created the great library in Alexandria. The library preserved much of the written Greek philosophy that passed to the Romans, and is part of the chain whereby Greek philosophy became imbedded in our Western culture and pervasive in Christianity. The other significant historical parts of Western cultural emergence are Rome, Byzantium and the Christian Church, with assistance from the Muslim Arabs who had conquered part of Spain and had built a magnificent center of learning at the great mosque in Cordoba. In particular, the

works of Aristotle, along with brilliant interpretation, were passed to medieval Europe at the end of the dark ages by an Arab qadi named ibn-Rushd, better known to the world as Avveroës. Were it not for Arab scholars, Western societies probably would not be oriented to logos rather than mythos.

Greek Stoicism

Stoicism was invented by a Greek philosopher named Zeno. Zeno of Citium said that true human happiness lies in virtue. True happiness lies in wisdom, in justice and in moderation. These virtues are eternal verities, so their attainment brings permanent happiness. Hence, placing happiness in transitory earthly pleasures is foolish. Health, wealth, fame and success are fleeting. They cause only temporary satisfactions. Those who are too morally weak to attain virtue are doomed to ultimate unhappiness. A related part of Stoic ethical doctrine is the assertion that every event in this world is ordered by Logos operating inexorably. Some call it fate. To live by *right reason*, humans have to impassively accept with dignity and courage whatever garbage fate dumps on them. Such acceptance is a duty. It is this latter doctrine that most people identify as Stoicism. The impassive part of Stoic doctrine serves exceedingly well as the Christian doctrine of accepting God's will. The part of the doctrine concerning the fleetingness of wealth and success also serves admirably as the Christian doctrine that the poor and oppressed are God's favorites because they don't have earthly goods, but they have virtuous Faith. These doctrines appear to match Christian doctrine; but, in fact, they are effective doctrines for keeping the oppressed oppressed.

The Stoics were also the architects of the notion of Natural Law. The Stoics built an elaborate and complex Natural Law theory. Like Aristotle, the Stoics believed that the Universe is rationally systematized by a Prime Author. Unlike Aristotle and his "out of this world" Prime Mover; the Stoics thought that the systematizer was the intrinsic Logos of the Universe. The Stoics described the

human mind as a fragment of the intrinsic Prime Author. A person guided by correct reason is living in harmony with nature. Living in harmony with nature is living in accord with Natural Law. Like most Greek philosophers, the Stoics embraced the doctrine of a lofty soul imprisoned in a base sordid body. Freud said that libido and id needed to be suppressed because they were in opposition to cultured society. The Stoics said that passion and lust are irrational animal functions that need to be eradicated because they are in opposition to the right reasoning of the soul. The two assertions would appear to be different, but they are not. Stoic Natural Law theory had one other dimension. In keeping with the agricultural notions of sovereign possession, the Greeks held the idea that nature gives the Body politic absolute ownership and sovereignty over all citizens. As exemplified in Sparta, Stoic Natural Law happiness meant assiduous practice of *civic* virtue. Right reason meant cultivation of civic, political life. So when the Stoics said suppress passion in favor of right reason, they were actually saying the same thing as Freud. Suppress passion because it causes trouble with culture and society. For the Stoics, and all adherents since, “Natural Law” actually means bureaucratically defined *arbitrary* laws promulgated by two bit ethnocentric lawmakers as nature given *moral imperatives*. In proposing subservient moral adherence to legislatively and ecclesiastically fabricated Natural Laws that are about as natural as castration; the Stoics directly created the dichotomy between the individual and society, between public and private. [Be aware that the true face of Natural Law is the ten commandments. Natural Laws are genuine moral necessities such as the natural demand that a person eat what is healthy or get sick. But much of the artificial trash propounded by petty bureaucrats as morally imperative is not true Natural Law.] The Stoics indirectly created the contrariety between public and private sex which today in America is causing problems between legally regulated sex and personal adult sex, as exemplified in the Court

cases concerning “sodomy”. Sodomy, or anal sex, is declared *unnatural* and *deviant* sexual intercourse. Sodomy, even within marriage, is declared to be *unnatural* by simplistic bureaucrats and preachers harkening to Stoic Natural Law theory. It is declared to be *deviant*, because it is not reproductive plant sex. Had these blind demagogues bothered to look, they would have discovered that the Greeks saw “sodomy” as great stuff. In ancient Greece, homosexuality was considered greatly superior to heterosexuality. The shallow, myopic assertion, of the “unnatural” character of sodomy, proclaimed by thoroughly frightened dull-witted demagogues, in turn, creates contemporary American problems concerning gay marriage and public authentication thereof. Sodomy is “unnatural” only if human sex really is males planting seed in females. Nevertheless there are natural limits. In 1973 the Supreme Court rightly approved of Virginia’s sodomy laws that criminalized sodomy by rape, with children, with the intoxicated and the mentally ill. In 1982 the Supreme Court upheld a New York law prohibiting materials involving children in sexually explicit situations. Child pornography thereby became a form of speech that is not protected by the First Amendment. Part of the problem in determining what is and what is not truly natural sex is the fact that purely Stoic Natural Law theory did not always land on what was objectively natural. The Stoic version is, in fact, an ideology of unconditional submission to authority. People must accept stoically whatever rubbish ignorant and incompetent bureaucrats dump on them. Under Stoic Natural Law theory, authorities have authority by nature; and the poor and oppressed are poor and oppressed by reason of their very nature. Within Western civilization, this is called the “Divine Right of Kings”. It is an assertion of actual and natural blue blood. Royalties are royal by nature. Royalties are royal by heredity. They are royal by reason of their genes; and the ignorant and poor, by reason of their genes, are subjects to be ruled. Hitler extended this personal dimension of Natural Law to race. There exists, by nature, a

master race. A body of out of the loop pseudo Christians, in turn, turned this doctrine of submission to authority into the assertion that there is a **master religion** with **absolute** religious authority; namely Fundamental Ultra-Conservative **Dominionist**, Christianity. Its pronouncements are infallible and **by their nature** Dominionist Christians have a Divine right to dictate right and wrong to all others. The Fundamentalist Assembly, and each individual Fundamentalist, speaks for God and must be obeyed. All other religions and States and people must submit.

The early American Puritans saw themselves in much the same way. They saw themselves as natural rulers of both the *secular* and the ecclesiastical. They saw themselves as the natural rulers of a combined Church-state. They claimed that as God's elect they had the right to direct the functioning of both the Calvinistic, Congregational Church in America and all colonial civic affairs in New England. Along with moral fanatics such as Comstock, the Puritans are one of the reasons why priggish sex morality infects American *civil law*. During the Vietnam war, however, many an American politician was forced, **by popular protest**, to eat his or her phony Natural Law, his or her assumed dictatorship, and his or her moral absolutism. Likewise, the thrust of women's rights has caused many a chauvinist male lawmaker to choke on his chauvinism. Nevertheless, George Bush Jr. convinced the American people, and particularly ultra conservative American Christians, that he ruled by reason of his alcoholic Christian Nature.

The concept of **Positive Law** stands in contrast to the concept of Natural Law. Positive Law is not a law of universal necessities and of nature given obligations that bind the entire race. *Positive Law is a set of local, man made elective and selective human prescriptions and proscriptions.* The term "positive" simply means laid down or "posited" by humans. Unlike Nature-given demands, Positive Law, as man made, can differ on the same subject in different cultures, or

in the same culture at different times. For instance; American law says polygamy is okay if it is successive. A man can have several wives or a woman can have several husbands provided they come one after the other and after a divorce in each instance. But American law forbids simultaneous polygamy. On the other hand, Islamic law says a man can have several wives simultaneously. The fact that Christianity allows only one wife at a time while Islam allows several at a time indicates that marriage is not a matter of Natural Law; but a matter of Positive Law. In other words, marriage is not the *nature* of human sex. Marriage is an artificial, human made control of sex. In perilous fact, marriage in each culture is arbitrarily whatever power mad politicians say it is. In keeping with the agricultural sex-lore upon which it is built; *posited agricultural civil marital* doctrines contain not only State absolutism, but also the myth of *nature given* inferiority of women relative to men. As the source of most American Positive law, misguided, *agricultural* notions thoroughly permeate American Positive or human made law as they do in most cultures that arose from farming beginnings. Various cultural forms of Positive law are riddled with precepts that define the inferior status of women and consequently limit women to the status of children. They cannot own property, they cannot make contracts, they cannot sue or be sued; and if they marry they must put all their property into the hands of their husbands and forsaking their own name, take his. This inferior legal civic status was the norm in early America.

Stoicism became one of the four reigning schools of Greek thought in the Roman Empire. It persisted as a powerful moral doctrine for centuries and heavily influenced many Fathers of the Church. Stoic Natural Law theory also persisted as a legal doctrine upon which lawmakers from the Romans to Christian Church authorities, to the Pilgrim founders of America, based their laws. Stoic doctrine was popularized among the Romans by Cicero; and the Corpus Juris Civilis of the

Byzantine emperor Justinian acknowledges a “ius naturale”. The notion of absolute sovereignty embodied within civil and spiritual rulers stayed with Natural Law until John Locke. Locke said that it isn’t the State that is natural, it is individuals who are a natural given. The State itself is an artificial construct of individuals. Until Locke, sovereign ruler and sovereign State were the same. In spite of the fact that America was designed by the founding fathers on the basis of Locke’s theory, those Americans with vested interests have not, to this day, let go of the assertion that they are “natural rulers” .

Orphic Mysteries

The Greeks influenced Christianity and sex-lore not only by way of their philosophy, but also by way of their mythological religions. The Greeks had a habit of building shrines to many of their Olympian gods and then developing a separate cult-following dedicated to each of the gods who had a shrine. Christians call their similar cults, dedication to this or that saint. One of the elitist Greek cults was dedicated to the god, Orpheus. His exclusive group of chosen followers believed that Orpheus had written something called the Orphic rhapsodies. These rhapsodies talked about sin and the afterlife in much the same way as Christianity does. Like most Greek philosophers, Orphic members thought that the task of human life was to pry a divine soul out of a constricting lowlife body. As in Stoicism, the way to do this was to suppress emotion and passion while eschewing things that catered to bodily passions and pleasures like meat, drink and sex. At the end of life, the soul faced a judgment. If eradication of bodily orientation and purification from bodily sin was successful, the soul went to a paradise called Elysium. If not successful, the unpurified soul was remanded to the underworld ruled by Hades.

Hierarchical soul-body

The Greeks held firmly to a soul versus body dichotomy rather than a union of the two; and their sex-lore reflected that dichotomy. The Greek, body-soul dichotomy led to two extreme forms of outlook and behavior in Greece.

A hierarchical universe of superior holy heavens and inferior profane earth in conjunction with a hierarchy of superior natural rulers and inferior natural subjects and a superior soul enslaved in a debasing body led some Greek philosophers to preach an ascetical ideal similar to that of the far East. Human life is better lived in tranquil contemplation of higher things rather than involvement with lower things like marriage, family and material possessions. Some Greek extremists claimed that any and all sex was depravity. The source of the dim view of sex and marriage for these male philosophers was not only the body-soul dualism but also the low estimation of woman. Greek doctrines resulted in the Christian concepts of a clean divine soul and dirty bestial body with its dirty sex. The Greek ascetical ideal, of course, became the Christian doctrine of the superiority of celibacy. The same body soul dichotomy led some intelligent Greeks, who had no desire to be tranquil contemplatives, to become highly sexual and even debauched. The doctrinal dichotomy produced a social and behavioral dichotomy in ancient Greece. Some favored no sex. Some favored all sex - with “all sex” predominating among the “hoi polloi” [the common folk].

Greek sex life

The ancient Greeks had a saying that later became part of subsequent Roman culture. “Marriage brings only two happy days – the day when the husband first claps his wife to his breast and the day he lays her in the tomb.” [See: [History of European Morals](#) by W. E. H. Lecky (New York: George Braziller, 1955) Vol. II, P 304.] The Greeks perpetuated the Sumerian and Babylonian cultural habit of seeing and treating women as inferior to men. That animosity was institutionalized in Greek culture structures such as the “oikos” or household as a woman’s place;

and was exhibited in the glorification of male homosexual love. A wife's duties consisted of running the household and raising the children. She was, in fact, a prisoner in her own home. In many cases she was not allowed to go out. She was not allowed to meet other men; and she was not, in most cases, allowed to participate in politics. Although Greek wives were not allowed extra marital liaisons, Greek husbands *were expected* to have them. It was almost a religious duty. Starting way back in Sumeria, the early role of priestess had been transformed into one of courtesan. Religious prostitution was an outcome of the sexual myths of orgiastic human assistance to the seasonal cycles of regeneration. The ultimate outcome in ancient Greece was the existence of a stratum of exalted prostitutes and mistresses called *hetaerae*. Hetaerae were not at the top of the status scale; but near it. They were an integral part of Greek life. The famous Greek lawgiver, Solon, created State brothels around the sixth century BCE. The women of these brothels were generally lower class. The hetaerae, on the other hand, were more educated and cultivated than most other Greek women. Hetaerae were women who knew how to make themselves attractive. They were classy women who knew how to please men; but unlike Gigi's aunt from the Lerner and Loewe movie Gigi, these women were associated with religion. A visit to a hetaera was a special religious act, because homosexuality was everyday moral behavior for Greek men, and demanded behavior for Spartan men, married or not. In addition to their hetaerae, Greek men had their young men with whom to enjoy sexual pleasures such as sodomy and fellatio. Like extra marital sex, premarital sex was forbidden to Greek women but expected for men. Homosexuality was also forbidden to most Greek women except in Sparta. This left Greek women with two choices. As a prelude to the restricted choices of Medieval Christian women who either married or entered a nunnery, Greek women either married or became hetaerae.

For Greeks, marriage had a purpose. That purpose was sacred. That purpose was sacred because it consisted of dedication to a good higher than that of the individual, namely the good of the “polis”. The purpose of Greek marriage was the sacred and patriotic duty of supplying the “polis” with *encultured male citizens*. Marriage was sacred because it was service to the State; and as such, Greek marriage had an identity that was public rather than private. Ancient Greek marriage did not denote personal pleasure. It denoted subservience to State authority. In Sparta, marriage was like military service. It was one of the State designed and State controlled forms of service to the State. Marriages existed as part of an economy planned and executed with military efficiency by a totalitarian dictatorship. In many Greek City-States, populations were less than exploding; so marriages were encouraged and legal punishments were imposed upon bachelors. Like marriages from the beginnings of civilization to the present, Greek marriages also served to legitimize children and provide proven lineage for inheritance of property. Because marriage in those days was a union of families rather than a union of individuals, Greek marriages were arranged by parents. Betrothal itself was a formal ceremony performed in the presence of witnesses. The wedding ceremony or “*gamos*” in essence was a feast which concluded the “*ekdosis*” or handing over of the bride to the groom and his family. Like most marriages in most Western cultures for most of history, Greek marriage was essentially a paternal *deeding* of title to a daughter to a husband. A father transferred his ownership title over his daughter to the groom. The daughter’s consent was not relevant. An entry was then made in a government register. The registry entry served as a record and as evidence of a valid *ekdosis*. Bigamy was allowed in the form of concubines, but a concubine’s children were not legitimate. To divorce their wives, Greek men simply sent them back to their fathers. If this occurred, the father could arrange another marriage for his daughter. Formats for modern American wedding

ceremonies are survivals from Greco-Roman sources. Greek marriage rites were religious ceremonies. The bride was modestly hidden by a veil. The ceremonies also involved a bridesmaid and a best man; but they started with a kiss rather than ended with a kiss. The Greeks thought that *onions* were an aphrodisiac, so in many cases they would eat one before kissing. Thankfully that custom never became part of American wedding rituals. The marital coupling was concluded with a feast which may be the source of contemporary wedding receptions.

The Greek emphasis on the superiority of homosexual relationships raises a question about the traditional institution of marriage. The question is: why didn't homosexual relationships become the essence of Western, or at least Greek, marriage? Why were Greek, second rate heterosexual relationships made the object of social control? The basic answer is very simple. Marriage, in the 8000 or 9000 years it had existed before it arrived in Greece via Near East cultures, had always been considered a form of male ownership of women. Marriage was a form of socially verified title to a woman.. Females were the private property of males. On the other hand, homosexual relationships in Greece were equalitarian. Homosexuals, particularly males, did not own each other; and consequently neither of the partners needed a civic *property title* to the other. In contrast, heterosexual marriages as a transfer of property did demand a public record of ownership; and hence the public record became the type of Greek sexuality that got passed to its cultural descendants. Furthermore, homosexual relationships in Greece were matters of love; while heterosexual relationships were matters of contract and business. Love relationships don't require some form of governmental knot to hold them together; but male-female relationships had no other bond except that of a contract of some sort. To put it another way, real organisms don't need artificial ties to weld them together; but legal fictions do. The government does not need to create bonds that artificially hold together an organic individual like a human

person; but the government does need to create ties that hold together a legal fiction, such as a corporate person. Like corporations, marriage is a legal fiction. Married couples are united by law even when un-united by their actual relationship. Asking why there were no Greek laws creating homosexual marriage is like asking why there were no laws requiring people's noses to stay on their faces. An additional reason for creating special legalities for male-female relationships was, of course, the matter of children and inheritance.

In today's America, however, just as legally fictitious corporate persons have more rights than real individual persons; the legal fiction of American marriage carries more rights than a real loving relationship. That is why many homosexual couples with real relationships feel cheated by American marriage laws. Nevertheless, had love and romance not become associated with sex and marriage during the late Middle Ages of Western history, today's American homosexuals might be like the Greeks. They might not be associating their love and sex with marriage. But American law provides artificial rights and privileges to heterosexual unions, while depriving homosexuals, not only of these legally bestowed rights and privileges of citizenship; but of the rights and privileges of Natural Law that the American constitution acknowledges they possess.

Rome

Originally, Rome was a dinky settlement in Latium located in central Italy. Yet it became one of the greatest empires in the ancient world. The early Romans had a traditionally passed on history somewhat akin to that of the Jews. The Jews were divided into 12 tribes; the Romans were divided into 10 "gentes" or clans. Roman myth said that Rome was founded by twin brothers, Romulus and Remus, who were supposedly children of the Trojan wanderer Aeneas. To save them from a usurper king, the infant twins, like Moses, were placed in a river. They were found and nursed, so the myth goes, by a she-wolf. When grown, the twins

founded Rome. Romulus later killed Remus, arranged the capture and rape of the neighboring Sabine women and divided the people into tribal units.

The Greek “oikos” became the Roman “familia” which was, in both Greece and Rome, the basic economic unit of the society. The Greek word “oikos” became the English word “economy”, and the Latin word “familia” is the source of the English words “familiar” and “family”. Each “familia” was an extended family consisting of all the descendants of one living “paterfamilias” [father of the family]. The “familia” included wives, children, grandchildren, in-laws, servants and livestock; and marriages were arrangements between “familiae”. These “familiae” were also religious communities. Each had its own religion and religious rites. These familial religions were built around the hearth which was the symbol of deceased ancestors or gods, the “*lares*” and “*penates*”. The fire in the domestic hearth [fireplace] was not allowed to go out; and the continued existence of the household religion depended upon procreation. Consequently, barrenness was cause for divorce. In the process of getting married, a woman had to leave her own religion of the hearth and take up the familial religion of her new husband. In early Rome, marriage for a woman was a religious transmutation as well as a familial transmigration. Among those the Romans conquered were the Greeks along with the Hellenistic cities that Alexander had founded. The Romans adopted Greek culture almost in its entirety; and via the Romans, Greek culture passed to the medieval world. Greece was conquered with finality by the Romans in the year 146 BCE. In that year, Mummius put down a Greek revolt. He burned Corinth, killed all the males, sold its women and children into slavery and looted it. The loot was sent to Rome; but Athens and Sparta were allowed to keep their own laws. Greece remained a distinct part of the Roman Empire until the European part of the Roman Empire was overrun in the year 476 A.D. During that period of roughly 600 years, Greek and Roman civilizations and thought overlapped; but Roman *law*

and order predominated. Historians identify the decisive end of the Hellenistic Age with the end of *Republican Rome* and the establishment of the *dictatorial* Roman Empire in the year 31 BCE. Julius Caesar, from whom comes the name of the surgical procedure “cesarean section”, had a nephew called Octavian whom Julius adopted as his son. Octavian won a decisive naval victory in the battle of Actium, defeating Antony and Cleopatra. At that time, Rome was considered a Republic. It was ruled by a senate and two magistrates. After the battle of Actium, Octavian became, in fact, the sole ruler of Rome. Rome ceased being a republic and became a dictatorship. In the year 27 BCE the Roman senate conferred on Octavian the title Emperor Caesar Augustus [the august or glorious imperator]. Augustus attempted to combat the debauchery of the times and advocated return to ancient religious festivals. Caesar was not particularly interested in the morality of sex, but he needed to create additional Roman citizens, because wars were making Roman citizens a scarce commodity. In his attempts to create additional Roman citizens, Caesar also undertook the rejuvenation of marriage. Until the adoption of Christianity as its official religion, the Romans worshipped Greek gods which were given Latin names. For example, the Greek Zeus became the Roman Jupiter. However, Roman citizens, supposedly as a civic function, were required to reverence the imperial image. What resulted was deification of Roman emperors. In the year 12 BCE, Caesar Augustus became high priest or Pontifex Maximus of the Roman Empire. With the espousal of Christianity as its State religion; the Romans then worshipped only one God along with the emperor; and Pontifex Maximus became a title used by the Pope.

Roman philosophy

There were 4 official schools of Greek philosophy in the overlapping Hellenistic-Roman period. The 4 were: Platonist Academics, the Epicureans, the Stoics and the Aristotelian Peripatetics of the Lyceum. Each school had its own

view of sex. Almost without exception, the views were negative.

Platonism

Plato developed a theory about a real and existent world of ideas or essences. Plato said that the human soul was *an independent essence* that was one of these forms, but it was trapped in a filthy body which kept getting in the way of true enlightenment. Plato's world of ideas, according to one of his followers called Plotinus, had actual existence in a world outside the physical universe. Plotinus said that Plato's world of essences existed just beyond the physical heavens. Like Christianity, Plotinus said that human life is a journey to this super heaven. There are 4 levels in the world of Plotinus: the level of the indefinable "One"; the level of reason and forms created by the "One"; the level of the soul, and the low level of dark, impure matter. The goal of life is to escape foul matter and return to the "One". The escape is accomplished by asceticism. The result will be ecstatic unification with the "One". The teachings of Plotinus were called Neoplatonism.

It is easy to see why the Fathers of the Christian Church liked this view of creation and used Neoplatonism as the basis of their theologies. The transcendent location of the world of the "One", which is beyond the Universe, matches a supernatural Heaven that is allegedly "**up there**" some *place - right?*. The primal "One" from which the other levels emanate is, of course, the Christian God. The level of pure essences or forms is the world of Christian Angels. This level has an internal sub-hierarchy. Like the Greek lovers of hierarchy, Christians with their fondness for natural, supernatural and moral hierarchies, perceive angels as a hierarchy. The Christian angelic hierarchies, however, are not very Christian; because they reflect Zoroastrian doctrine. But starting with the most powerful, the angelic hierarchies supposedly are: seraphim, cherubim, thrones, dominations, virtues, powers, principalities, archangels, and angels. None of the mere angels have names known to Christianity; but Gabriel, Raphael and Michael are

considered archangels. The lowly mere angels are thought to be guardian angels. The level of soul is the Christian doctrine of a spiritual human soul created independently without matter, patiently standing in line from all eternity, waiting to be coerced by God into an elementary level, impure material body consisting of a “fertilized” egg, so that the journey back to God might be a test, a trial and a tribulation. The ecstatic unification with the “One” as the goal of the journey is an excellent description of Heaven as the contemplation of a beloved God.

Epicureanism

In the same tone of escape from the body, Greek Epicurean philosophy, which was oriented as a *connoisseur* to the *higher pleasures of the spirit* and to tranquility of life; taught that sex is a sickness catering to animal lust rather than rational enlightenment. When the Epicureans said pleasure was the purpose of life, they were talking about the opera, not pornography. Titus Lucretius Carus, the famous Roman philosopher-poet, promoted the Epicurean view of sex as a sickness in his didactic poem, De Rerum Natura [On the Nature of Things]. Nevertheless, Epicureanism, in the hands of the average Roman, became a license for dissipation.

Stoicism

The Stoics preached a more virulent anti sensual, anti sexual doctrine than the Epicureans. Their sexual doctrines were more like those of the Neoplatonists. While the Epicureans simply said people should develop a taste for the finer things in life, the Stoics declared that emotion and passion are irrational and must be crushed. This notion of evil passion, from that time to the present, has been glued to the Stoic originated concept of Natural Law. Pulverizing evil passion is also the doctrine underlying and supposedly justifying asceticism. In line with the doctrine of evil passion, an early Roman Stoic by the name of Musonius Rufus asserted that

copulation for pleasure was a sin even between married persons. His notion of the sinfulness of sex for pleasure, even among spouses, was reiterated by Saint Augustine. Augustine refined the doctrine of evil passion by declaring that before sinning Adam and Eve had no emotions or passions. Emotions and passions, said Augustine, are the result of original sin. Passions, especially lust, are properties of fallen nature, not properties of pristine human nature. Others purified that Augustinian doctrine still further by asserting that any emotions or passions in an individual were being stirred then and there by the devil. Sexual reactions between individuals required prodding by the devil.

In the 1st century BCE, the Roman politician Cicero popularized the Stoic doctrine of Natural Law. Above human customs and laws there was a natural or universal and implacable law. Cicero identified Natural Law with the ideal essences of Plato's super world. He claimed that this super world could be understood by all human beings and be applied to all peoples. According to Cicero's Stoic notion of an unchanging, universal Natural Law; everyone everywhere at all times should know that such things as slavery and cannibalism are evil. Somehow, not everyone got the message, because all of Western civilization, Sumerians, Greeks, Romans and Americans were resolutely into slavery. But thanks to Cicero's hypothesis, Roman administrators could feel justified in overriding the local laws of those they conquered and imposing their own laws.

Aristotelianism

Aristotle had a much more moderate view of the body-soul relationship. He called the body-soul construct "*our composite nature*"; meaning that the body-soul construct was the nature of a human being. Hence, it was stupid to think that beating the body to death would cause happiness. He did, however, acknowledge two regions of the human soul. One part animates the intellect and will and the

other part animates the body. He called the former part, which grasps principles or truth, the rational part; and he called the body animating part irrational. He also said that those who live by their senses alone are brutish. By that he meant the kind of brutes described as “*Yahoos*” in the classical work Gulliver’s Travels written by the priest, Jonathan Swift. Being much more of a realist than many of his contemporaries; Aristotle, in partially agreeing with the Stoics and Epicureans that ultimate human happiness included enjoyment of the higher things in life, also included within human happiness the *health of all the parts of a human*. He acknowledged the enjoyable contemplation of the higher things in life, but also added that this contemplation had to be accompanied by virtuous enjoyment of pleasurable passions and emotions, as well as by sufficient income or wealth to provide not only survival but also the means for justice and philanthropy. The *virtuous* enjoyment of pleasurable passions and emotions is the essence of morality. *Virtuous* emotionality is the required setting for the contemplative life. Without it, the emotions and passions will obstruct serene contemplation. Hence, immorality, or disordered emotionality, in Christians will obstruct spirituality. Aristotle noted thousands of years ago that men understand other men better than they understand women, and likewise for women. So he observed that same sex friendships are not as hard to form as are heterosexual friendships. Aristotle was not necessarily talking about homosexuality. He was talking about everyday pals and friends. But he did add the observation that the only reason for making the efforts necessary to a heterosexual friendship was the desire for children. For Aristotle deep mutual love was a friendship relation just as much as the less intimate, acquaintance type friendships we would normally associate with the word ‘friendship’. The characteristic of the Aristotelian view of sex was not an anti-flesh dimension. It was instead the common Greek, men only orientation. In his Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle describes friendship, or deep and mutual, genuine,

unselfish love in terms of males. Aristotle considered heterosexual relationships to be for reproduction only. For Aristotle, heterosex was not a matter of love. Heterosex was economics. Heterosex was reproduction while homosex was sexual love. For Aristotle, along with most Greeks, only male homosexuality was a matter of noble love; and lesbianism was a cheap copy. This doctrine of homosexuality, along with the worship of multiple gods including the Emperor and some of the spectacles in the coliseum, were basically the only contents of Greco-Roman culture that early Christians choked on. The subjugation of women was ***Pauline doctrine***, and thus became mandated Christian practice. The early ecclesiastical male bosses did not want any women challenging their ruling position. They still don't. Aristotle agreed with the Stoics that civic [political] virtue is the archetypal virtue. In his Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle asserts that people act for purposes; but it is the "political philosopher" who is the architect of those purposes. Politicians, [the law makers of a society] according to Aristotle, determine the ultimate human good which is *the common good*; and consequently determine what are the preeminent good and bad actions that are the measure of all other actions. Aristotle was saying that, although both individual moral behavior and family moral behavior have their own specific purposes; those purposes are measured by the common good as their standard, but the common good, as ultimate, does not have a standard. It is the ultimate standard. The common or body-politic good, in effect, is the purpose of family good and of individual good. Individuals and families exist for the good of the State. Since the State is the top of the moral hierarchy, service to the State is sacred. This is partially the Stoic Natural Law doctrine of absolute submission to the State dressed in different clothes. However, Natural Law, as propounded by the Stoics; did not acknowledge that individuals and families, by Nature, had their own specific moral standards that were outside of State control. The Stoics thought the State was god and that

over and above social morality, the State created the standards of individual and family morals. Aristotle, in contrast, put Nature in command of political laws such that politicians had to bow to the Nature given moral standards of private individual behavior and non-public aspects of family life. Aristotle saw that individual and family moral standards are *unique* and pertain only to the unique personal good of each unique individual, and likewise each unique marriage. Since these standards are unique to each individual and each family, the State has no right to touch them insofar as they are “individual-only” moral standards. Aristotle was stating the American “Bill of Rights” and the American Constitutional declaration that individuals come with “inalienable” nature given rights not bestowed by politicians. Aristotle was saying that the State has the right to govern individuals and families only insofar as they are citizens. For example; the American Federal Government has the right to dictate the morals of American individuals only *insofar as they are Americans*. It has no right to dictate the behavioral standards of Americans *insofar as they are humans*. And since sex is provided by Nature, and not by Federal or State laws; ***neither Congress nor State legislators have the right to touch sexual behaviors that do not intrude into the public domain***. Aristotle also asserted the existence of a human participation in the external Prime Mover’s governance of the universe. However, as tutored by Plato, Aristotle thought political philosophers were the only persons who were smart enough to read the naturally given Logos of the *common good*, and had the magnanimity to properly apply nature given social standards to the good of the “polis” [society] precisely and only as the good of the “polis” as a “polis”. Since “smarts” and a big heart [magna animus] come from Nature; Aristotle could have called his doctrine of rulers, “the Natural Law of natural blue bloods”. Over and above European *blue blooded* kings and queens; the early Bishops of Rome were also quick to appropriate such absolute authority to themselves. The “super wise

and magnanimous” Pontifex Maximus or supreme bridge between Heaven and Earth became the Divinely created supreme papa or Pope. Although Aristotelianism is currently the fundamental thought system utilized by modern theology, at least within Roman Catholicism; Aristotelianism did not, at first, become the philosophy of the Christian Church. Aristotle’s concept of the Universe as made of concentric spheres did become orthodox Christian doctrine from early on. But the rest of his philosophy did not. Aristotle’s concept of the Universe was passed into early Christianity by way of Plato and his famous follower, Ptolemy. The concentric universe had the earth as the non-moving center of all the spheres; and was accepted as orthodoxy by reason of the fact that it was long held traditional *astronomy* and *astrology* that appeared to fit a literal interpretation of Scripture. The bulk of Aristotle’s philosophy did not become the thought system of the Christian Church until it was presented by the Arabs to Western scholars at the end of the Dark Ages. Aristotelianism, at that point in European history, became the source of Scholasticism. There were two major reasons why Aristotelianism was not adopted by the early Church. First, after he died in the year 322 BCE, Aristotle’s works were lost for a time. Second, he was considered excessively materialistic. Unlike Plato, Aristotle did not live or think in some ivory tower ideal world of essences. He lived in the real world we actually reside in, and he thought about factual things. In addition, the Fathers of the Church did not like his Nicomachean Ethics nor his Eudaemonian Ethics [spiritual happiness as the ultimate **moral goal**], insofar as these ethical doctrines exalted homosexuality. They did not like Aristotelian statements asserting that human happiness includes pleasurable passions and wealth; and they most certainly did not like reading Aristotelian statements such as: *“Those who say that the victim on the rack or the man who falls into great misfortune is happy if he is good, are, whether they mean to or not, talking nonsense.”* [[Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics](#)]

trans. by W.D. Ross, in The Basic Works of Aristotle, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, Inc., 1968) P 1055] Along with the other schools of Greek thought, the Romans accepted Aristotelian philosophy and the Peripatetic school; but they never produced an Aristotle of their own. The Romans excelled in governance and law, not as philosophers, but as lawgivers. A strong and effective code of law was absolutely necessary for governance of conquered peoples; and the Romans were masters at creating and imposed law and order. Rome's greatest achievement was the introduction of organized legal systems into the Nations it conquered.

Roman sex customs

Most people, in the absence of some heavy duty commitment to restrictive sexual principles, will tend to favor and to seek venereal pleasures. As previously noted; the Greek philosophers went one way in regard to sex, and Greek and Roman citizens went another. In fact, the Roman Empire as well as Rome itself, was, at one point, notorious for its licentiousness. The Romans were notably more sexually earthy than the Greeks. While the Greeks associated sexual pleasure with the arts; the Romans, at least at times, associated sexual pleasure with pain as in the gladiatorial contests and the ripping up of Christians. The original Roman Republic was an austere place. There was a plethora of gods who were spirits within natural objects. Roman priests foretold the fortunes of Rome from birds. "Avis" is the Latin word for bird. The Latin for flying birds or birds carried by the air is "aves gero". In English, this becomes "augers". The Romans also foretold the future from the guts of birds. The Latin for inspection of bird innards is "aves spicio" from which comes the English word "auspices". The Roman priests read *augers and auspices*. Pagan Roman priests were **not** caught up in celibacy. Every Pagan Roman priest had to have a wife, and he lost his office when she died.

"Religio" in Latin means scrupulous performance of rituals. The word

religion in English denotes conscientiously following moral rules; but it also connotes *scrupulous* non moral behaviors. For example: “religiously” following the instructions for dying one’s hair. Make a mistake and the ritual won’t work its magic. This is the nature of a *sacrament* within Catholicism. Sacraments work independently of the purity and piety of the performer. Under such circumstances, the focus of religion can cease to be the god of the ritual, and become the ritual itself. This is due to the fact that the ritual, not the god of the ritual, answers the request. The word “*sacrifice*” comes from the Latin words “*sacer*” or sacred; and “*facere*” which means to make. Literally, the word sacrifice means *to make sacred*. This notion aligns with the Greek hierarchical idea of the sacred as “up there”. “Up there” sacredness, in turn, means to make something belong to a god who lives *up there in the outer heavenly sphere* by destroying it for human use. In other words, sacrifice is equivalent to a substitute or scapegoat that is “set aside” for divine use only, instead of a worshipper setting self aside for divine use only.

The Romans had gods for everything including most sexual situations. *Tutumus* was the god of conception. *Lucina* protected menstruation and delivery. *Priapus*, who in Greek mythology wound up with a perpetual erection, was the god of fertility. Roman women sat on his statue in order to insure pregnancy. Many wore small phallic images of him to bring fertility and protect against the “*evil eye*”. *Juno Regina* was the Roman queen of heaven, the protective spirit of womanhood, marriage and maternity. From Juno Regina comes our month of June as the best month for getting married. *Venus* was the goddess of desire and mating. *Diana* was a goddess prayed to by women and children. The Romans of the early pre emperor, republican period were similar to American frontiersmen. They were tough, solid, serious and hard working. And like the average American; the average Roman took it for granted that the Government had the right to dictate his private individual morality upon which the development of the Rome did not

depend, but the maturity of the individual depended. However, while ruining the chances of individuals to attain a maturity pertaining solely to their individuality, government control of individual morality enabled bureaucrats to tap the pocket books of citizens. Consequently, the morality of the Roman individual was fundamentally obedience to the Republic. The life of a Roman woman was basically one of subservience and dependence to any and all males who came near her. Early Roman law described women as children, forever inferior to men. The statutory status of a Roman wife was similar to that of Greek women. Women were, in essence, treated as children. No matter what her age or circumstances, a Roman woman was always under the authority of some male. If young, she was subject to her father. If her father was dead, she was subject to a brother. When married, she was subject to her husband. If her husband died, she was subject to her own first born son. She had to have male consent for any significant action such as disposal of property or getting married. Women could not appear in court even as witnesses. Neither Greeks nor Romans considered nudity erotic as is evidenced by many of their classic sculptures. Nevertheless, both cultures had their erotic art. But little of this art survived the fanatically frigid purges of the Christian Church. Fortunately, however, Mount Vesuvius lent preservation a hand. When Vesuvius erupted in 79 AD and buried Pompeii and Herculaneum; it also buried and preserved a great deal of erotic Roman art along with interring these cities. Today archeologists are finding that art. Marriages, as in preceding Babylonia and Greece, were arrangements between families. Couples seldom met before their betrothal. The Romans did not even have a word for courtship. The Roman writer Seneca said that everything else was tested before purchase except a bride by a groom. Because of the sovereign status of male authority, both fathers had to agree to a betrothal. The bride's father had to agree to give her. The groom's father had to agree to accept her. Betrothal itself was a formal binding contract. The Roman

word for straw is "*stipula*". Each time an agreement on a given issue was reached a straw was broken in order to signify agreement on that issue. From that practice came the legal term "*stipulations*" in a contract. There are also other carry over dimensions. Just as contemporary contracts require a "*consideration*" in order for the contract to be legally binding, so also ancient betrothals. "Consideration" in a contract is basically the price a promisor receives for the promise of providing something - in the case of a daughter's marriage, the promised was the daughter. It has to be something to which the promisor is not otherwise entitled outside of the contract, and must be *exactly what the promisor specifies as the price - for example: prices posted on the shelves of a grocery store.* [This means the shelf prices better be what shows up at the cash register when you check out, or the cash register price is a breach of contract.] Most written contracts contain an introductory clause which says that on "*receipt of one dollar and other considerations*" such and such is promised. The "consideration" for a betrothal contract was the "*arrha*" or dowry promised by the father of the bride. Marriage was not viewed as a matter of love. A dowry was a status symbol. Its value caused the standing or class of the bride. This, in turn, determined the status of her eligible suitors. When Roman law established age 6 and then age 12 as minimum age of a female for sale to a highest bidder, the female gained the power to say no if she was not of age. This led to an historical trend of increased excuses of females to say **no** to marriages arranged by daddy. The initial, newly added reason pertained to age as did too young to marry. A daughter's **no** became: "the decrepit ugly guy you chose is old enough to be my grandfather". Then came: "I don't like the creep you chose"; and "I've got a headache". In due time, in some places, papa lost all power. Love and female choice of partner entered the picture. This put daddy into the position of being the one who said yes or no to the marriage. When betrothal negotiations were concluded, the future groom put an iron ring on the fourth finger

of the left hand of his bride to be. The Romans, following the Greeks, thought that this finger contained a nerve or blood vessel that went to the heart. As in Greece, marriage was an obligation to the Roman State similar to military service; and bachelors were penalized. Taught by the Greeks, the Romans considered sanctity and righteousness to mean nothing other than sacrosanct dedication to the State as the *summum bonum* or highest good of the individual. This sacredness of the Roman State was acknowledged by required sacrifices to the Emperor. Reverence to the Emperor, military service, and marriage, were all sacred to the Romans; and sacred in the same manner. All were forms of obedience to the State. The Romans, with their law and order, treated marriage and the wedding ceremony as sacred because they were State matters. It was Roman society and Roman law that crystallized the nature of marriage as sacred service to the State consisting of a **legal contract** for reproduction that subjected wife to husband, made marital sex an *on demand* obligation, and legitimized children as heirs and as genuine Roman citizens. The reason for compulsory Roman marriage, as previously noted, was lack of population. A lot of Roman men were killed off by the many Roman wars. The Romans, indoctrinated with the agricultural notion of heterosex as males seeding females, perceived marriage simply and solely as a reproductive enterprise that created new citizens. So did the Romans who became Christians. Marriage had to serve the needs of the Republic and be prolific. But even at that, the Romans never got obsessive-compulsive about reproductive marriage as did the Christians. In spite of the fact that the Bible says the purpose of marriage is to make *one flesh out of two*, [See: **Matthew 19:5-6**] the average Christian wound up with an absolute fixation on reproduction as the purpose of marriage. Just as religious observance of rituals can replace the god of the ritual such that the ritual itself becomes the god, so also for Christian marriage. Reproduction became the absolute god of marriage irrespective of the fact that under other circumstances, over

population, not under population, was the problem of the community and the society. Interestingly, *genuine* Christian doctrine has never held that reproduction is the purpose of marriage. This was due to the fact that, like the human heart, purposes are both *essential and integral parts* of the very nature of things. The demand for children in a marriage is exactly the same as saying: “if there is no bride, there is no marriage”. You cannot marry yourself. If reproduction is part of the very nature of marriage, childless couples are not married. To push the notion that reproduction is the necessary purpose of human sex and marriage to its absurd conclusions, consider this. If reproduction is a necessary part of **sex *such that sex cannot exist without it***; then whenever reproduction does not result from the copulating, the coitus, or the intercourse, or from whatever else a couple was doing; *none of the copulating or coitus or intercourse, or whatever else, was sex*. Reproductive agricultural sex-lore concludes to the fact that actions that are not reproductive are **not sex**. Under plant sex, picking your nose is not sex - but neither is **homosexuality, or masturbation, or bestiality, or fetishism**; because none of these is reproductive.

The error of thinking that reproductive marriage is genuine Christian doctrine comes from untrained and sometimes simplistic preachers and evangelists who are unable to properly interpret Christian doctrine. The unmistakable **Biblical assertion** that *spousal unity or merging is the purpose of marriage* is not a statement that reproduction is the purpose of marriage. Genuine Christian doctrine says that *reproduction* is an “*officium*” or *office* of marriage; not a purpose of marriage. Although some contemporary Christians and Christian Churches want to interpret “*officium*” to mean a duty or obligation; the Latin word “*officium*”, or in English, the word “*official*”, refers to **authority**. True Christian doctrine says that ***married couples only are authorized*** to have children. Unmarried couples are not. The morality that follows is not “don’t have sex outside of marriage”. It is “***don’t***

have kids outside of marriage". Marriage *authorizes* reproduction. It does not oblige those who are married to have children. For the Romans, the purpose of marriage was the Republic, and reproduction was the means for preserving the familial religion as well as preserving the State. For Romans, reproduction was a duty and an obligation to the Roman State. Roman *marital* reproduction was designed for the good of the Roman State. But reproduction was not required in order to make the marriage to be a marriage. Those who preach reproduction as the required purpose of Christian marriage simply do not know what they are talking about; because the consequence is that those who are unable to have children are not allowed to be married. And those who preach reproduction as a duty obliging families to produce children for the State or for the good of the local Christian diocese, are not preaching Christian doctrine. They are preaching Pagan Roman doctrine. The doctrine of reproduction as the essence of human sex is the same as stating that if someone works had to make a living, but fails; they are a lazy bum. Or if a student studies relentlessly to pass a test, but fails the test; it is a claim that they did not study. Ultimately, it is the same as saying: "if no child results from intercourse, intercourse is not sex".

Roman men married at a young age, not because they were captivated by their prospective brides; but because they wanted healthy young wives who could participate in some lusty sex, bear many young and give the men long term utilization of their offspring. The religion of early times said that children were required in order to reverence the graves of their fathers by keeping the fire in the hearth going. Ancient agricultural sex-lore said that childless males were going to have a miserable afterlife.

Like ancient Greece, ancient Rome had legally licensed and regulated female prostitutes. There was a class of women in Rome who were similar to the Greek high class hetaerae. At the same time, middle class females who worked in

pubs and lodging places, even if they did not offer sex, were legally classified as prostitutes. Prostitutes in Rome, however, were not allowed to wear the matron's robe that signified respectability. Male prostitution was also widespread, but did not require being licensed and regulated in the fashion of females. Although prostitution was common, female virginity was highly prized in prospective brides. Virginity was demanded of Roman women because of the proprietary view that Roman males had in regard to Roman females, and because Roman males wanted to be sure that their inheritors were their own offspring. The Romans considered female purity to be of such power that virgins had dominion over nature. Virgins could make wild animals docile. This outlook became the source of the Medieval sex-lore of a virgin catching a Unicorn. Masculinity, on the other hand, consisted of sexual prowess. As in Greece, Roman wives had to be sexually pure; but husbands were expected to be Casanovas. Just as in Sumerian society, and in Hebrew and Greek societies, wherein fathers owned daughters and husbands owned wives; a thing called the "*patria potestas*" or power of the father, prevailed in Roman marriages. The power was sovereign. The male head of the "familia", the "pater familias", had life and death authority over the women and children of the family. Justice within the family was administered by the husband and father not by the State. Naughty wives were turned over to their husbands as judge and executioner. Some Roman husbands could be highly arbitrary; a slap on the wrist for adultery; but death for sipping his wine.

Early, republican Rome contained magistrates called "**censors**" who took the census and watched over public morals and conduct. Somewhat like the American Supreme Court, these magistrates were the ultimate judges of Roman conduct. Cato the Elder, who wrote the first Latin history of Rome, was a respected Roman censor. Cato said: "*If you take your wife in adultery, you may freely kill her without a trial. But if you commit adultery or if another commits adultery with you,*

she [your wife] has no right to raise a finger against you.” [Otto Keifer, Sexual Life in Ancient Rome (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1953)] The progenitors of contemporary Western civilization taught us all we know about the double standard; and they taught us well. What did not persist into modern culture, however, was infanticide. Infanticide was a common practice in Rome as in Greece. Female children and deformed children would be left exposed in the countryside to die, mainly because the Romans did know how to effectively abort. Ancient Roman marriage, as the male **deed or title to a woman** is not an exaggeration. Roman marriages were “*cum manu*” or “*sine manu*”. “*Manus*” is Latin for *hand*, and “*cum manu*” roughly means to have something in hand. It referred to the completed transfer of dominion from father to new husband. It signified transference of the “*patria potestas*” from father to husband. “*Cum manu*” meant that the new husband had in his hands sovereign possession of the woman. Marriages “*cum manu*” were marriages in which the father gave away not only the bride; but also his ownership over the bride. “*Cum manu*” marriages could also be created by “*usus*” or use. “*Usus*” in this case meant marital cohabitation for a year. After a year of cohabitation, the male got full possession and title to his bride. Today, cohabitation presented to others as marriage, takes 7 years and results in a *common law*, legal marriage. The Roman year of cohabitation could be bought off or shortened by “*co emptio*” which means the outright purchase of the bride from her father. In some cases, the purchase of the bride was disregarded because of the woman’s substantial dowry. In this case, the father of the bride, in effect, bought his daughter a husband. The dowry or its equivalent had to be returned to the father on divorce or on death of the husband. “*Sine*” is the Latin word for *without*. Marriages that did not include the bride’s father giving dominion to her new husband were “*sine manu*”. “*Sine manu*” or *common law* marriages were the basic form of marriage in early Rome. What created such marriages was

“*affectio maritalis*”, the reciprocal intention to live together in order to beget children. This marital *affection*, which was an enterprise rather than a love affair, was required as an enduring commitment in order to sustain the marriage. When “*affectio maritalis*” was withdrawn by either party, the effect was a divorce. Marriages of this kind were realities, not legalities. They were personal unions, not paper unions. Common law marriages, created by mutual consent, were dissolved by removal of that consent. Such marriages were a matter of family arrangements, not a matter of the public laws of Rome; and as family matters, common law marriages were dissolved without the intervention of Roman public officials.

Later in their history when the secular “polis” or State was dominant, Roman authorities legitimized and legalized common law marriage. Citizens above the age of puberty, with the consent of their families, could cohabit in permanent fashion. Roman law recognized such unions as official and legal, but made divorce much easier for common law marriages than it did for those married by way of “*confarreatio*”. Common law marriages were “*sine manu*” unless “*usus*” converted them into marriages “*cum manu*”. Eventually, common law “*usus*” or use of each other in order to produce children was displaced by the secular and legalized ceremony of “*matrimonium justum*”. As the Roman religious “*familia*” gave way to the Roman secular “polis” or State; natural and real “*affectio maritalis*” was changed into an artificial, secular and legal entity. Just as it does with corporations considered as persons, legal fiction substitutes for natural reality. The original and ancient religious form of Roman marriage was called “*confarreatio*”. It became the legal marital entity for high class Romans or patricians. Over and above the legally authenticated Roman *religious* “*confarreatio*” of patricians was added the plebeian *secular* form of marriage called “**matrimonium justum**”. “*Confarreatio*” means eating cake together and remains as an American ceremonial tradition. “*Justum*” is the same word as “*just*” and in

the context of Roman marriages, meant legal. “*Matri*” is Latin for mother, and “*mono*” means one only; so the term “*matrimonium*” literally means “one mother” or *monogyny*. Monogamous marriage means one wife and one husband; but *monogyny* means wifely monogamy, but not husband monogamy - and the word *matrimony* means *the same*. Only the woman is bound to one spouse. The implication is that all the legitimate children in the family come from only one legal mother. Mama better not have children by other than her legal husband; although her husband can have children by other women. Children not born of a legal wife seeded by the legal father are illegitimate. All five Roman ideas, namely: a marriage as a legally binding, State authorized, bilateral contract; a husband’s dominion over his wife; a male as the cause of producing legitimate children by way of his legal wife; and the resulting serial *monogyny*; still persist as contemporary American notions about the nature of **Christian** marriage. Marriage in contemporary America is:

One: an exclusive heterosexual lifetime *bilateral civil law contract*;

Two: for the purpose of begetting children;

Three: obliging serial *monogyny* or legitimizing of children by way of being birthed of a legally married wife;

Four: causing male dominion over the female who promises *to obey*;

Five: resulting in a state or “station” in life that is rendered *sacred* via authorization and certification of the contract by Church and State.

Ancient Roman “**confarreatio**” ceremonies started with the bride being freed from her *father’s household religion*. The marital or freeing ceremony, held in her father’s house, signified the handing over of the bride to a groom with a different family religion. After a bit of reveling, the wedding party paraded to the home of the groom’s father which is where bride and groom were to live as part of the groom’s “*familia*”, and where the bride was initiated into the household

religion of her new husband. There the groom carried his bride over the threshold to signify that his wife was now part of the groom's family and would take the family name of the groom. She was then sprinkled with lustral [holy] water and allowed to touch the hearth of her groom's family. Finally bride and groom shared the wedding cake. Her new husband then gave her the keys to the house as a foretoken of her place as manager of the household. The gesture was purely symbolic if the wife of the master "pater familias" [grandma] was still around and was still mistress of the household. Then came another symbolic gesture. Bride and groom simultaneously stuck their necks into a double yoke [the cumbersome wooden device put on the necks of two oxen who together were to pull a plow] as a symbol of their union. The Latin word for conjoint yoking is "*con-jugium*". Hence the English word "*conjugal*" meaning that the spouses will pull together in the marriage.

Profane, low class "**Matrimonium justum**" differed substantially from "confarreatio". The essence of "confarreatio" was the transfer of the "patria potestas", or title to a woman, from father to groom. Following the lead of the Egyptians who were the first to make marriage consist of contractual consent [*sunk horësis*], the Romans made the essence of "matrimonium justum", which derived from freely chosen cohabitation or "affectio maritalis", to be *mutual consent* – subject to State provisos, licensing and approval. The change of marriage in Rome from religious "confarreatio" to civil "matrimonium justum" also modified male domination of females in regard to marriage. "Matrimonium justum" ceased being absolute male title to a female over which a female had no control, and became male rule over a female by way of her consent. Henceforth, her obedience to a husband in marriage had to be freely chosen by her. This latter dimension, in turn, began to impact arranged marriages. Even if daddies continued to arrange for their daughters marriages that were economically or politically advantageous to daddy,

she could say “I refuse”; and daddies, by way of cultural indoctrination, unquestioningly accepted the fact that the marriage could not take place unless she agreed. Daddy could no longer simply hand over a daughter “cum manu” whether she agreed or not. On the other hand, her father retained his legalizing consent to any marriage she might enter. He could not marry her off without her consent, and she could not legally marry without his consent. Just as some of the Greek rites such as the bridal veil and the bridesmaid and best man still exist within contemporary American marriage rituals, so do some of the Roman rites. Fathers still give away their daughters. The wedding cake is from the ceremonies of the *confarreatio*. The custom of having the groom carry the bride over the threshold is thought to be a carry over from the myth about the rape of the Sabine women. When the followers of Romulus kidnapped the women from the nearby Sabine hills, they then forcibly carried the women over their thresholds and into their homes. The wedding ring on the fourth finger of the left hand was also, as noted previously, a Greco-Roman practice. By the time Christianity found its way into Rome, Roman marriage was a secular, legal *institution* subject to State designed citizenship and age eligibilities coupled with State conditions, requirements, authentication and registration. Roman marriage was formatted by Roman law as publicly witnessed mutually sworn consent to monogamous reproductive forms of sex [no illegal woman on top, no doggie style and absolutely no “buggery”], performed on demand by mutual right and obligation, with the contract of exclusive partners lasting as long as neither spouse withdrew consent, and requiring rigid subservience of wife to husband for the sacred civic duty of producing and rearing legitimate offspring, encultured as good little Roman citizens. Eventually, everything else associated with marriage and the wedding ceremony became non-essential trappings. For Christians, the wedding ceremony required *Church witnessed* mutual consent; but all else was circumstantial,

including sex and children. Marriage was not caused by cohabitation or intercourse; and it was not consummated [perfected] by either sex or reproduction. It was strictly an exclusive partnership caused by legally required mutual consent; and it could exist without sex and without children. Marriage was caused, not by sex; but by making a lifetime, exclusive, monogamous, bilateral contract for sex.

As its descendant, American marriage is neither sex nor reproduction nor personal relationship. Marriage is the State or Church-State approved **contract for sex**. Marriage within Western culture is a legal fiction like a corporation. The contract alone is the marriage. Within Western culture and Western law, within Christianity and Canon law, within contemporary American culture and all State and Federal laws; marriage is nothing more and nothing less than a government authorized and certified, lifetime **bilateral contract** for monogamous sex on demand. There is no demand within the contract that it involve heterosex; because there is no stipulation of guaranteed reproduction as the purpose of the contract. In America, heterosex is NOT contained in either the State or the religious marital contract, because reproduction cannot be guaranteed. [Nevertheless, other Federal and State laws forbid marital sex to be doggie style or “buggery” or anything else some hypocritical bureaucrat thinks is immoral.] The lack of heterosex in the contract raises the question of what is the real purpose of the bilateral marital contract if it isn’t reproduction? Think about it! What is the only mutually exchangeable item that can be guaranteed and thus be the significant “**material content**” of the bilateral contract? Look in the Bible. It is called **one flesh**.

The Christianized Empire

In the early 4th century AD, a Roman named Constantine achieved supreme power over the Roman Empire. Following the lead of his predecessor, Diocletian; Constantine reorganized the Roman Empire into provinces, dioceses and departments called prefectures. The same basic organizational structure became,

and still is, the fundamental organization of the Roman Catholic Church. Unlike Diocletian who had persecuted the Christians, Constantine used the new religion of Christianity to consolidate his hold on the Roman Empire. He made Christianity the official State religion of Rome. Using the hierarchical Greek notion of the sacred as “up there at the top of the hierarchy”, Constantine shoved the Christian God into high Heaven and let Him rule there and in the afterlife; while he, as the object of Roman veneration, became the ruler of this world and this life, and the factual ruler of the Christian Church as well as the ruler of the Roman State. He, not the Pope, summoned the very first ecumenical Church council at Nicaea. That council created the Nicene Creed. Constantine’s control over Christianity was such that there was little difference between Church and State. In the year 333 AD, Constantine moved the capital of the Roman Empire to a Greek colony in present day Turkey, called Byzantium. He renamed the colony after himself, namely, Constantinople. Because of its location, Constantinople, now called Istanbul, became a major bridge between Europe and Asia. With the emperor residing in Constantinople, the only major source of overall authority remaining in Rome was the Bishop of Rome. The serial bishops of Rome increasingly became secular State rulers of the Western part of the Roman Empire, as well as religious leaders. Their unique position ultimately caused them to claim supreme religious authority over both Eastern and Western Christianity. In the year 395 AD, upon the death of the emperor Theodosius the First, the Roman Empire was split between his two sons. The Eastern empire became known as the Byzantine Empire; the Western portion was termed the Latin Empire. The Byzantine Empire was Greek in language and spirit. It was more closely bound to the Middle East than to the Latin Empire. In the 6th century, one of the Byzantine emperors, Justinian the First, created a single code of Roman law. The Justinian Code was a collection of all known Roman laws dating from the 2nd century. The code sanctified the Natural

Law doctrine of the absolute authority of rulers over their subjects. It heavily influenced legal theory in later Europe. It also significantly influenced Christianity and its Canon Law. The Justinian Code became the foundation for all law within Western culture except for England. Under Justinian based codes, nefarious peasants were hung for their misdeeds. Miscreants of noble status got their heads chopped off, while heretics and witches received tougher penalties. They were burned at the stake or put into a sack and drowned. But in *England* during the Middle Ages, with its non-Justinian *common law* practices; the penalty for grave misdeeds was truly grievous. Criminals were “drawn”, meaning their intestines were pulled out while they were still alive. Then they were “quartered”. Their bodies were chopped into quarters. This punishment is the source of the expression to “draw and quarter”; meaning that whatever it is, it won’t be such any longer. The Western empire, modified by its barbarian invaders, was Latin in language and closer to its Roman roots. During the Middle Ages, the Roman Pope was basically the only source of unity in Western Europe. In the Byzantine Empire, Church authority became divided between the patriarchs of Constantinople in Turkey, Antioch in Syria and Alexandria in Egypt. In the 11th century, differences between the Western Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church caused the first major split in Christianity. The two Primates excommunicated each other. The Roman Pope, Leo IX, excommunicated the Byzantine Patriarch, Michael Cerularius; and Cerularius excommunicated Leo. The principle issue was the assertion by the Bishop of Rome, the Pope, that he had supreme authority over the entire Christian Church including the Byzantine Eastern Church.

Early Christianity

Christianity has its religious roots in Old Testament Judaism; but it also incorporates a heavy dose of Greek philosophy and Roman law. Aspects of Greek philosophy originally entered Christianity by way of Hellenized Jews; and

subsequently by way of the Romans. Although Judaism itself is not terribly hostile to sex, an influential Jewish philosopher theologian named Philo, utilized the anti corporeal philosophy of Plato to reconcile the Jewish Old Testament, with Greek thought. Philo adopted Plato's dichotomy of body and soul. With that dichotomy came the accompanying antipathy to base sexual pleasure. Philo claimed that the original sin was sexual lust. He asserted that intercourse was legitimate only in marriage and only when there was a likelihood of reproduction. Mating with a barren woman was immoral because it wasted male seed. Early Christian doctrinaires followed that lead. It was Hellenized Judaism which became the source of Christianity at the time of Christ. As precedents to Christianity, the Jews, particularly those outside of Palestine, created an initial integration of Greek culture and Jewish doctrines. In countries outside of Palestine, the Jewish people were so Hellenized that Greek was their native tongue. Greek was spoken even in the synagogues. By the time of Jesus and the early Church, the Jews outside of Palestine were already thoroughly Hellenized. The strictly **Hebrew part** of the Christian Church originally headed by the apostle James and located in Palestine was decisively eradicated by the Roman emperor Hadrian in 135 AD. All Jews were kicked out of Palestine. The Non-Palestinian Church created by Paul among the Hellenized Jews was the Christianity that survived. The Hellenistic synthesis of Greek and Jewish thought which found its way into Christianity is reflected in the history of the Bible. The Hebrew bible was translated into Greek around 300 BCE, because many Hellenized Jews could not read their Scriptures in the original Hebrew. The Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament is called the **Septuagint**. Septuagint means seventy, and the name comes from the legend that the translation was done by seventy scholars. Irrespective of who did the translation, the Septuagint is the official Old Testament of early Christianity and the official Word of God. The original Hebrew Old Testament that was written in

Hebrew is not. In fact, the Hebrew Old Testament canon was not definitively established until the year 100 AD when Jewish Rabbis got together to settle the issue. This was about 400 years after the Septuagint, and about the same time that the **New Testament Gospels were being written in Greek**. Some of the 15 *apocryphal* [fake] Bible books and additions in the Septuagint, that are not in the official Hebrew Bible, were originally written in Greek, not Hebrew. All of the New Testament was initially written in Greek. Hellenized Judeo-Christianity was subsequently spread to Hellenized Gentiles rather than to Jews. Jerome, translated the entire Septuagint into a Latin version called the **Vulgate**. “Vulgar” in Latin means ordinary; and the Vulgate was the common man’s translation. The Vulgate became, and remains today, one of the authoritative ancient versions of the Christian Bible. Jerome included the entire Septuagint *with apocrypha* in his translation of the Old Testament; but within the New Testament he included only 4 of at least 12 existing Gospels. Although Matthew seemed to think 14 was some kind of magical number, **[See: Matthew 1:17]** Jerome reduced to 4 the number of Gospels considered to be the word of God, because the bishop Irenaeus, said so in his polemic against heretics. Bishop Irenaeus argued that there were only 4 Gospels because 4 was the order of the Universe. There were 4 Cherubim in the vision of Ezekiel, **[See: Ezekiel 10:1–22]** there were 4 winds, there were 4 corners to the Universe, 4 horsemen of the Apocalypse, 4 elements, 4 humors and 4 temperaments. The 4 Gospels that Jerome retained were Greek in language and somewhat Roman or gentile in tone. Luke, in fact, was a gentile. All others of the 12 extant Gospels, such as those from the Coptic Catholics in Egypt and gospels ascribed to the Apostle Philip, to Thomas, to Mary Magdalene, and to Nicodemus who helped recover Jesus body from the Romans, went into the junk heap. One of those Gospels claimed Jesus was gay.

Pseudepigrapha

The word **pseudepigrapha**, meaning "books with false titles," refers to books similar in type to those of the Bible whose authors gave them the names of persons of a much earlier period in order to enhance their authority. The pseudepigrapha are important for the light they throw on Judaism and early Christianity. The Old Testament is not the whole literature of Israel, nor is the New Testament the whole literature of early Christianity. Many other books with religious themes circulated among those of ancient Judaism and in the early Church. Some of these books are called pseudepigrapha, or "spurious writings." Among *Judaism's* pseudepigrapha are: The Letter of Aristeas, III and IV Maccabees, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Testament of Job, the Life of Adam and Eve, the Psalms of Solomon, and the Assumption of Moses. The Christian pseudepigrapha include various gospels, books of acts, epistles, and revelations. Some, such as the gospels according to the Hebrews, the Nazarenes, and the Egyptians [lost, except for fragments]; were at one time used in certain Churches as Scripture. The Infancy Gospel of James has influenced Christian tradition and art. There are acts of apostles attributed to Peter, to Paul, and to James, as well as apocalypses, or books of revelations, such as that of Peter. Those attributed to Paul (Third Corinthians and Laodiceans) and other gospels are obvious forgeries. Among the best known are 3 and 4 Esdras, and the Prayer of Manasses; which are included in the Apocrypha. The term is applied to many Jewish and Judeo-Christian books written in the period 200 BCE to AD 200. The Jewish books include Jubilees, Enoch, Psalms of Solomon, Assumption (or Testament) of Moses, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sibylline Oracles, and the Apocalypse of Baruch. Fragments of the Damascus Document have been found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Other pseudepigrapha exist in Greek, Slavonic, and other languages, many of them revisions of Jewish books. These include the Apocalypse of Peter, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Ascension of Isaiah. The

Gospel of Thomas and the Protoevangelium of James contain many legends about Jesus and Mary and show the influence of Gnosticism, as does the Apocalypse of Adam. The Gospel of Nicodemus is composed of the Acts of Pilate and the Harrowing of Hell. The Epistle of Jude, for example, reflects a knowledge of Enoch and of the Assumption of Moses.

The Nag Hammadi papyri

The Nag Hammadi papyri are sort of like the Dead Sea Scrolls. They were discovered in 1945 by a couple of shepherds [one of whom was named Mohammed Ali] in a jar buried in a field near Chenoboskion, Egypt. Before any scholars knew of the existence of these incredibly important historical documents, Mohammed's mother burned some of them for heat. These writings have been characterized as heretical Gnostic documents, meaning they are not part of the Greek language writings claimed as the only inspired works belonging in the New Testament. These documents are written in the Coptic or Egyptian language, and nothing Coptic was ever allowed into the Bible as inspired of God. Some, nevertheless, are actually translations from Greek while others are original Coptic documents. The translations from Greek include the apocryphon of John, the gospel of truth and the gospel of Thomas. Biblical scholars are quite certain there was a single source document for all the sayings of Jesus found in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. They call that source document "Q" from the German "*quelle*" meaning wellspring or source. This means that a non-inspired document supplied all the inspired sayings of Jesus found in the 4 accepted Gospels. Other gospels found near Nag Hammadi were the one by the Apostle Philip and the one by Mary Magdalene. Then there are the apocalypses, the revelations dealing with the end of the world. Among these are an apocalypse supposedly written by Adam himself, along with others attributed to James, Paul and Peter.

New Testament sex-lore

Most of the sex-lore in the New Testament comes from Paul. Jesus preached the new Kingdom of God and said little about sex. **[See: Mark 10:1-12]** Paul, although trained as a Pharisee, was a Roman citizen. As a Roman, Paul was impregnated with the sexual doctrines of the Greco Roman philosophers. As the evangelist to the Gentiles, or in other words to the Romans and the Greeks, he encountered Greco Roman sexual behaviors among his converts; and he, on many an occasion, chastised them for it. Like many of the subsequent Fathers of the Church, Paul exhibits an anti sexual orientation along with an anti female bias. The anti sexual, anti female attitudes of Paul and the early writers of the Church still prevail in contemporary American Christianity irrespective of the particular denomination or sect. One of the most influential aspects of Hellenized Judaism and of Greco Roman culture upon Paul was the dualism of body and soul. The doctrine of pure soul and unclean body found a sympathetic ear with Paul and with most early Christians. The reason was simple. Christianity preaches a “way up there God in Heaven” **[See: John 18:36]** as the goal of life; and a procurement of that goal by stripping self of “down here” worldly goods and earthy conduct. **[See: Luke 9:23 & 18:22]** The Christian goal of attaining the vision of God, when seen through the eyes of Greco Roman dualism, created an outlook in which the practice of religion became identified with sexual abstinence and mortification of the flesh. **“For if you live according to the flesh, you shall die”. (Romans 8:13)** Matthew even says if your eyes or hands cause you to sin, get rid of them. **[See: Matthew 5:29-30]** **“And they that are Christ's, have crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences.” (Galatians 5:24)** The outlook led not just to a simple renunciation of bodily pleasures; but to a sweeping denunciation of all bodily pleasures including affection, tenderness, and amusement, as well as to a rejection of bodily sustenance such as meat and drink. Paul says that he “chastises”

his body lest he be damned. **[See: 1 Corinthians 9:27]** Emotions are functions of the body; and Christianity, in order to be bodily divorced and emotionally inert, had to be grave and lugubrious. No good Christian could be frivolous or funny. In order to be a saint, one had to fast frequently, flagellate one's body ferociously, and be a frightened, frigid, anti sexual, gloom and doom fanatic. The anti sexual orientation of Christianity is part of the rejection of a corporal body perceived as sordid and obscene. Sex was thought of as essentially unclean and vile. Even though Jesus worked his first miracle at a marriage in Cana, **[See: John 2:1-10]** Paul, not only did not like sex, he did not like marriage. He begrudgingly allows marriage for those who can't contain themselves. **"For it is better to marry than to be burnt."** **(1 Corinthians 7:9)** Origen, the most influential theologian and Father of the Christian Church prior to Augustine, taking the advice of **Matthew 19:12**, castrated himself to show his attitude toward sexual pleasures. The notion of loving sex was a-priori wiped out. Love was separate from sex, and sex was not a useful instrument of love. Interestingly, nearly two thirds of the women who admitted to premarital sex in the various surveys like that of Alfred Kinsey, later married the man concerned. In spite of Christian doctrine, it seems sex can produce love. Jesus said he came that we might have life and have it more abundantly. **[See: John 10:10]** Jesus identified that greater life as love for God and for neighbor - and neighbor includes a wife. **[See: Matthew 22: 37-39]** Paul turned that message into an anti sexual, pro celibacy religion. The Greeks had their hetaerae and the Romans their courtesans; but sex in Greco Roman secular cultures was not a matter of guilt. It was Paul and the early Christians who created the guilt associated with sex, particularly non marital sex. As a major source of Christian doctrine, Paul turned Christianity into a religion that held sex contemptible and endowed marriage with second class Christian status. There was also an additional dimension to the Christian denunciation of sex. Early Christians were certain that

the final judgment of the world **[See: 2 Corinthians 5:10 & 1 Corinthians 15:51-54]** and the establishment of God's rule on earth was immanent. **[See: John 12:31; Romans 13:11-12; 1 Corinthians 7:29; and Revelation 14:7]** Consequently, it was not prudent to get involved in earthly matters and pursuits. With the last judgment in the wings, it was smarter to pay attention to heavenly things. With a fixation on a soon to come terrible judgment, Christianity became not only an anti sexual religion; it also became a frightening religion wherein sexuality could draw horrendous punishments from God. Women, because of Eve, were considered to be the root of sin. Adam was not seduced, Eve was. **[See: 1 Timothy 2:14]** In this first Epistle to Timothy, Paul says that women, since the time of Eve, have been loose and apt to seduce men. Younger widows are to be avoided; because they have grown wanton, and **“are not only idle, but tattlers also, and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not.” (1 Timothy 5:13)** In **1 Corinthians 7:1**, Paul says it is good for a man not to touch a woman. The dim Christian view of women fell in line with the traditional secular view that women were inferior to males and subject to males. Paul says that the head of every woman is a man. **[See: 1 Colossians 11: 3]** Wives, should be subject to their husbands. **[See: 1 Colossians 3:18 & Ephesians 5:22]** Christian male superiority, thoroughly tainted with the agricultural lore of a male seeding a women, claimed that women were inferior to men because Eve was made from a rib of Adam. Paul even went so far as to say that women were created to serve men. **[See: 1 Corinthians 11:8-9]** Women must learn in silence, must never be allowed to teach, must never be allowed to exercise authority over men, must always keep their heads covered, and if they wish to know anything they should ask their husbands at home. **[See: 1 Timothy 2:11-12 & 1 Corinthians 14:34-35]** Women will be saved by bearing children. **[See: 1 Timothy 2:15 & 5:14]** The New Testament also picks up on the secular Roman concept of marriage as a contract of marital duty and obligation.

Paul, in First Corinthians, says that husbands should render the “debt” to their wives; and wives likewise to husbands. [See: 1 Corinthians 7:4] Paul also says that celibacy, like his own, is the better state. [See: 1 Corinthians 7:7-8] Celibacy was exalted on the grounds that it not only suppressed the desires of the body, but also allowed those who were unmarried to pay attention to the things of God; while those who were married were solicitous about worldly things. [See: 1 Corinthians 7:32-34] What is glaring in these passages from the Bible is the fact that Christian sexual doctrine is derived from the secular doctrines of the anti corporeal Greco Roman philosophers. It is not derived from anything that Jesus said or did.

Early Christian sexual customs

Until Constantine, in the Edict of Milan of 313 AD, made Christianity the official religion of Rome; the Christians had been a lowly despised religious sect. Once given power, the Christian Church ruthlessly pursued “heretics” and other enemies in order to maintain that power. Back around 800 BCE a Greek by the name of Hesiod, in a work called the Theogony, recorded some of the Greek myths concerning the origins of the Universe. He wrote about the first woman on earth. She was called Pandora, and she opened a box that released all the ills and evils that mankind is subject to. Pandora epitomizes the manner in which ancient Greece perceived women. Women were seen as troublemakers and as major sources of temptation and evil. Hesiod described the progress of civilization as males and justice overcoming the disruptive forces of women. Roman Christians, then perpetuated the ancient animosity toward women. Like Pandora, the Biblical first woman, Eve, caused mankind to lose its felicitous state in the Garden of Eden; and become subject to misery, sickness and sin. Christian theology, built upon the Bible, also perpetuated a hostile view of women. As a burgeoning organization, the Church felt compelled to formulate rules and regulations for the guidance of its

members. When the early Christian Church, after its democratic “*Presbyterian*” days, became a dictatorial monarchy; ecclesiastical rulers felt free to enact Church laws or canons condemning and penalizing offenses that offended their personal sensibilities rather than Nature. They condemned, among other practices:

Homosexuality: from the Greek “homo” meaning one and the same. Homosexuality is homogenous sex or sex between same sex participants.

Bestiality: from the Latin word “*bestia*” meaning beast. Bestiality is sexual activity with an animal, or acting like an animal, or depraved sexual behavior - whatever that is.

Sodomy: named from the city of Sodom in the Old Testament. It refers to anal sex or any bestial sex. The word “*Qadesh*” in the Bible means holy woman; but it is translated as “sacred prostitute” or “**whore**” in the King James bible. The male “*Qadesh*” is translated in the King James Bible as “sodomite” instead of “holy man”; and “sodomite” refers to a male temple prostitute. On the basis of these questionable translations, **Deuteronomy 23:18** is then treated as forbidding Temple “sodomites” or “sacred whores”.

Adultery: from the Latin “*ad – alter*” meaning to make different. It is the same word as adulterate. It refers to corrupting a marital state by voluntary sex with a non-spouse.

Cunnilinguis: from the Latin words “*cuneous – linguis*” which transliterates into “*wedge – tongue*” or in Latin usage “vulva licker”. It means oral sex on a woman, popularly called “cunt licking”.

Fellatio: from the Latin “*fellare*” meaning to suck. It refers to oral sex on a male, popularly called “cock sucking”. “Fellare” is also the Latin root of the word fetus. Apparently a fetus is the male seed that a woman’s vagina and uterus suck into themselves during intercourse. When both fellatio and cunnilinguis are mutually simultaneous, the sexual act is called “soixante-neuf” or the 6/9

position.

Fornication: from the Latin “*forni*” which means arch. Roman prostitutes solicited trade from under arches. It means sex outside of marriage.

Post “quicken” abortion: The Latin root is “*ab-orire*” meaning to arise from or to be born. The past participle “*abortus*” means to be born prematurely. “*Orire*” is also the root of words such as origin, original and aboriginal. The early Church did not condemn abortion from the instant of conception. The Church condemned abortion only when it was after “quicken”, meaning when the mother could feel the child moving.

Masturbation: from the Latin words “*manus*” and “*stupare*” which together mean to stupefy with the hand.

self-mutilation: from the Latin “*mutilare*” which means to cut off and render imperfect. Self mutilation is the act of maiming self. The basic root is the same as mutate or change.

Incest: from the Latin “*castus*” meaning morally pure or chaste. It refers to adulterating one’s bloodline by having sex with close blood relatives. Current biologists know that incest or inbreeding causes offspring to come from a single gene pool. This results in all the offspring of a small gene pool being vulnerable to the same diseases. The result would be that a single disease could wipe out the entire bloodline.

Bigamy: from the Greek “*bi – gamos*” meaning twice married.

Not included was **paedophilia** or lust for little kids. Neither were **satyriasis** or **nymphomania**.

The canons also took aim at clerical celibacy by requiring it; and at mixed marriages between Christians and pagans by forbidding them. Because some early Christians looked upon marriage, not as a contract for exclusive mutual sex, but as a contract for not engaging in sex with others; the canons allowed divorce.

Consequently some canons dealt with remarriage. As Paul had instructed, other canons required women to cover their heads in order to approach the altar or to receive Holy Communion. Under Paul, the notion of religion as the worship of God was changed into the idea of *individual life lived* as a means to spiritual perfection. And Paul did not think Christian life should include marriage. But he begrudgingly allowed it for those whom he called “weak”. The prudish attitude toward sex that was created by Paul was reinforced in the minds of early Christians by the licentiousness of the times. They were appalled by all the sex going on around them. Consequently, asceticism became the spirituality and worship of the Christian Church. Spirituality was equated with renunciation of the world and with subjugation of the body. Fasting, mortification of the body and solitude became the nature of the Christian religion itself. In line with the neurotic fear of sex, the ultimate test of sanctity was chastity. Chastity and sanctity became one and the same thing. That historical situation is why, even today in America, most Christians think that the only sin is sex. Fraud, defamation of character, lying and cheating as well as ignorance - what are they? Are you telling me these are sins? [Ignorance is not nescience or absence of knowledge. Ignorance is *culpable nescience* of those things a person has an obligation to know, could have learned, but didn't. For example: ignorant is a doctor who is nescient concerning the disease he is treating in a patient; and the patient, who could have survived with proper treatment, dies.] Early Christians were required to attain a minimal level of chastity or more preferably, virginity. If called to a “higher” spiritual life, celibacy was the criterion. Christian chastity means fidelity to one's sexual status. If married, it means marital fidelity. If unmarried, it means virginity unless and until married. Virginity implies temporary celibacy while celibacy itself means a lifetime wipe-out of sex. *Abstinence from sex* even between married couples became a form of spirituality. These sexual standards included shunning any and

all interaction with the opposite sex. Christianity still has the same view. In keeping with the ascetical regimens that were ignorantly identified as sanctity; the early Christian Church attempted to apply the criterion of chastity equally to men and to women. Christian males did not appreciate this. By the 4th century the old double standard was back in favor. In deference to agricultural sex wherein men own women as farmland, women alone were censured and punished for not being chaste. Libidinous men were applauded. Spiritual equality between the sexes also implied that if a husband could get rid of an adulterous wife, a wife should be able to dump an adulterous husband. But this problem of male adultery was solved by not calling a married man's outside liaisons adulterous. Sexual indiscretions by married men were not treated as adultery. The aggrieved wife had to accept them; but if the wife sinned, that was genuine adultery. Under Pauline doctrine, women were denied official Christian roles. Women as the source of sin, were not allowed to own or inherit property. Eventually, Christianity created a place for competent Christian women who wished to contribute to Christianity. Like Greco Roman women, Christian women were given two choices. The first choice was to marry. The second choice, however, was not the choice of being a Hetaera; but the choice of being nudged into a convent - for life. Fasting, along with marital abstinence from sex, the day before receiving communion became rigid requirements. The requirement of fasting before receiving communion survived into the 20th century. In the manner of Jewish traditions concerning ritual cleanness and uncleanness, a Christian must not engage in profane things like eating and sexing before coming into contact with holy things. The wedding night became a celibacy night because of its proximity to the just received sacrament of matrimony. This practice of keeping the profane separated from the sacred, by way of time; had its foundation in the Roman Catholic Old Testament book of Tobias, which is an apocryphal book from the Septuagint not contained in Protestant Bibles.

Somewhere along the line, the warped Christian attitudes toward sex resulted in a real zinger. It was called “*syneisaktism*” or “spiritual marriage”. Spiritual marriage was designed as a test of one’s commitment to virginity. It consisted of an unmarried male and an unmarried female living together in a strictly sexless relationship. It almost always failed, because most participants could not keep their hands off each other. Spiritual cohabitation on a secular plane was tried again in the middle ages as a form of courtly love between an adoring knight and a noble lady. It didn’t work that time either. Because it views marriage as second class status next to celibacy, the Christian Church adopted the low brow Greco Roman ceremonies of *matrimonium justum* and *sexual contract* as the Christian form of marriage. Christians who marry do not get to eat cake. Notwithstanding the eccentric outlook of some early Christians that marriage is a contract for *not having sex*; the Roman “matrimonial” or “*matrimonium justum*”, sex contract became and still is Christian marriage. Christian marriage, like Roman marriage, is executed as an exchange of sworn consent or vows before witnesses, and is constitutively a bilateral contract for exclusive and lifelong mutual sex. The only change Christians made was to substitute the celebration of the Eucharist for the usual pagan sacrifice and call the marriage contract a symbol of the union between Christ and His Church. In effect, the Church adopted the prevailing Roman, civil marriage format and “sanctified” it by calling it a sacrament. Divorce and remarriage were somewhat of an option because of a statement, found twice in the Gospel of Matthew. Matthew, quoting Jesus, says that adultery is justification for divorce and remarriage. **[See: Matthew 5:32 & 19:9]** Former Church Canon law, as well as the Poenitentials, reflected this concession. That concession remained for about 4 centuries. However, in the early 5th century Christian marriages were starting to be considered lifelong. In the 16th century, the Council of Trent authoritatively declared marriage to be a Christian sacrament. As

previously noted, a sacrament, within Christianity, is a magical symbol that actually does what it signifies. In declaring Christian marriage to be a sacrament that signifies the union between Christ and his Church, the Council coincidentally made Christian marriage absolutely indissoluble under any circumstances. If the union of Christ and His Church could never fail, then neither could its symbol, the sacrament of matrimony. Hence, no divorce! But at that point, the Church had a problem; what to do about the dual passages in Matthew that allow divorce. Biblical scholars, like good lawyers, solved the problem by abracadabra. They declared the passages in the Gospel of Matthew to be fake insertions. However, they dared not remove the offending passages; and currently, many a Christian denomination utilizes these passages to justify their approval of divorce. Luther, in order to get rid of the absolute indissolubility, dumped the sacramental character of Christian marriage and called marriage a purely civil matter.

These days the no-divorce outlook also has been mitigated by the Catholic Church to say that in certain circumstances a divorce is okay; but a subsequent remarriage is not. In addition, divorce is acceptable when it allows a Christian to enter into a holy state of celibacy within a monastery or within the Priesthood. The good theologians also left open another doorway to dissolving marriages. This one allows for remarriage. If a married pagan is converted to Christianity and that convert's pagan spouse wants nothing to do with the whole affair, the Christian convert is allowed to marry a Christian. It's called the Pauline Privilege, because it is based upon Paul's statement in First Corinthians wherein Paul says a Christian is not bound to a pagan who stays behind. **[See: 1 Corinthians 7:15]** However, the best approach developed by the Church, and utilized by American civil law as well, was to find a flaw in the legalities of the original marriage and call that marriage voidable. Voidable is a legal term applied to contracts. It means the required conditions for a valid and binding contract were absent at the time of the

contract. For example: the bride was only ten years old. After a declaration of “null and void”, everyone just pretends the marriage and any accompanying sex never happened. It’s called an annulment. Like the Pauline Privilege, annulment allows for remarriage; but any children born of such voidable non-marriages are nevertheless considered legitimate.

The Fathers of the Church

The title “Father of the Church” is generally bestowed upon the notable Christian writers who developed original Christian theology. These writers, many of whom were bishops, integrated Bible teachings, ecclesiastical proclamations and the dogmas proclaimed by Church Councils by integrating them under some *system* of philosophy. The Fathers of the Church created a standard body of teaching that became the basic Christian doctrine taught to all Christians even to the present day. As the title “father” denotes, all the Fathers of the Church were males. Although some of them were also “Apostolic Fathers”, the Church Fathers are not the same as the “Apostolic Fathers”. The “Apostolic Fathers” are those men who had direct contact with the Apostles themselves. They were men who knew the Apostles of Jesus. These men include the 3rd Pope of the Christian Church called Clement of Rome who wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians. This Epistle is the earliest piece of Christian writing of known authorship outside of the New Testament itself. Other authoritative male writers of the period were known as “apologists” or writers against heresies. The apologists included men such as Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, France. Irenaeus is the man who said there are only 4 Gospels because 4 is the order of the Universe. He is considered to have produced the first systematic treatment of the Christian doctrine of his time. Later on, the “Doctors” or oracles of the Church appeared on the scene. Almost everyone has heard of Augustine of Hippo and of Jerome. Jerome translated the Bible into vulgar Latin. Augustine, on the other hand, is the primary source of today’s

“Christian” sex doctrine.

Theology is an attempt to synthesize Biblical doctrine and human knowledge acquired from the world around. It is an attempt to explain God’s revealed truth in terms of the known factual truths of this Universe we live in. Theology is an attempt to follow the command found in **Romans 1:20**. In fact, the 10 commandments are “theology”, because they are a Divine revelation of the basic *behavioral laws demanded by **human nature** as intelligent and free-willed*. While most of modern Christian theology is based upon Aristotelianism, modern Christian **sex doctrine** remains locked into Platonist and Stoic philosophy. The doctrines of Plato and the Stoics were applied by the early Church Fathers to the ancient agricultural sex-lore and to the anti-sexual messages of Paul. They still are. When it came to the question of what human knowledge to apply to Revelation, the Fathers of the Church were all in favor of Platonism with a heavy dose of Stoicism. The “other world” character of Plato’s doctrines matched the “other world” character of Christianity, while Stoicism provided a rationale for Christian asceticism. Stoic Natural Law theory also provided the basis for a theological harmony of universal, unchanging, *natural ethics*, and universal, unchanging, *Divinely revealed morality*. Since the Christian God is the Author of nature, His Natural Law became Divine word along with the Divine word found in the Bible. But just as people can misinterpret the Bible, they can also misinterpret Nature - and do it deliberately if it suits their purposes. And so it was that the *erroneous* Natural Law doctrine of natural blue blooded rulers and natural obsequious subjects, caused theological moral doctrine to be systemized under the Greek hierarchical pyramid of pure ecclesiastical rulers and impure Christian minions. This was a nasty case of “science” dictating Divine revelation rather than explaining Divine revelation. And anyone who believes Ecclesiastical bureaucrats are sinless and can unerringly dictate the nature of all sins has their head in the

sand. It is true that in contemporary America, American secular cultural sex doctrine and State laws regarding sex are derived from Christian doctrine. But at the time Christian sex doctrine originally was formulated, the situation was just the opposite. It was cultural sex doctrine that became the format for Christian sex doctrine. In the original applications of reason to Revelation, applying reason resulted in the application of culturally relative concepts to Revelation. Even Paul was thoroughly imbued with the Roman cultural sex doctrines of marriage as a contract for planting seed, the subordination of women to men, and a body-soul dualism.

Like Paul, the Fathers of the Church likewise were thoroughgoing products of their own culture. They also saw sex through the eyes of the agricultural definition of a male planting seed into a female. The ancient cultural concept of male seed ascribed to male seed the properties we now know belong to the zygote or *an already fertilized female gamete*. Agricultural sex-lore pictures sex in the fashion of a mother wasp implanting its eggs into a paralyzed victim. When the eggs hatch, they feed on the body of the victim. Ancient agricultural sex-lore depicts human sex in much the same manner. Agricultural sex-lore says that human reproduction occurs when male seed containing the entire offspring is deposited within the female womb where it feeds off of menstrual blood. The woman is simply an apt incubator. The plant picture itself is off base, because a plant seed that will grow when planted has to be already pollinated. But primitive botany did not know that, so human planters of male seed thought the totality of new human life was contained in male seed. The purveyors of primitive botany viewed females as non agent sources of reproduction. That totalitarian notion of male seed obviously renders the male superior to the female. It also accounts for the horrified reactions of Christianity to such things as nocturnal pollutions and sodomy. In addition, this chauvinist view of sex accounts for the fact that male

masturbation draws hysterical reactions, while female masturbation simply gets a nod. And artificial contraception, under agricultural sex-lore, is viewed as a ghastly waste of little humans. The Fathers of the Church, not only applied culturally relative concepts to Revelation, many of them, as previously noted, were personally sexual misfits and misogynists. Almost all of the Fathers of the Church were extremists. Many went through a period of licentiousness during their early years, but later advocated severe asceticism and discipline. As the saying goes, “there is nothing worse than a reformed drunk”. When they had engaged in sex earlier in life, they experienced sex as something that overrode their better knowledge and their desired self control. Consequently, almost all of them saw sex itself as evil and obscene; and they condemned not only the waste of seed, but sex itself. In order to explain their own extreme, overpowering, passionate reactions to sex; they followed the lead of the Jewish theologian, Philo; and they accused sex of being irrational because of Original Sin. They assumed that prior to original sin, sex could be controlled by the will in the same fashion as deliberately moving one’s arm. The “Fathers” of allegedly Christian, agricultural sex precepts said that in the garden of Eden, Adam willed an erection and he willed ejaculation. Eve, in turn, willed fertility. Because their own lust had been overpowering, the “Fathers” saw, not just sex, but all emotion as evil. Hence, they claimed that before the Fall, evil passions and emotions did not exist. In a consequent burst of irrationality, the Fathers of the Church declared that emotions are not part of the nature of humans, they are the consequences of Original Sin. After the Fall, sex could not be controlled deliberately by the will any more than the will can control a sneeze. As part of the association of sex with Original Sin, and their own inability to control themselves in the face of alluring women, the Fathers of the Church also took many a shot at women in general and Eve in particular as the source of temptation and the Fall. Jerome, who created the Vulgate Bible, and who had a rather

tarnished sexual reputation among his contemporaries; labeled women as “the path of wickedness,” “the sting of the serpent,” and “perilous objects”. He also said passionate sex even within marriage is a sin. He claimed that any man who loved his wife too sensually was an adulterer. Although he later defected, the lawyer Quintus Tertullianus, son of a Roman centurion, was one of the greatest of the early Western theologians. He gave the theological language of the West a legalistic cast that has never been replaced. According to Tertullian, Christian morality is a matter of law. And ever since, Christians have thought that obedience to the law is sanctity. They are confounded by the actual fact that sanctity is the *effect on self* that obedience to the law produces. Moral obedience is not worth a tinker’s damn if it does not permanently change a person’s character or habits toward what is right. Tertullian said of women that they were the “devil’s gateway.” Referring to Eve, he called her “the first deserter of the divine law”; and said she was the reason why Jesus had to die - which is theological poppycock, because creatures do not cause changes of mind or decisions or reactions in the *unchangeable* Creator. In conjunction with his malicious attitude toward woman in general and Eve in particular, Tertullian said that starting with Eve, sex transmitted man’s fallen state from generation to generation. It was Tertullian who came up with the notion of Original Sin; and he blamed its transmission on sex.

The most prominent of the Church Fathers, and one of the most vociferous on sexual matters, was Augustine of Hippo [Algeria, North Africa]. We know Augustine had early problems with sex, because he wrote a whole book about it called his “Confessions”. He, like the other Fathers of the Church, associated his experience of uncontrollable irrational sex with Original Sin. Unlike some of the others, however, Augustine did not say that Original Sin was sex. He was smart enough to realize that if sex before the Fall was cool, calm and collected, if sex, prior to Original Sin, was emotionless; it could not have been something that

would tempt Adam and Eve. But after sinning, Adam and Eve felt naked in a new way and felt compelled to cover up their genitals because they could no longer control them. To Augustine, sexual arousal was involuntary. But Original sin was not an uncontrollable irrational sex act. Instead sex was uncontrollable as a consequence of, and a punishment for, Original Sin. This stance allowed Augustine to say that Pre Fall, **pristine agricultural reproductive sex** was a good thing created by God, but that Pre Fall pristine agricultural reproductive sex was now vitiated by the overwhelming surrounding passion that resulted from Original Sin. Augustine was saying that Post Fall copulation by fallen Man is intrinsically evil, but is rescued by emotionless procreative agricultural sex within marriage. Satisfaction of lust is transformed into a redeeming duty of propagating the race, and the intrinsic sinfulness of post Fall lusty intercourse is extenuated. Moreover, said Augustine, marital intercourse itself is evil and sinful if the intention of the spouses is not pure procreation. If married couples go at it for pleasure, they sin; because pure sex before the Fall did not involve passion or pleasure. According to Augustine, sex is evil under any circumstances unless it is marital sex intended for purely procreative purposes. This explains the obsession of Christian doctrine with *procreative marital sex*. Post Paradisal sex requires justification. Marital sex purely for procreation is the justification. Any form of sex outside of procreative **marital** sex and not accompanied by procreative intention is unjustified and evil. [And now you know why marriage, in spite of being an artificial contract in the minds of ecclesiastics, dictates the nature and thus the morality of sex, rather than the nature of sex dictating the validity and morality of the artificial contract of marriage. It is a claim that the man made marriage contract **causes** the existence and nature of sex. It works just like claiming the shape of clothes causes the shape of the human body.] But even when justified by marital procreation, Christian sex is still deformed. Procreative sex transmits the world's first venereal disease or "STD",

namely, Original Sin. In other words, Christian doctrine, as derived from Augustine and the other Fathers of the Church, says that sex, because of the Fall, is in and of itself evil and propagates Original Sin. That is how Christian guilt got associated with sex. Married people, truly in love, are accepted as not having a desire to run wild but a desire to unite. Yet put the very same desire to unite in the context of unmarried individuals, and these unmarried people in love are accused of wild drives. When the very same reality is proposed without referring to contracts, somehow or other the same reality is no longer the same. In truth, however, the fact of a marital contract does not change the realities of love and sex.

However, calling sex intrinsically evil made a lot of people, even Churchmen, extremely uncomfortable. Because sex is a built in, integral part of the human body; calling sex intrinsically evil is like calling your head intrinsically evil. Intrinsically evil sex doesn't fit well with the notion of Logos, or of Natural Law or with Divinely *ordered nature*. Further, Augustine's notion of justification is fundamentally illogical. He proposed what everyone knows what you cannot do. He proposed that you cannot use a good end [reproduction] to justify an intrinsically evil means [sex]. Actions that are intrinsically evil, such as murder, are evil no matter what the circumstances or purposes. If sex is intrinsically evil, then it is evil not only outside of marriage; it is evil inside of marriage. Intrinsically evil sex fits even worse with common sense. Calling sex intrinsically evil is like calling speech intrinsically evil. In the course of transition to modern times, Augustine's radical notion that sex of itself is evil, lasted in the form of sex outside of marriage is evil *because it is outside of marriage*. Of course, if marriage is the sole criterion for the morality of sex, then there is no such thing as "unnatural" sex. There is only *marital sex that is good* even if "unnatural", and *non-marital sex that is evil no matter what*. While turning marital sex into the savior of any sort of sex;

Augustine said that human sex is concupiscible *animal appetite or lust*. He then proceeded to state that procreative marital sex required the face to face missionary position. For moral marital sex, the husband had to be on top and the wife face up underneath. The necessity that the wife be underneath is another reproductive requirement that comes with agricultural plant sex-lore. It is the notion that a woman on top could lose the seed implanted in her. The face to face requirement also was considered to provide some semblance of humanness to the act, because brute animals do it doggie style. Foreplay was taboo because it was unproductive lust, and only the penis in the vagina was proper. Sex surveys indicate that many current Americans still think foreplay is sinful. Any format for sex other than immediate marital penetration of the vagina is thought to be sinful, because it is not reproductive.

Even though they thought that marriage justified sex, the Fathers of the Church could not bring themselves to commend it. Like Paul, they looked upon it as a concession to weaker individuals. Copulation was treated as a unfortunate and deplorable exigency. They constantly painted marriage as an onerous state. They managed to create a dismal and depressing picture of marriage which they called, a "sad tragedy" and a "galling burden". Augustine died in the year 430 AD; and by that time Christian theology was thoroughly besotted with the *inhuman*, culturally relative sexual traditions of ancient *agricultural* sex, as well as being colored by Hellenistic Judaism, Greek anti corporeal dualism, and Roman legalism. Christian doctrine was totally saturated with the idea that the only thing women were good for was the care and feeding of male generated offspring. Distinctively Christian elements such as Original Sin contributed further negativity to the sexual morality of Christianity. Like the Greek philosophers, the Christian Fathers viewed Christian life as contemplative detachment from the world and its attractions. The inferior nature of women along with evil sex all combined to produce an exaltation

of celibacy and a deprecation of marriage. People who have designed their very lives and sexuality on the basis of these paternalistic anti sex, plant theories are not going to like this; but it is the considered opinion of most **competent theologians** of whatever Christian denomination that Patristic agricultural sex ideology, so obviously out of tune with human nature, is a bucket of rubbish. Few people on the face of the earth would accept the notion that emotions and passions are punishments rather than intrinsic functions of human nature like seeing and hearing. Few would accept the idea that thinking is natural but feeling is not. Even the Greeks, who thought that feelings were lower functions, never declared them to be alien to human nature. From a religious point of view, the sexual suppositions of the Fathers of the Church, when critically examined, contain little logical relationship to anything considered Revealed doctrine. And they obviously have even less relationship to human sex as it exists in the world of factual Nature. Except for the allowance of divorce in the Gospel of Matthew which refers to divorce as not always being so, *nowhere in Scripture* is human sex defined as intrinsically evil and directly attributed to Original Sin. Although it describes some forms of sex as evil, Scripture never says sex itself is evil. The tree from which Adam and Eve ate is called the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Hardly a description of sex. Moreover, there is no Biblical indication, not even a hint, that after sinning Adam and Eve got married in order to justify being fruitful and multiplying. And Scripture never says that emotions are the result of Original Sin. Jesus had emotions; so if emotions are intrinsically evil, Jesus was evil. The same is true of Jesus if death is part of sinful human nature. If the emotional and crucified Jesus was sinless, neither emotions nor death can be part of fallen human nature. They have to be part of pristine sinless human nature. Painful childbirth and male dominance are the only sexually related consequences of Original Sin that Scripture expresses. **[See: Genesis 3:16]** The sins enveloped by the Ten

Commandments are not expressed as derived from Original Sin. Neither are the sins of Sodom and Gomorra. The Pauline statement about marrying rather than being burnt refers to licentiousness, not the redemption of sex. Although Scripture does say there is no marriage and no sex in Heaven, [See: **Matthew 22:30**] not even Paul declared sex to be intrinsically evil. He, like the subsequent Fathers of the Church, had a thing about sex; but he never called it intrinsically evil. The sanctimonious sexual twaddle of the early theologians is nothing but imaginative and emotional fiction and self justification in the form of: “I could not help myself. I’m a sex addict”. And do not forget, the seed planting notion of sex has nothing to do with Revelation or the Bible. Although the Old Testament is full of agricultural language, it is not agricultural sex that is being revealed. Agricultural language is used because that is the language the ancient Jews understood. Like calling God a *He*, agricultural sex is simply the cultural garment of the truths that are being revealed. Sadly, in spite of the fact that these sexual doctrines are subjective and emotional rather than objective and discerning, they were immediately accepted as part of the so called “deposit of Faith” and thus became authoritative and “infallible” Christian doctrine.

The Fathers of the Church and those who followed seem to have forgotten that the resurrection of Jesus and the resurrection of all humankind during the second coming is a restoration of the body to the soul. Apparently God thinks the human body is worthwhile even if the Fathers of the Church did not.

Historical Middle Ages

The Byzantine half of the original Roman Empire endured for over 1400 years. Constantinople was overrun by the Turks in the year 1453 AD. The Latin half was not so long lived. The last Western Roman Emperor, Romulus Augustulus was displaced by German invaders led by Odoacer in the year 476 AD. Although this could have been the demise of the Greco Roman basis of Western culture, it

wasn't. Fortunately, throughout the Dark Ages, Greek learning and Roman law were preserved *by the Byzantine Christians and by Muslims in Cairo and Baghdad.*

Basic Medieval periods

The term "Middle Ages" came from Renaissance humanists who defined it as the period from the end of the Roman Empire in the 5th century until their own time around the 15th century. They saw their own time as a rebirth of Greco-Roman civilization. Historians, in turn sub-divided the Middle Ages. The first period, lasting about 500 years, or until about the year 1000, came to be known as the Dark Ages. The following 300 years or so are called the High Middle ages. The 14th and 15th centuries are known as the Late Middle Ages.

The Early Middle Ages of Western sex-lore

The Early Middle Ages was the period during which Christianity became the culture and religion of Europe. Europe, during that time was broken up into barbarian kingdoms; but each wave of barbarian invaders was for the most part converted to Christianity. In consequence, the Church was the strongest single influence in Europe; and the Pope was the most powerful and richest man in Europe. The great feudal type war lords in those days, second only to the Pope in wealth, power and military might, were the archbishops, bishops, and abbots. Church magistrates had jurisdiction not only over Church matters; but also over the innards of marriage, of family life, of children and of inheritances. The threat and punishment used by the Church to maintain power was excommunication. Excommunication meant not only fire and brimstone in hell; but also the earthly loss of family, status, job, wealth and income. Later on, the Inquisition, after imposing excommunication on heretics, used the secular authorities to enforce earthly penalties which by then included imprisonment and burning at the stake. The Church would also impose Interdictions upon the territories of lords and

nobles who scoffed at being excommunicated. Interdict closed the Churches and brought marriages and burials in sacred ground to a halt. These penalties would cause angry insurrection in a noble's subjects. Consequently, Interdict scared recalcitrant nobles into submission.

Ownership of land was the source of wealth and power in this dark ages agricultural society. Local lords ruled their territories and their extended families as well as conjoint peasants. The contract between an overlord and his knights who provided military support in return for land is called feudalism. Feudalism was a form of government basically consisting of security contracts between big time war lords and small time war lords. The overlord paid off the little lords with land in return for using them as his army. The form of culture under feudalism was manorialism. Manorialism refers to the form of family and serf management utilized by the lords and knights. Manorialism is a form of agriculture. Manorial estates were large farms tilled by serfs. Although the lord of the family, in effect, owned everything; an extended family was run as a sort of commune. All family resources were held in common. None of its members owned personal property. Individuals contributed their labor and services; and, in turn, received what they needed. The feudal overlord, from his castle, ruled over a combination of family members, knights, servants, apprentices, employees, lodgers, chaplains, serfs, entertainers, retainers and visiting guests. These communities required efficient organization. That organization, was a hierarchy. Seniors had power over juniors, men had power over women and parents had power over children. Birth, not merit, determined the status of the individual. Competition and striving for improvement of status was basically unacceptable. All had to accept their appointed place. As a result, the members were able to live a rather secure and tranquil life. However, the security and tranquility of the individual came at a price. There was strict and rigid limitation to individual ambition and mature self development. The status of a

member of a patriarchal family is that of a perpetual child. Self-governance was not available, only filial obedience.

On Christmas day in the year 800, the Pope crowned Charlemagne as the Emperor over the whole of the West. The gesture was a bit pretentious. Vikings, Muslims and Magyars were carving up various portions of the West. One hundred and ninety two years later, the then reigning Pope crowned Otto of Saxony as emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. The Pope crowned the Holy Roman emperors because secular civil authority was thought to rest in the Pope along with ecclesiastical authority. The Pope was the feudal lord of all Europe; and the Holy Roman emperors were his subjects. The nominal restoration of a united Roman empire marks the end of this Medieval period.

The High Middle Ages of Western sex-lore

During the 11th to the 14th centuries, the Ecclesiastical feudal form of government became urban. It is the period within which powerful towns began to emerge and vie for power with the Pope and with feudal lords. Feudalism is government of people. Local government is government of place. Feudalism is government structured by function or rule over a fixed set of subjects whose *territory can change*. Local government is government structured by rule over a fixed territory whose *subjects can change*. Feudal government holds the same population fixed in their varying stations. Urban government holds a variable population to the same fixed rules of the place. The economics of urban towns also differs from the economics of feudal manorialism. Manorialism is a form of self-sufficient agriculture wherein wealth consists of land. Manorial economics is extended family enterprise. It is the economics of the Greek “*oikos*”. Urban economics is the economics of the “polis”. Urban economics consist of commercial trade or exchange of goods, and wealth consists of money. Modern economics consists primarily of the latter. The most aggressive towns, like Venice

and Milan, became rich enough, by way of taxes, to buy arms and military forces which they utilized for getting rid of feudal masters and for conquering their neighbors.

Living in an early medieval town was no picnic for the average person. Each town was a small fortress open in the center to allow for a cathedral and a central market place. Houses were narrow and cramped, while streets were sewers into which garbage was thrown and chamber pots emptied. With contaminated water supplies and raw sewage all over, towns were incubators for plagues. For wealthy blue-bloods, life was a bit more silken. Their courts were social centers wherein the ladies demanded courtly love. Monasteries, located just outside of many towns, were centers for learning. During this Medieval period Arabic mathematics and the mathematical concept of zero, along with the works of the Greek philosophers, particularly Aristotle, were re-acquired from the Muslims in Spain. These historical incidents had enormous impact on Western culture. Prior to the rediscovery of Aristotle's philosophy, Augustine's theology and that of the other Fathers of the Church was the predominant mode of thought in Medieval Europe. But the intellectual playground of Augustine's form of thought was Plato's out of this world realm of independent essences. Aristotle's thought, in contrast to Plato's, addresses the world in which we really live. One might think that Plato versus Aristotle is an ivory tower tête-à-tête; but today's science and technology depend upon where scientists think the Logos of the world is located. Is Logos within this world as Aristotle thought, or is Logos in a world of its own as Plato thought? Without the Arab reintroduction of Aristotelian thought into the Western world; more than likely, there would have been no Galileo and no Isaac Newton and no mathematical physics as a tool for examining and gaining control of the real world. Without the Aristotelian point of view, the culture of contemporary Europe and America probably would be more like the culture of Tibet, than the culture we

today live in. Even though many a fearful ultra conservative is trying desperately to put us back into Plato's world; had Plato's world prevailed, we would be living in a world of Mythos rather than Logos.

The reformation of Platonist thought into an Aristotelian mode was accomplished primarily by a Dominican Friar named Thomas Aquinas. Following his lead, the intellectual world of Scholasticism arose and so did the reputations of teachers like Aquinas. These learned scholars attracted numerous students and became the source of the great universities of the 12th century. At these universities men could become masters of arts and obtain a "licentiate" which is a license to teach. Males could also study theology, law, or medicine. Most education during the early days of the universities was aimed at producing clergymen or teachers. Later on, both male and female students started to attend the universities for some of the same reasons they do today. Many did not wish to become either clergy or teachers or learn a profession; but they did wish to develop their intellectual and social lives. The emphasis on knowledge for its impact on self and self development led to the Liberal Arts, Humanism and the Renaissance. The orientation to self development by way of knowledge and self governance rather than by way of obedience to Church mandates, ultimately caused a crucial change in the notion of a spiritual life. Asceticism, although still a powerful ideal, started to give way to self control. Asceticism and its accompanying conservatism is a contraction of personal experience; self governance and its liberation from dependence on others is an expansion of personal experience. Self governance and self development lead not only to greater awareness of the surrounding natural world, but also to greater awareness of the powers, passions and pleasures that come from within one's self. Individuality and emotion along with the natural and the secular become significant. When this point of view is exemplified in the arts and publicized in writing, it reaches the general populace; and people start taking a

second look at doctrines such as other world Christian life and the divine right of kings. Social change, however, usually brings a violent reaction from ultra conservatives. The reaction from Catholic radicals was the Inquisition and vicious persecution of all who were not staunch Catholics. The attacks were aimed both at individuals such as Galileo, and at groups such as Muslims and Jews.

Perhaps as part of its attempt to divorce itself from Judaism, the Christian Church, from its earliest days, had labeled Jews, “Christ killers”. In consequence of the rise of towns, the Jews had become noticeable pockets of urban populations; and this made them targets of ugly persecutions. The Crusaders on the way to Jerusalem massacred huge numbers of Jews. Vicious fables about Jews who murdered and ate Christian children were circulated. Jews were pictured as diabolical creatures who were plotting to take over the world. In spite of the Holocaust, these racist notions persist, not only in contemporary Europe but also in contemporary America. Laws were passed which restricted Jews to ghettos within the towns and restricted the types of employment they could engage in. Since lending money at interest was considered evil usury, Christians were forbidden to engage in lending but Jews were allowed to do it. That made some Jews, like the Rothschilds rich; but it also brought resentment and hatred of Jewish lenders from Christian borrowers who couldn’t repay. If you wish to lose a friend or a relative, lend them money and expect repayment.

Along with the Byzantine Liberal Arts and Aristotelian thinking, Medieval Europe also acquired the Byzantine law codes of Justinian I (483-565). Justinian I was a Byzantine emperor who grabbed control over the West when the “Barbarian” Odoacer got rid of the Western emperor, Romulus Augustulus. The acquisition and study of the Justinian legal compilation during the 11th and 12th centuries taught the Europeans how to establish a codified body of *positive* law. In contrast, there is another form of organized positive law called *common law*. The

difference between codified law and common law is roughly the difference between an organized body of permanent statutes enacted by a legislative body and a collection of case law or judicial decisions treated as permanent legal precedents. In effect, codes of *common law* are based on the past while statute law codes are enacted to deal with the present and the future. Common law uses history to evaluate the present and the future. Today, the law in England is basically common law. It arose because itinerant judges appointed by the king moved from place to place administering local laws. These judges then used the same precedents in more than one locality producing a broader or more commonly accepted body of laws valid in more than one jurisdiction. Eventually, some of the expansive decisions of the judges were accepted throughout England. A codified common law structure is also the State civil system in California. Most European societies adopted a codified approach to law, as did the Church and the founders of the United States. In France, Napoleon had a civil code enacted that still remains in force and has had major influence in Latin America. The Napoleonic code constitutes the first *deliberately secular* code in Christian European history. It is based upon an attempt to create a code free of past inequities and religious prejudices as well as to separate State laws from Church laws. The Napoleonic code, like American law, grants all citizens equality and equal protection. It contains no class privileges. Because Louisiana, named after Louis XIV, was once a French colony; Louisiana has a Napoleonic civil code. However, the overall influence of this code has waned in contemporary times probably because it isn't riddled with Greek hierarchies. The Napoleonic civil code, however, does not get rid of female subjection to males.

The Late Middle Ages

The black death or Bubonic plague which occurred in the 14th century killed nearly half of Europe's population. This caused a short labor supply and higher

wages. The greater financial freedom of the peasants and villagers produced greater individual freedom. In England a “peasant’s revolt” occurred with peasants demanding an end to serfdom. Along with the rise of towns, these conditions caused the death of feudalism and the birth of local and national forms of government. What is critical to this change is the fact that cities and nations are not organized as religious communities. They are secular organizations. This means that townspeople no longer lived lives ordered by religion. They lead lives ordered by secular governments and secular laws. “Secular” in late medieval Europe had a rather specific meaning. It did not simply mean non-religious; nor did it mean anti-religious. Secular and “secularism” meant that humans were not creatures fallen from grace in the garden of Eden. They were not creatures who needed redemption through the Church. Secularism meant the doctrine that humans were a part of nature and nature was quite okay, thank you. Under secularism, life becomes self governing and religion and religious morality no longer rule. Individualism and humanism predominate, and societies possess sovereign secular authority that is not derived from the Church or the Pope. From secular rule, regional and national civic awareness emerged replacing religious awareness. This transition from Church rule over feudal society to political rule over cities and nations by secular governments is marked by a general struggle for supremacy between Church and State.

A second major consequence of Secularism was the Renaissance. The core of the Renaissance or renewal movement was a re-examination and re-study of classical Greek and Roman civilization and ideology. The interest in these civilizations was triggered by the fact that they were secular. Greece and Rome were not Christian societies. Their cultures were purely natural. If a person wished to know and emulate the workings of purely natural societies, all that person had to do is look at the lives and thought of the Greeks and Romans. The breakup of religious homogeneity was accompanied by the emergence of what

might be called national languages. The indigenous language of the conquered Romans was called vulgar Latin, vulgar meaning the Latin of the common folk. Languages based on vulgar Latin became the languages of various European nations. These languages are called Romance Languages; not because they are Romantic, but because they are Roman. In addition, the rise of secular nationalism spawned many a war between emerging European countries. Even the Church got into the factionalism. Along with fighting secular governments for power over Europe, the Roman Popes wound up with rival Popes in Avignon France and in Pisa Italy. A century after the Council of Constance settled the multiple Popes issue, Martin Luther ignited the Protestant revolution. The late middle ages also saw the apogee of Renaissance humanism, the blossoming of courtly love and the beginnings of the Age of Romance of the 19th and 20th centuries.

The Medieval Church and learning

The Christian catechism

Catechisms are instruction manuals constructed in the form of questions and answers, originally designed for teaching the common folk. They were a form of religious instruction. The first of the Christian catechisms was created in the 8th century by a monk named Alcuin. Others followed. In the 16th century, Martin Luther created a catechism explaining the Creed, the ten commandments and the Lord's prayer. That catechism is contained in the Lutheran Book of Concord. John Calvin also wrote a couple of catechisms; and the Council of Trent published a Roman Catholic version called the Catechism of Pius the Fifth. In the year 1563, the Heidelberg catechism became the accepted catechism of all Reform Churches which today include the Dutch and German reformed Churches of America. The catechism of the Anglican Church is contained in the Book of Common Prayer. The first part explains the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal symbol, and the Nicene

Creed as the adequate expression of the Christian faith. Other explanations address the Lord's prayer and the Ten Commandments. The second part explains the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. In America the Catholic bishops got together in Baltimore in the year 1885 and created the American Baltimore catechism. The current Roman Catholic catechism from the 2nd Vatican Council really isn't a catechism at all. The English version is a 900 page tome.

The poenitentials

The poenitentials or penitentials were somewhat like catechisms. They were designed principally for the use of Priests, especially in the confessional. In the manner of question and answer catechisms, the penitentials would lay out a taboo and then list the penalties and penances for breaking that taboo. A sampling of their ancient contents, such as **human** life begins 40 days after conception, should provide a bit of insight into the modern changes in Christian doctrine that are today erroneously proclaimed as part of the traditional "Deposit of Faith". The following examples are quoted from: **Medieval Handbooks of Penance, translated by John T. McNeill and Helena M. Gamer, Records of Civilization series, Dept. of History, Columbia University, vol. 29 (New York, Octagon Books, 1965)**

- ◆ If the wife of anyone commits fornication, he may put her away and take another; that is, if a man puts away his wife on account of fornication, if she was his first, he is permitted to take another; but if she wishes to do penance for her sins, she may take another husband after five years. (P. 208)
- ◆ In the case of one whose wife is barren, both he and she shall live in continence. (P. 105)
- ◆ "Qui semen in os miserit" [literally - whoever squirts semen into the mouth], shall do penance for seven years; this is the worst of evils. (P. 186)
- ◆ A woman may not take a vow without the consent of her husband; (P. 196)

- ◆ Women who commit abortion before [the fetus] has life, shall do penance for one year or for the three forty day periods or for forty days, according to the nature of the offense; and if later, that is, *more than forty days after conception*, [the time before the fetus wiggles] they shall do penance as murderesses, (P. 197)
- ◆ A husband ought not to see his wife nude. (P. 211)
- ◆ When she has conceived a woman ought to abstain [sic] from her husband for three months before the birth, and afterward *in the time of purgation*, that is, forty days and nights, [the forty days and nights of time before the fetus wiggles] whether she has borne a male or a female child. (P. 208)
- ◆ A legal marriage may not be broken without the consent of both parties. (P. 209)
- ◆ Any woman who commits adultery is in the power of her husband if he wishes to be reconciled to an adulterous woman. If he makes a reconciliation, her punishment does not concern the clergy, it belongs to her own husband. (P. 209)
- ◆ If he is compelled by necessity, a father has the power to sell his son of seven years of age into slavery; after that, he has not the right to sell him without his [the child's] consent. (P. 211)
- ◆ Hast thou believed what many women, turning back to Satan, believe...that while thou art in bodily form thou canst go out by closed doors and art able to cross the spaces of the world...and without visible weapons slay persons who have been baptized and redeemed by the blood of Christ, and cook and eat their flesh. (P. 339) [This is a reference to belief in witchcraft. This penitential says it's a no no.]

Canon law

Canon law is positive law. Canon law is ecclesiastical positive law. Canon Law arose as collections of Church council edicts and the acts of synods. Roman Catholic Canon Law also brandishes Papal decrees and traditional practices of the Church. Currently, Roman Catholic, as well as Orthodox Catholic and Anglican Churches possess significant codes of Canon Law; and the Catholic Church maintains courts in each diocese staffed by Canon Lawyers. Canon law was originally designed to regulate religious behavior; but because the Medieval Church held overall secular power; Canon law addressed most economic and political matters as well as religious matters. In regard to coinciding matters such as marriage and divorce, civil law and Canon Law can be in conflict. Canon Law can also be in conflict with science. The Inquisition was designed to make sure Canon Law and Church doctrines prevailed over civil law as well as over secular doctrines such as Galileo's assertion that the planets circle the sun and not vice-versa.

The legal nature of Christian marriage

The Justinian Code, the compilation of Roman law assembled in the year 529 AD., explicitly says that valid marriages are created by **mutual consent** and not by sex: "*nuptias non concubitus, sed consensus facit.*" This pretty well establishes that the traditional purpose of contractual marriage is not procreation. At very least, this comment in the Justinian Code proves that traditional legalized sex in the *Western world* did not have reproduction as its legal purpose. Legal civilized **security sex or marriage** is a step above male planting of seed within a woman. The freely chosen mutual contract of marriage is a *security* device, not a *survival* device as is seed planting. In the move from plant sex to contractual plant sex, an automatic natural organic reflex called sex becomes a consciously and freely chosen artificial, legally recognized, *social status* or position. Unlike pure plant sex; legalized or civilized sex called marriage, is not sex at a non cognitive

botanical level. This *security level* of plant sex includes conscious human contractual choice which at least puts human sex at a human level, but the conscious contract comes with security level, human made rules. The *marital contract* requires free choice, but it puts a supposedly automatic and irresistible *individual* botanical sex urge under *social* [bureaucratic] control. Unfortunately, in the step up to safely corralled sex, plant sex did not lose all of its odious non-cognitive and propagative botanical identification. Security sex or marriage is still thought by many, including many an uninformed American lawmaker, to enclose totally automatic and non-voluntary, ungoverned plant sex rather than consciously controlled and chosen human sex. More unfortunate is the fact that under maritally caged *legal sex*, the Government, not the individual, owns individual sex. Human sex defined as marriage is not a private function. *It is a public and political activity*. Marriage is the vehicle through which the government and the Church get their immoral and generally misguided hands on your privates.

Prior to Christianity being made the official religion of Rome, *Christian* marriage had already become the Roman invented secular form of **sex by mutual contract**, because the Roman Empire encircled everyone in the civilized world. If you lived in a conquered territory, you either married under Roman Law or you did not marry at all. **Contractual sex**, as created by Roman Law, was called “Matrimonium Justum”. In fact, Paul, even in his day, assumes that Roman “Matrimonium Justum”, as a mutual contract for sex on demand, is the form Christians of his day were using. **[See: 1 Corinthians 7:4]** The early Church accepted Roman law about marriage, or sex on demand by reason of a legalized mutual contract. But like carry over plant sex, the notion of *arranged marriages* carried over in the form of the authority of the father. The consent of the bride’s father was still required in order to enter a valid marriage. In consequence, Roman contractual sex did not require an official from the Roman government as

authenticator, certifier and recorder of a marriage. The ceremony of mutual contractual consent was celebrated within the home, and the father of the bride was the official validator and authenticator.

The original connection between Christianity and marriage, as conceived by early Christians, was the existence of Baptism which, prior to marriage, caused the participants to be part of the Body of Christ. Although the essence of marriage was a civil and legal matter, it was a Christian marriage when it involved baptized Christians. Basically Christian marriage meant marrying another Christian. Marriages to non Christians were forbidden, and were considered invalid. Tertullian said that a marriage to a pagan was “evilly founded” and that Christians who marry pagans “pray to the devil”. Christian marriages were considered to be surrounded by, and witnessed by, angels. Mixed marriages of Christians and Pagans were considered to be surrounded by demons. Marital sex within these mixed marriages was considered to be evil sodomy or buggery no matter what was engaged in. Part of the religious outlook on marriage was the notion that Christian to Christian marriage was the source of producing legitimate *Christian* children. Within secular Roman society there was sufficient adultery and licentiousness to cause significant problems with the parentage of many children. The Fathers of the Church were concerned with keeping the children of baptized parents within the Christian congregation and pagan children out of participation in the Christian mystery. In other words, they were concerned with how to identify totally Christian children in opposition to half pagan bastards born of a mixed marriage. Just as men had always valued virginity and fidelity in their wives as a protection against their property being inherited by an alien child, so also the Church Fathers were concerned that Christian sacraments and grace should not be bestowed on undeserving, unidentified impostors who were outwardly children of a Christian. The emphasis on valid Christian children of an unmixed marriage caused

reproduction, which for the Greeks and Romans was a necessary source of citizens, to become for the Christians a *reason for asserting permanence of marriage*. The premise was that unmixed marriage causes valid Christian children, and Christian marriage is, therefore, permanent because of the long-term needs of legitimate children. The problem with long term care as the reason for permanence of marriage is that children grow up and no longer need parental care. Should divorce then be allowed?

For valid Christian marriages Baptism was necessary, but clerical intervention or certification was not required under normal circumstances. Clerics who could certify that valid mutual consent had taken place, and who could record the details of a marriage in an official Church record; were required only for marriages *of clergy and catechumens* [someone newly Baptized]. Papal decrees of the 4th century Popes, Siricius and Innocent I, required that *lower clergy and catechumens* who were to be married have their marriages ***solemnized*** by a priest. Since any clergyman who was about to be married was a male, while newly baptized catechumen females probably did not have a Christian father who had them Baptized when they were infants; the priest who *solemnly conducted the marriage ceremony* served authoritatively in the place of a father who would otherwise authorize the marriage of the bride. This official fatherly priest is the first indication of a religious form of Christian marriage in which a priest is required to officiate at a wedding, precisely as a priest. In these marriages of clergy and newly Baptized females; the solemnizing priest was not standing-in for a pagan father. Instead, he *replaced* the authority of a father with the authority of the Church. All other *Christian* marriages wherein a valid father was available occurred under *secular Roman "matrimonium justum"* even though there was a difficulty with the marriages of Christians who were slaves. Did a female slave's biological father have to authorize the marriage of his daughter, or did her

owner/master? Additionally, Roman law did not recognize slave marriages as valid, whether to another slave or to a Roman citizen. This caused marriages between Christian slaves to be treated as valid marriages of “conscience” or marriages that remove extra-marital sex. The Pope and Bishops permitted and recognized these marriages as valid in spite of their non recognition by secular Rome. These marriages of conscience were kept secret from Roman authorities; and, in effect were religious marriages solely, rather than secular. Bishops, as legal guardians and not as clergy, also exercised the role of fathers in the case of orphans. Another situation which brought Bishops into marital arrangements was the fact that during the first 3 centuries of Christianity, celibacy was actually forced upon lay Christians by many ecclesiastics. In order to combat this over addiction to celibacy, some bishops became marital “matchmakers”. Augustine declined, however, because he did not want to get blamed for marriages that failed. Since Roman marriages involved ceremonies and celebrations, bishops were often invited to the ceremonies simply as friends of the bridal couple or their parents. In consequence of being present at many weddings, bishops were often asked to bless the bridal couple. By the 3rd century this blessing became somewhat of a custom. Moreover, as Tertullian and Augustine tell us; Christians, following Roman practice, were using a marriage certificate, and the certificate wound up being something signed by a bishop. In time, although the secular form of Roman marriage as mutual consent remained, *Matrimonium Justum* between Christians became surrounded by Christian ceremonies, including the Eucharist. In the early 4th century the veiling of the bride by the priest and the blessing by a priest became synonymous. The bride’s father led the bride to the altar where the veiling of the bride and groom and a prayer by a clergyman took place. In the middle 5th century a Mass was celebrated as part of the ceremonies, and wedding gifts were given during the Mass. These ceremonies were allowed only for a 1st marriage. In

Rome a ring was a sign of *betrothal* or engagement. Among the Germans who conquered the Romans, a ring was given as a sign of the marriage itself. So today we have both engagement rings and wedding rings.

During the period of purely secular marriages between Christians; the Church, along with acquiring official control over marriages between Christians, was building up a bunch of impediments and no-nos to marriage in the form of customs and in the form of Canon Law. These regulations included items like the age of consent, impediments to consent, mixed marriages, divorce etc. In the 8th century, the Synod of Verneuil said that marriages between nobles and commoners had to be celebrated publicly [to prove mutual consent]. Also in the 8th century pre notification to a priest became a requirement prior to Christian marriage. One of the reasons for this requirement was the uncertainty about ability to marry caused by tricky impediments. Canon Law impediments included, not only those noted above, but also legal relationships such as guardianships, spiritual relationships such as baptismal sponsorship and other invalidating conditions such as previous adulterous relationships. The Church didn't want impediments like these popping up when least expected or concocted. A forewarned priest conducted an investigation to insure that there were no impediments to the marriage and that the marriage was not forbidden. The Priest's investigation was supplemented by a public call for information on 3 consecutive Sundays. These calls became known as "**banns**" [impediments] of marriage. Today, an officiating priest or justice of the peace may ask if anyone attending knows a reason why the marriage should not take place. At this point in Western history, the Church, although not having a marriage ceremony of its own; already had "licensing" or authorization control over the marriages of Christians. In the 9th century, the process of Christianizing secular marriage was hastened by reason of some fake documents. Certain rigorists within the Church wrote saying that the giving of a dowry [which had become

proof of parental consent], the examination for legitimacy, and the marriage of mutual consent itself all had to take place publicly in Church in the presence of a priest who authenticated the entire proceedings. The documents, called the Pseudo Isidorian Writings, fraudulently claimed to be written by previous Popes and general Church Councils. Because the Isidorian Writings were considered authentic, they were incorporated into early Canon Law and the public witch hunts they demanded were enforced until the 15th century. In the 15th century the Isidorian Writings were exposed as phony.

Partly because the kings lost some of their power and partly because many Bishops were powerful feudal lords, secular power in the early Middle Ages was in the hands of the Church rather than the State; and power over secular marriage came with it. By the 11th century, the Church had almost complete and absolute legal jurisdiction over all marriages in Europe. The Church then imposed the concept of marriage *by consent of the spouses* upon all the various tribes such as the Germans and the Franks who still considered the essence of marriage to be a father's handing over of a bride to her betrothed. Because of the Church's legal power over marriage, the marriage ceremonies were enforced in such fashion that the officiating priest replaced the father of the bride and it was the priest who handed her over to her groom as part of the liturgy carried out publicly in a Church. The priest's blessing of the bride became an integral part of the ceremony. In addition, the Greek and Roman notion of leading a bride to a bridal chamber in order to consummate the marriage still persisted as belonging to the nature of marriage. In the period between the 11th and 13th centuries the Church developed the further notion that Christian marriage was an **efficacious sacrament**. This is not the same as saying that all marriages, whether of Christians or not, were subject to Church Canon Law. The notion of marriage as a sacrament has to do with the inner nature of marriage itself rather than with legal eligibility,

competency and impediments that might exist within the prospective spouses. Nonetheless, it was legal power over secular marriages that led the Church to formulate the notion of Christian marriage as an efficacious symbol. Earlier 9th century canonists had made distinctions between matrimonial consent and the sexual consummation of the marriage. They had said that if no consummation was possible at the time of the marriage, the marriage could be dissolved. If consummation was possible, even if not executed, the marriage could not be dissolved. The upshot was that indissoluble Christian marriage could exist without sex and without children. These doctrines clearly made the public ceremonial exchange of consent in a church the essence of marriage. However, these doctrines caused problems with the symbolism expressed by Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians which compares marriage to the relation between Christ and the Church. A sexless, childless marriage would imply that the bond between Christ and the Church is not very intimate, and not very fruitful. Later scholastic theologians had a real struggle with such doctrines. How can you proclaim that the “duty” of marriage is reproduction and then say that the essence of marriage is consent not sexual intercourse? How can you say that the long term needs of children are the reason for the permanence of marriage when there are no children in a sexless marriage? Scholastic theologians solved the problem by making the whole works symbolic à la Paul.

The word “**sacramentum**” in vulgar Latin means basically the same thing as sacred. It means permanent religious commitment or *dedication*. However, Tertullian, in his writings, used the word in the sense of a *permanent sign or symbol*. He used the term “sacramentum–signum” in commenting upon Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians. **[See: Ephesians 5:22–33]** Following Tertullian’s lead; Augustine, in order to reinforce the notion of the permanence of marriage, also said that marriage was a “sacrament – signum.” He did not assert the magical character

of the marriage ceremony, namely, that it caused what it signified; but he did use the symbolic union of Christ to his Church that Paul speaks of in Ephesians as an argument against allowing remarriages of Christians after a divorce. In conjunction with the argument of long term child care, the *permanent bond between Christ and his Church* thus became the rationale for disallowing remarriages of divorced Christians. The argument for inviolable marriage bonds in view of their religious symbolism adds *absolute* permanency to Christian marriage. The bond between Christ and his Church is a far more demanding basis for marital permanence than the needs of children. Christ will never divorce his Church even unto eternity. Notice, however, that the symbolism has been reversed. With Paul, Nature-given temporal sex was a sign of the perpetual bond between Christ and his Church. With Augustine, the permanent bond between Christ and his Church is now a sign that *requires* the permanence of natural sex. Paul reasoned from natural marital sex to the Church as the “Bride of Christ.. Augustine reasoned from Bride of Christ to legal marriage. Paul, in conformity with his statement in **Romans 1:20**, said marriages, by way of their positive law identity, signify the Christian bond. But **Augustine** said the opposite, He said the bond between Christ and His bride, the Church, causes the indissolubility of the positive law sexual bonding. Augustine’s statement that the Christian ceremony of marriage *causes* the indissolubility of a contractual marriage is a “sacramental” statement. It is a statement that claims the Christian wedding *ceremony* causes what it signifies. But on the basis of **Paul’s** comparison of legal marriage relative to the Church, it cannot be claimed that *Christian marriages* are indissoluble; because positive Roman law wrapped around plant sex does not require permanence. Legally, mutual contracts can be dissolved by mutual consent. Accordingly, if arguing from legal marriage to the bond between Christ and his Church, logic would say that because legal marriages can and do break up; Christians can divorce themselves from a Christian marriage. [As

a matter of fact, excommunication also causes severance of the Christian bond. But the Church never claimed that excommunication was not possible in regard to married Christians.]

A 12th century Italian monk named Gratian, who is considered the father of Canon Law because he collected and synthesized all known Church laws from all over Europe; attempted to solve the problem by stating that marriage consent alone did not fully signify the permanent bond between Christ and his Church. Basically, Gratian identified **wedding consent** as the initiating cause of marriage, but he distinguished it from the consequent **marital state** or permanent union that it caused. He said that marital consent produces the marital *bond*, but is not of itself the full bond and full representation of the bond between Christ and His Body of Christ. Gratian said that a perfected marriage is one that has attained its purpose. But the wedding ceremony is not its own purpose. Although some people do think that being married is the end-all purpose of human life; most people do not. The physical bonding into *one flesh* is the **purpose** of the wedding sacrament, but attainment of this purpose is accomplished by sexual consummation. Gratian then said that marriage by mutual marital consent, but without consummation, is a dissoluble marriage. In contrast, marriage consent that is consummated represents the full bond between Christ and his Church. Consequently, sexually consummated, mutual sexual consent, *properly exchanged under statutory positive law requirements*, becomes absolutely indissoluble. That is Roman Catholic doctrine to this day. So also is the fact that paternal consent is no longer a validating condition of bridal consent.

The following Church doctrines emerged.

1. Although it is binding, *betrothal* is not marriage even when accompanied by sexual intercourse. [If it were, engaged couples who fool around would thereby

be married.] Betrothal is an *intention* to be married in the future. Christian *betrothal* might be compared symbolically to the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. Judaism was the promise of a Bride of Christ, and Christianity is the actual Bride.

2. Christian marriage is produced by consent, but consent is not the full perfected essence of marriage. That which is consented to is not yet carried out. What is consented to is not just mutual sex, and it is not reproduction. What is sworn under oath is a mutual *merging, not just of sex, but of total persons and personalities*. A completed or perfected Christian marriage is the *accomplished* exchange of selves that results in *two persons becoming one person*. **“I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me”**. (**Galatians 2:20**) What is sworn to is: “ I live, yet not I, but my spouse liveth in me”. The reality of **one flesh** is accomplished by genuine love. It is accomplished by the husband making his wife’s needs and desires and wishes and pleasures and satisfactions the cause of his actions and his happiness; while at the same time the wife makes her husbands needs, and desires and wishes, and pleasures and satisfactions the cause of her actions and happiness. Merging into one person is accomplished, so to speak, by mutually trading personalities. A husband acts on behalf of his wife, and his wife acts on behalf of her husband. **“For this reason shall a man leave father and mother and cling to a woman, and the two shall become one flesh.”** (**Genesis 2:24**) Obviously, a person who has a tenuous hold on an incomplete “ego” does not make a very good spouse. Such a person is not capable of acting on behalf of another, because they are too needy to serve other than self.
3. The foundation sworn to as the basis for accomplishing one flesh is sexual intercourse. Sex is like gametes. It is two “half” persons uniting to form one “whole” person.

The next legalistic step was to say that if the essence of marriage is mutual consent, does this not create a bilateral contract? The answer was yes. Marriage is essentially a legally binding contract. Pushing that notion further, the question was then asked: “what is it a contract for”. The answer given was that marriage is a contract for “*jus ad corpus*”- literally “*the right to a body*”. Marriage is a binding contract specifically for the mutual right to each other’s body. Marriage is a contract giving each spouse mutual sexual right to the other spouse’s body. To put it plainly, Christian marriage is a legally binding bilateral contract for *exclusive lifelong sex - on demand*. In its essence, marriage is not a contract for children. It is not a contract to live together and it is not a contract to love each other. It is a contract for sex on demand. In the context of the indissolubility of Jesus and His Body of Christ; marriage is a *permanent* contract for sex. In the context of one Jesus and one bride of Jesus, namely the Church; marriage is a mutually sworn *exclusive and permanent* contract for sex on demand; i.e. marriage, as permanently excluding all other partners, is *monogamous*. What was not included, because not considered to be part of the essence of marriage, was the ancient notion of creating a new family unit that would become part of the extended family of the groom. Ancient betrothal marriage was the process by which a woman was moved from her father’s family to the groom’s family. It was the process by which the newly united bridal couple became a *reproductive sub-family unit of the extended family or clan of the groom*. Although in-laws are significant even today in America; newly wed couples do not consider moving in with parents part of the essence of marriage. However, the ancient notion of marriage as entry into an extended family is found today in the mistaken carry over notion that marriage, whether Christian or not, is a *reproductive institution* for the raising of children. But people who believe this cannot seem to fathom that it is not possible to make a contract for children any more than it is possible to make a contract for living to be 200 years

of age. Nevertheless, implacably reproductive, deaf and dumb plant sex for humans has never gone away. Lots of grandparents cannot wait for the “promised” grandchildren of newly weds. It is their duty to spoil grandchildren rotten.

Reproduction, as the purpose of marriage, is a misfit application of plant sex onto a human legal contract for becoming one flesh. Unfortunately, however, most Ultra Conservative American legislators, whether State or Federal, are ignorant of the fact the contemporary American marriage, whether Christian or civil, does not have reproduction as its purpose. Apparently they are not very good Christians. Good Christians know that Roman Law, and then **the Bible, and then the Christian Church**, changed plant sex into legal sex whose *purpose is to represent that Christ and His Church are one*. They obviously caught on to the new legal identity of sex as a contract, because they are legislatively all over it like maggots. But apparently they never caught on to the legally defined **Christian purpose** of sex as **“one flesh”**. This misfit identification of Christian contractual marriage as planting reproductive seed creates a totally erroneous obstacle preventing contemporary American homosexual couples from making a public contract to unite. *Intentionally childless* heterosexual couples who have exchanged vows yet live apart, with one living in New York and the other in San Diego, are considered to be married by any and all Christian denominations. But homosexuals who can, in fact, become *one flesh* are not. Republican Fundamentalist Ultra-Conservatism notwithstanding; ***genuine Christian doctrine*** does not say that reproduction is the essence or purpose of marriage. Genuine Christian and civil doctrine says that reproduction is an **“officium”** of the married. Legislators should know what an **“officium”** is; because they *“are one”*. But apparently a lot of them do not. An **office** is a legally created stationary position with authority to perform as an arm of the State and/or church. As a combined Church and State authorized **station in society**, the marital office, the social right to produce religiously grounded citizens,

is assigned only to married couples, and not to unmarried couples. Christian and civil doctrine says that anyone who is going to reproduce must be married. The combined religious-civil “**office**” of reproducing, however, is conditional. It does not say that the office of marriage requires the begetting of children. The marriage bond is not created by biological fertility. It is created by freely chosen consent. Hence, the **office** of reproduction demands that: **if** someone wishes to reproduce, they must be contractually married. In regard to specifically Christian marriage, Christian marriage is not perfected by reproduction. Since the Christian purpose is representation of the bond between Christ and His Church, the **purpose** of Christian marriage, clearly stated in the Bible, is to become **one flesh**. To consider reproductive heterosexual the essence of marriage is to believe in primitive agricultural sex-lore. And like it or not, plant sex is not Christian sex. Plant sex is purely instinctive, physical sex that has nothing to do with creating one flesh. Moreover, asserting that agricultural heterosexual is also the essential nature of marital or legal sex leads to undesirable conclusions concerning sex outside of marriage. Traditional Christian doctrine says that all forms of sex outside of marriage are immoral. But if marital sex is exclusively heterosexual, then:

1. Only **reproductive heterosexual** outside of marriage is immoral because of being outside of marriage. Defining marital sex as reproductive sex means that having babies outside of marriage is the only immoral form of sex. Non-reproductive and contraceptive sex outside of a contract is perfectly moral.

2. All forms of deliberately **non-reproductive and contraceptive** sex *within marriage* are immoral – as long ago proclaimed by the Fathers of the Church. “Buggery”, whatever that is, is immoral whether within or without marriage. So is woman on top, because she might lose the little buggers planted within her.

3. **Non reproductive** sexual actions, whether natural or artificial, whether heterosexual or homosexual, whether group or solitary are not immoral by reason

of being outside of marriage. They are not immoral outside of marriage, because according to *reproductive* marital doctrine they are not marital forms of sex. As non reproductive, they are non marital forms of sex; and non marital forms of sex outside of marriage are by that very reason okay. If homosexuality is unacceptable solely as marital, as Republicans would have it; then homosexuality outside of marriage is acceptable.

The Truth

1. Christians should be basing their morality upon Scripture. But **Genesis 2:24** and **Mark 10:8** say that individuals should leave parents and cling to each other becoming **one flesh**. I cannot find any verbiage in the Bible which says that couples do not become one flesh unless they actually reproduce.
2. In fact, the single Christian truth that might be asserted regarding gay marriages is that not being reproductive, they are dissoluble.
3. Furthermore, the Council of Trent beat Ultra-Conservative Christians to the punch in regard to their attempt to override the 10th amendment to the American Constitution and forbid gay marriages. The tenth article of the Bill of Rights says: *“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people”*. There was heated debate at the Council of Trent about whether or not the Church [or State] could intervene in a person’s natural right to marry. Any attempt to make freedom of mutual consent derive from social and cultural conditions was ultimately judged by this Council to be an attack on inalienable natural rights and free will. The free will of citizens does not come from the State. It comes from nature. The freedom to marry does not come from the State. It comes from nature. The natural right to marry is part of the natural right to pursue happiness. The right of individuals to exchange voluntary sexual “consensus” is just as much of a natural right as the right to

live. Although the American format for marriage may be artificial, the right to marry is not. The right to marry is a matter of Natural Law, not positive law; and all positive law that runs afoul of Natural Law by preventing gay consent is immoral. What is next: forbidding “barren” women or men with low sperm counts to marry? They can’t reproduce. Perhaps the Constitution should be amended to forbid individuals with IQ’s of less than 90 to marry on the grounds they aren’t smart enough to fathom a marriage contract. Inability to fathom a given contract is a legally recognized impediment to making that contract. That is why young children are not permitted to marry. Marital law calls it the “age of consent”. However, the real problem with an IQ criterion for marriage is the fact that it might include more than a few politicians. Since the American constitution and the American Bill of Rights are the foundation of American society and culture, marriage to any other single person that one pleases should be considered an implicit part of American foundations and American rights. Uninformed and misinformed Ultra Conservatives should not be trying for a constitutional amendment banning gay marriages. They should be working for an addition to the Bill of Rights explicitly guaranteeing the right of any unmarried adult to marry any other unmarried adult they wish. Instead, Ultra-Conservatives worked hard to make sure 9 year olds could get their hands on an **Uzi**. [An Uzi is an incredibly rapid fire Israeli designed machine gun.] The Ultra Conservatives succeeded, and a 9 year old girl on a firing range who could not control the kick of the weapon accidentally shot her instructor-father to pieces. The framers of the American constitution wanted inalienable rights to pertain to all the people. So far, the United States Supreme Court agrees. Let’s hope it continues in spite of Ultra Conservative attempts to turn the Court into a wing of Ultra Conservative domination of the world.

American civil laws concerning sex and marriage are actually derivatives of

Christian or Canon Law. Consequently, the legal nature of Christian marriage is also the legal nature of American civil marriage. Unless it has been changed since this was written, current North Dakota marriage law, in Chapter 14 - 03, Section 1, says the following: “*Marriage is a personal relation arising out of a civil contract between one man and one woman to which the consent of the parties involved is essential*”. American civil law says that the essence of marriage is consent. Notice, however, that this North Dakota law not only defines marriage as a consensual contract, it also emphasizes “*one man and one woman*”. North Dakota State law requires both monogamy and heterosexuality which the same section goes on to make clear by stating: “*A spouse refers only to a person of the opposite sex who is a husband or a wife*”. Believe it or not, this part of North Dakota civil law is derived from the Roman Catholic doctrine that marriage is a sacrament representing the bond between Christ and His **Bride** - the Church. Mutual consent does not require heterosexuality; but the Roman Catholic sacrament does. The symbolic comparing of *civil* marriage to the relation of Christ and His Bride requires that marriage in North Dakota be the Roman Catholic sacrament of heterosexual marriage. Guess what! That is a violation of the separation of Church and State.

The innards of the sacramental nature of Christian marriage

Just as there are 4 canonical Gospels in scripture because Bishop Irenaeus said 4 was the order of the Universe, so also there are 7 sacraments because 7 in the Bible and in early Christianity was a sacred number. These sacred 7 “*sacramentum – signi*” were defined as magical instruments that effectively sanctified the natural realities they symbolized. Marriage became one of the 7. Gratian had proposed that consummated sexual consent was the nature of marriage. What Gratian did not propose was the efficacy of the *marriage ceremony* as a sacrament. That step was impeded by the attitudes of the Church Fathers

toward marriage. The Church Fathers, with their deprecation of marriage had related marriage only to the wedding feast at Cana which they interpreted as Jesus' approval of marriage as one of the paths to heaven. [See: John 2:1–11] Origen had admitted that marriage was a divine gift and a means to salvation and that it had some power to help the spouses live a good Christian life. None of the Fathers of the Church, however, ever said that Christian marriage, as a symbol of Christ and His Church, magically elevated a civil contract to a supernatural plane and provided God's efficacious grace toward living, in complete fidelity, a good Christian marital life including the rearing of good Christian children. The Roman rite or ceremonial form of *Matrimonium Justum* adopted by the Christian world was a veiling ceremony in which the bride was completely covered and the groom partially covered with head uncovered. For the Romans, this veiling signified the joining in peace of two households under one roof. In addition the Romans had a custom involving a second veil. Before the wedding ceremony, the bride veiled herself in order to signify her virginity. Christian brides still wear the veil, but not as a proof of virginity. During the wedding itself, a priest would then put the common veil on both the previously veiled bride and the groom, and simultaneously bless them. Because of the ancient emphasis on the fact that marriage consisted of a bride being passed to a husband, the priest's blessing was regarded primarily as a blessing of the bride. Gradually only the bride was veiled, and the accompanying nuptial mass was offered for the bride only.

On the basis of Paul's comparison of Christians to brides of Christ in his Epistle to the Ephesians, the Church has always considered *as direct brides of Christ* women who dedicate themselves and their virginity directly to God, particularly within convent life. In celebrating this marriage of a virgin to Christ, early Christians used the existing Roman wedding custom of veiling the virginal bride. The veil used was called the "*flammeum nuptiale*." It was fiery red. This

public veiling constituted the Church's official recognition and confirmation of a woman's lifelong virginal dedication to Christ. Entrance into a convent was called, "taking the veil." In an attempt to combat the overemphasis on virginity and the deprecation of marriage by the Fathers of the Church, the Church applied the veiling ceremony of marrying Christ to Christian marriages between a bride and an earthly groom. A woman's husband was seen as representing Christ; and in serving her husband, a woman served Christ. There are a lot of staunch conservative Christian males around who still think the same way. Forget the fact that marriage is a mutually given bilateral contract. The service on demand pertains only to women serving their husbands hand and foot along with sexually. Probably because the color red relative to sex is now associated with red light districts; the red veil of virginity was changed by the Church to a white veil of virginity. The veiling of the bride gave the secular, positive law marriages of Christians a religious significance beyond its basic nature as a contract. While the bond between a dedicated virgin and Christ was the real thing, the bond between husband and wife was a *symbol* of the bond between Christ and his Church. Since the veiling of a virgin dedicated directly to Christ is the real thing in and of itself, it does not have the nature of a symbol or sign of some other reality. Consequently, "taking the veil" and becoming a Nun is not a sacrament. Consecrated virginity is a holy reality. Eventually, just as the public veiling of a virgin was the Church's official authentication of permanent virginity, the public veiling of a bride became the Church's official warranting of Christian marriages.

In the 12th century, the Catharist and Albigensian sects taught that marriage was fundamentally evil. Their doctrines were condemned as heresy by the Second Lateran Council held in 1139 AD; but the controversy forced the theologians of the Church to more closely examine the "sacramentum – signum" of marriage. Initially, because they were gagging on the idea that a sexual contract tainted by

Original sin could be a holy sacrament; 12th century theologians were all over the place in regard to what essentially constituted the sacrament. However, logic finally forced them to accept consensual, *contractual sexual intercourse* as the basis. That view, in turn, forced theologians to say that it was not a priest or priest's blessing that conferred the sacrament. It was the couple themselves who administered the sacrament to each other. No mutual human contract equaled no sacrament. Institutional family life was then identified as a *consequence* of the sacrament of marriage, but not the sacrament; and procreation, by reason of the same logic, was thereupon identified as an "*officium*" or *official function of married persons*, but again, not its essence. Also recognized at the time was the nature of marriage as a part of society. The step up to marriage as social status is from extended family, to clan, to tribe, and finally to State. The social, civil and political dimensions of marriage and family were then added to reproduction as "officia" [social offices] of both Christian and secular marriage.

With their usual finesse, the theologians made a delicate distinction between the **objective** contract for sex, and the **subjective** conjugal love the couple might have for each other. It was the objective contract that was the indissoluble sacrament representing the eternal bond between Christ and his Church. The subjective bond, on the other hand, could be missing or deteriorate. Starting with the notion that Christian sacramental marriage was a remedy for fallen sex vitiated by Original Sin, 13th century theologians said that if Christian marriage was curative of evil sex it had to confer God's grace in order to do so. In due time, that notion was enlarged to say that the sacred symbolism of the contract for sex conferred all the grace necessary for fulfilling the rights and obligations of a "marriage **in** the Lord" in such fashion that supernatural salvation would result from living marital life within the context of secular society. In the face of the humanists who had rediscovered civil marriage and were declaring marriage non-

sacramental; the sacramental definition of Christian marriage, including monogamy, heterosexuality, indissolubility and supernatural efficacy, was declared infallible Christian dogma by the Council of Trent in the 16th century. So was the superiority of celibacy.

At this point sexual morality takes a bit of a turn. The assertion that sex outside of marriage is immoral, now has to mean that sex outside of the sacrament of marriage is immoral. So where does that leave sex relative to civil and other non-sacramental marriages? The logical conclusion is that only sex outside of Catholic and Anglican marriages is immoral. To put the conclusion another way, only sex outside of marriage by baptized Christians who believe that marriage is an effective Sacrament is immoral. As strange as that may sound, it is a genuine moral conclusion based upon following one's conscience. Those who don't believe in Christian moral doctrine and Christian sacraments can follow their conscience and morally engage in sex outside of marriage. Fundamentalist Moral Nazis aside, sex outside of marriage is immoral only for those who conscientiously believe it is. The same is true of stem cell use. [The terms "Moral Nazi" and "sexual fascist" were coined by the psychologist Albert Ellis.] **[See: [Sex Without Guilt](#) by Albert Ellis (New York: Grove Press, Inc., Rev. Ed. 1965) PP 151, 155, 157, 158.]**

Because marriage is a public "officium" [an office of the State as well as the Church], and because at the time of the Council of Trent, the Church had complete secular jurisdiction over marriage; the Council of Trent also said that marriages were not valid unless contracted in the presence of a priest and at least 2 witnesses. Totally clandestine marriages were declared invalid. The priest was the *official witness* for the Church and the State, and he had to hear the exchange of vows. Bridesmaid and best man are the traditional 2 witnesses, but they do not act for the State or the Church. The *public official* in current America can be any person with authority to officially represent the respective State in which the marriage occurs.

This includes any official, from a justice of the peace to certified clergy. However, purely civil marriages involving at least one baptized Catholic and no priest are considered by the Catholic Church to be invalid. In the 17th century, because of the process of secularization, speculation about marriage became the concern of the humanities, the encyclopedists, the evolutionists, the anthropologists, the sociologists, and the psychologists - over and above theologians.

Celibacy

I once heard a young, born again Christian woman say that she was going to remain “pure” until marriage. The conclusion to such a viewpoint is that marriage is impure.

Celibacy, according to Webster, is the state of being unmarried established by a vow not to marry. Within Christianity, monks and nuns are celibates. Starting with the Council of Elvira in Spain, around the year 306, and confirmed by commonly accepted Canons around the 6th century, priests in the Western or Latin part of the Catholic Church have been held to celibacy by Canon Law rather than by vow. Celibacy is not required of Catholic priests in the Uniate Catholic Church of the East; but it is required of their bishops. In 1967, the encyclical “Humanae Vitae” of Pope Paul VI, reaffirmed celibacy for both priests and bishops in the Latin half of the Church. That same encyclical contains the Catholic Church’s contemporary condemnation of artificial contraception. In contrast, the Protestant reformers of the 16th century rejected clerical celibacy. The Confession of Faith submitted to Charles V by Philip Melancthon, in the year 1530, translated by F. Bente and W.H.T. Dau, says: “*Paul, in 1 Tim. 4,3, calls that a doctrine of devils which forbids marriage...But as no law of man can annul the commandment of God, so neither can it [celibacy] be done by any vow*”. **[See: Triglot Concordia: The Symbolic Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921) PP 37-95]**

Closely connected with, and largely dependent upon, this negative attitude is the fact that the serious pursuit of the Christian life has always been to some extent associated, either explicitly or by implication, with sexual renunciation. The Church's conception of sanctity and the good life has been too much controlled in the past by the idea that venereal asceticism is the supreme and most meritorious spiritual discipline. St. Paul's contrast between the care of the married for worldly things and that of the single for the things of the lord became the foundation of a double ethical standard in the name of which clerical celibacy was justified, and virginity devoted to God was regarded as the noblest form of Christianity and the "religious" life par excellence - an idea which some still think it improper to call in question. **[Sherwin Bailey Sexual Ethics (New York: The Macmillan Company; 60 5th Avenue, 1963). P 57]**

True civilization represents a consolidation of the agricultural gains. Civilization marks the arrival of law and order which are the hallmark satisfactions of the security need. The rise of Western civilization in Greece is heavily oriented to 'Logos', or in other words, oriented to finding rational order in the Universe and in human life and in human society. The Roman contribution is actual lawmaking and the development of rule by government. The Christian religion is also a part of the security process. The Church represents law and order and control raised to the level of the divine. But even within the Church, let alone within the State, the individual is simply a cog in the overall scheme of things - a remnant of Greek and Roman doctrine that the state is supreme.

The Renaissance and Humanism versus Church Designed sex

The Renaissance is the artistic age of Dante, of Leonardo De Vinci, of Michelangelo and of William Shakespeare. It is also the scientific age of Copernicus, of Galileo, of Harvey and of Isaac Newton. Likewise, the Renaissance is the age of Gutenberg and movable type printing. Due to men like these, the culture of the late Middle Ages marked a turn from religious subservience to individual self governance and independence. Cutting out the middle men of Church and State who ruled the masses as if they were children led to a secular atmosphere that placed value on the individual and on individualism. It also broke the chains of the implicit caste system contained in feudalism and provided opportunity for individuals to advance their status on the basis of merit rather than birthright. Life in this world ceased to be a gloomy and standardized preparation for the next world and became a glorious and marvelous personal tour of the world we live in here and now. The result was the artistic creativity of the Renaissance and the exploratory realism of the burgeoning sciences. Sad to say, however, the Renaissance was for males only. Women remained the source of evil and were confined to the household. Renaissance education was for boys not girls. Boys were taught the classics; mathematics, science, history and music along with being given physical training. Boys were taught the “humanities”.

Renaissance Humanism and the Liberal Arts

Humanism is a term used to describe the intellectual content of the Renaissance orientation to the individual and to secular values. Its basic premises revolve around the value of the individual and the ability of individuals to attain truth and live a good life without being told by the Church or State how to blow their nose. It is a doctrine that, at very least, is compatible with romance and affection. Its educational program is called the *humanities*. The fundament of humanist education is the Liberal Arts curriculum. Although in some contemporary American colleges and universities the Liberal Arts curricula is considered, and in

fact is, a bunch of pud courses for inferior students; that is not a true image of what the Liberal Arts really are. The Liberal Arts curriculum is not designed for creating specialists in science or technology. Art is the knowledge of how to make something. And as an overall **art**, the Liberal Arts are designed to teach students what a self governing adult is, and how to personally become one. The Liberal Arts are designed to teach students how to think and choose properly for themselves. Liberal, in the title Liberal Arts, means the same as the word liberty. It is a reference to human freedom. The Liberal Arts are designed to teach students to function intellectually and personally with liberated or self-governing judgment and freedom. The Liberal Arts are designed to teach students how to free themselves from slavish childish submission to unsound cultural lore, from invasive government, from false truths, false advertising, propaganda, lies, and all the other junk and propaganda and false authority that floats around within a culture. The Liberal Arts are intended to give students the generalized *critical judgment for competently evaluating* anything from science to technology, to society, to culture, to psychology, to music, to themselves. The Liberal Arts might be considered as the technology for building top notch human beings in contrast to engineering top notch aircraft.

The Liberal Arts were not designed in the Western Empire. Originally they were established by the likes of Plato and Aristotle. These Greeks separated the arts into “liberal” arts as distinct from the “practical” arts. Basically the distinction separates the arts of *making a great self* from the arts of *making great things outside of self*. In the 1st century, the Roman scholar Marcus Terentius Varro set the number of Liberal Arts at the ancient magic 7. In the 5th century, a Byzantine educator, Martianus Capella, created the trivium and the quadrivium which, to this day, are considered the true 7 liberal arts. In the West, the Liberal Arts were added to the classical Medieval university curricula of philosophy, theology, law and

medicine. The **trivium** of: grammar, rhetoric, and logic, and the **quadrivium** of: arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music; basically refer to the same disciplines as “readin”, “writin” and “rithmatic”. These studies roughly constitute the “humanities” curriculum. Completion of the trivium resulted in a Bachelor’s degree. Completion of the quadrivium resulted in a Master of arts degree. The Liberal Arts imply a self protection for citizens from simply being cogs in the wheels of the State or Church. The Liberal Arts are aimed at the development of people as self competent human individuals, rather than as slaves or children of the Church or State who need a parent all their life. The Liberal Arts are intended to lift students above blind indoctrinated enculturation; and free them from ignorance, prejudice and the whims of the powerful. Conservatism is the opposite of liberal. The word conservative means to conserve what is already there. Liberal means liberated from ignorance and socially imposed, perpetual childhood. But Conservatives still see education as a means for producing brainwashed docile citizens who will unquestionably obey government and bureaucrat authority while sopping up and transmitting governmentally censored versions of culture and thought. Education and educational systems, according to conservatives, should be designed solely to serve the needs of a petrified and stratified society run by themselves. The Nazis called such manipulative and persuasive government programs that taught the Germans to sit up and salute Hitler, *propaganda and indoctrination*. The result was a barbaric Germany. Liberal Arts curricula are designed to prevent such catastrophes. Besides having the development of the individual as a purpose, a further purpose of the Liberal Arts is to create adults who can evaluate the society in which they live. Liberals are those who have the knowledge and maturity to uncover the real identity of prevalent cultural dictums and who can help to create societies consisting of intelligent, self-governing adults rather than domesticated children or tamed ignorant citizens. Further implied is the

fact that the cultural improvement of a society by liberally trained citizens will not occur by rebellion or revolution. It will occur by reason of a “better idea” and a “better way to do things”.

Although in its origins humanism was basically coordinated with religious notions, by the 18th century humanism had come to be identified with the secular as independent of the religious. The current American Humanist Association supports the cultural opinion that “god” can be found within the individual. [Do not falsely read this to say that the God Who governs the universe **is** your inner self. The opinion says the god who governs *your personal behavior* is found within. It is you.] Fundamentalist Christian groups in the United States think that this is a depraved and profane attitude that has invaded not only our society but even our churches. They see secularism and liberal education and the sciences as the moral decay of America; and they are bound and determined to eliminate, by violence if necessary, Democratic “Liberalism” along with any other persons or groups who stand in their way.

The overall moral impact of the Industrial Revolution

In Britain, the Reformist Protestant ethic of hard work and thrift produced an environment complimentary to the industrialization of society. Unlocked social status and the consequent social mobility allowed for and encouraged urban economics and accumulation of wealth as a goal. New scientific knowledge and technical developments, such as the creation of a blast furnace and hearth combination that produced steel, and the invention of the steam engine also stimulated the industrial revolution. The Industrial Revolution, which originated in Britain, refers to the ultimate transformation of Medieval agricultural society into a modern industrially fueled economic society. Agriculture as the basic economics supporting society gave way to manufacturing and the factory system as the basic economics of society. While the Industrial Revolution is generally seen as the

mechanization of European society, it was much more than that. The previous changes of cultural focus from survival agriculture to civilized law and order within Greece and Rome now changed from collective law and order to individual self development and satisfactions. Whereas civilized society had placed the individual at the service of the body politic, the new cultural focus places the body politic at the service of the individual. Thinkers such as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke changed the ancient political concept of natural government by superior persons over inferior persons into the concept of government created by consent of the governed and operated for the protection and good of its individual citizens. [The equalitarian notion which removed the idea of blue blood never caught on with Christian churches and Sects; because all of them claimed to be established by God, rather than by believers. Alleged Divinely established superiors, because of their self claimed divine origin, see themselves as “all knowing” and unimpeachable. In consequence they do not tolerate requests for rational justification or proof of their unsupported claims.] Writers such as Adam Smith created a concept of laissez-faire, or government hands off, economics. These changes in political and economic thinking reflected a significant change in individual outlook. When supply of manufactured goods replaced food supply as a major appetite of a secular society, and accumulation of individual wealth became a means to gratifying personal desires; the focus of culture changed from production to consumption. The Christian notion of asceticism and self-denial as a means to happiness in another world was replaced by the secular concept of consumption and gratification as the means to happiness in this world. The explosive growth of population which began in the middle 18th century significantly bolstered the consumptive attitude. Shortly after the great depression, American production, it is claimed, exceeded consumption; and the industrial American economy thereby became a market economy wherein existing need was

not sufficient to sop up existing production. So advertising was given the job of creating imagined need where real need does not exist. The mass-produced automobile and the individual freedom it offers is one of the prime symbols of the Industrial Revolution.

Some Christian conservatives see these changes in individual orientation as immorally self serving, lustful and avaricious. That is not the truth of the matter. Conservatives hate individualism because it kills their self proclaimed superiority and self-appropriated right to demand docile submission from others. The truth is that individual consumption and gratification are not diametrically opposed to self development. They are at the service of genuine self-development. Along with the acquisition of knowledge and the practice of self cultivation; individual consumption and gratification, at least within the early American ethic, served as effective means to self development and even Christian development. For example: management of one's money can make an adult out of most individuals. A majority of *conservative* Christians accept the Horatio Alger stories as representing good Christian ethics. Horatio Alger wrote 119 books which sold 250,000,000 copies. His stories depict heroes who by effort and bravery go from rags to riches and from nobody to somebody. Christian conservatives who favor these stories need to be reminded that the stories of the Unitarian minister, Horatio Alger, depict the rewards to be attained by wealth as worldly status, fame and fortune. Accumulation of worldly goods is claimed to be despicable when Conservatives are attacking Liberal Secularists. But it is acclaimed by Conservatives when propounded by a Protestant Minister. We are creatures of nature and nature supplies to us those things which we need, not just for survival; but for development. It is not the use of these supplies that is immoral. It is the abuse of these supplies that is immoral. It is immoral to turn worldly goods into an ultimate goal that drives God out of the picture. That is why we need Environmentalists to

remind us that the universe is not our purpose in life, but the supplier of the tools we need to stay alive and attain God as the purpose of our life.

The impact of the Industrial Revolution on family and morals

In the agricultural setting, the family was the work group. All the members of the family worked together on a daily basis. Along with the family work group, there existed craftsmen and artisans who also worked on a more or less family basis. The Industrial Revolution buried the individual skilled craftsman. The work group became a large factory or other impersonal cooperative. Family enterprise, the livelihood of the family produced by the family, became the sale of individual labor to a large extra familial operation. Careers as laborers and professionals and managers replaced lifetime farm work. The sale of personal labor to an outside employer took individuals away from the family domicile for large periods of time. This situation left less time for family concerns, especially the care and education of children. The result was the creation, in society, of institutions that took over former family tasks. Secular education of children became the responsibility of mass public school systems; and religious education became the domain of local churches. Health care became hospitals with professional doctors and nurses; and recreation outside of the home ultimately was provided by the likes of circuses, theme parks, movies and shows. Given the radical difference between city life and extended family rural life, moral values had to change to fit the new circumstances. Family values lessened while income, career and social mobility values increased. Large families ceased to have their former appeal. Children became less desirable because in an industrial setting they are not wage earners for some length of time and are thus an economic expense rather than an economic asset. With overpopulation becoming a problem, reproduction also ceased to have its former social value. Additionally, the difficulties of finding a mate changed radically from those of rural life. Finding a mate ceased being a matter of choosing among a few

lifetime acquaintances and became a matter of searching among a horde of strangers. That change caused a change in sexual values. Although originally people weren't advertising for mates in the newspapers or on the internet, sex was made an *instrument of attraction* and with it came courtship and dating as we know them today. In a metropolis, changes in moral and sexual values along with behavior are not as scandalous as these same changes might be in a rural village. Gossip is not as powerful and reputations are not superintended closely by neighboring, self appointed hyper moral, keepers of village morality. In a city with divergence of opinions and morals, there will be many who agree with any given form of value system and behavior. What did not originally change, however, was the traditional view of male and female family roles. The notion that women belonged in the home and were naturally suited to domestic tasks endured. They remained as stay-at-home managers of the household. The notion that men were naturally suited to dealing with the outside world and its affairs produced the notion that men were, by nature, the breadwinners. So it was that men became the sellers of their labor to outside employers. As late as 1970, the majority of American husbands opposed wives working outside the home. Currently, the drastic need for two-income sources in order for many families to survive has forced nearly a majority of married women, particularly those with young children, to find jobs outside the home.

The change from farmer sex to city sex caused a severe hit on the thinking of many in regard to the sex-lore that women are naturally homemakers and men naturally breadwinners. The attitudes of many men toward doing domestic chores changed. There are now more than a few stay at home dads. Along with that change has come greater acceptance of wives working outside the home. Modern women, being a bit more bold and a bit more self assured than many men; have developed highly successful careers outside of the family. A career differs from

simple employment. A career implies long term and nearly total commitment. A career is part of self-identity and self-esteem. Although still subject to prejudice and to male fear of being outdone; many women, not only those unmarried, but many who are married with children, have faced this sex-lore prejudice of the inferior domestic female and have dedicated themselves in highly competent fashion to careers outside the home. The culmination of these changes is the current emphasis on the one thing that remains as a family tie, and that is love and affection. Loving and affectionate romantic sex has become the principle bond of couples within marriage; and love and affection have become the bonds between parents and children. Today we think of a loveless marriage as an aberration, and think that the way to a successful marriage is a courtship or two that will find the Divinely created, perfect and loving, one and only. We also think that romantic dating is a form of recreation and pleasure rather than solely a form of courtship.

The Enlightenment and super civilized sex

Like the Renaissance, the Enlightenment was fundamentally an intellectual development that ultimately permeated Western culture. Thomas Paine called it the “Age of Reason”. The Enlightenment was a continuation of the change in cultural focus from religious to secular and from fixed subservient collective uniformity to individual freedom and variety; but the Enlightenment had its own characteristics. In great part, the Renaissance looked to classical authorities for guidance; while Enlightenment thinkers looked to rational and scientific observation of nature for guidance. Truth was to be found in the examination of nature rather than in the study of the Bible and of classical authors. The Enlightenment represents a definitive split of human thought away from religious revelation. Like the separation of Church and State, Enlightenment thinking created a decisive separation of secular and scientific thinking that predominated over religious thinking. Christian theology, as represented by Augustine and later by Thomas

Aquinas, attempted to combine revealed truth with natural rational truth. These theologies dominated Western thinking for at least 1500 to 1600 years; but during that time **revealed truth** was always the master and determinant of natural truth. Enlightenment thought, however, got rid of the subservience of reason to revelation. Unquestioning, uncritical assent to religious dictums changed into questioning, reexamination and exploration of ideas and values. The old Faith was Christianity. The new faith was science.

Although a descendant of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment produced certain contrasts. The Renaissance looked back, the Enlightenment looked forward. The Renaissance focused on secular individualism. The Enlightenment focused on individual rights and their relation to government. The Renaissance made the human species a creature of nature. The Enlightenment made nature a tool of humankind. The Renaissance affected Western thinking in the area of human origins. The Enlightenment affected Western thinking in the area of human goals. The Renaissance, as a revival of classical learning, had changed the religious outlook on the origins of humankind into an investigation of natural historical origins; the Enlightenment turned the goals of life from God to nature. Next life religious goals of Faith became this life secular goals of reason, and the Enlightenment took place in America as well as in Europe. The goals of reason, all of which were underlined by the rejection of servile subservience to Church and State and the notion of Divine Rights of individuals. These rights included improved possibilities for social mobility and social status, the justification of self-expression without State or Church censorship or suppression, the redemption of sentiment and emotion from their defamed evil status, improvement of society and governments and unending human progress in knowledge, technology and behavior. The Greeks and the Romans thought human history moved in circles. The Christian church thought history moved toward the next world.

Enlightenment thinkers believed that science could continually lead humankind to unending progress, both material and moral, within this world.

This was the age in which John Locke, rejecting the notion that governments owned their citizens, asserted inalienable individual rights. He asserted that governments were created by consent of the governed, and that governments were bound to protect and foster their citizens. It is the age of the American Revolution from subjection to England. It is the age of the American Constitution. The Enlightenment was also the age of Isaac Newton, the man who justified the Greek concept of an *internal Logos of the entire Universe*. Following the lead of Galileo, who by careful measurement had identified gravity as a source of acceleration dependent upon the distance between gravitational bodies; Newton proposed that earthly, straight line gravity also propelled the heavens, rather than a heavenly, circular gravity. In addition, Newton created mathematical physics. He showed the Western world how to analyze and measure the Universe *quantitatively* in contrast to all previous science [philosophy] which had analyzed the Universe *qualitatively* and didn't quite know how to measure it. He used Galileo's notion of inertia as a starting point. Galileo's notion of inertia said that if a person jumps up into the air and leaves the spinning earth for a moment, his or her spinning will be sustained by inertia and it will prevent the earth from moving out from under the jumper. Using that notion, Newton solved the problem of how to measure the orbits of heavenly bodies; or in other words, how to get mathematical hold on natural realities which are constantly in motion. Following the lead of Galileo and his specific form of inertia, Newton formulated a generalized concept of inertia. He said: a body in motion will remain in motion unless acted upon from the outside". Newton got rid of circular heavenly gravity as distinct from centrifugal straight line earth gravity, by combining inertial forward motion with gravitational motion and came up with the orbits of heavenly bodies. This united earthly gravity and

heavenly gravity, which removed the notion that science and religion were distinct forms of knowledge and never the twain should meet. Although it eventually ran into Einstein's theory of gravity, along with quantum mechanics and Neils Bohr's uncertainty; Newton's single gravity gave the Western world the start instrument for precise prediction and even control of almost all natural events. Newton's inertia and single form of gravity made the Western world almost totally different from the far East. Other thinkers of the Enlightenment were not necessarily great minds, but they were savvy. They knew how to push the new ideas. They knew how to write pamphlets and newspapers and journals and propaganda, and they did so. Historians call these people the "philosophes" [philosophy makers] of the age.

Changes in Natural Law concepts

The basic form of Natural Law is the ten commandments. The ten commandments are revealed laws; but all are expressions of how the Nature-made individual has to act in order to grow into a self governing adult. As expressions of Nature, and not as revealed descriptions of God's world; Natural Law can be figured out without the Bible. In fact, much of it is instinctive behavior such as the drive to survive. Humans can intellectually evaluate what behaviors assist attainment of proper maturity and which are destructive. These evaluated behaviors are then stated as moral laws of human behavior.

During the Middle Ages the Stoic idea of Natural Law was incorporated into Christian doctrine. Within Christian doctrine, Natural Law became the Divine Eternal Law of God. The thinkers of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, however, turned Natural Law back into Nature's laws of human developmental behavior. In the 17th century a Dutch jurist by the name of Hugo Grotius taught that humans are both reasonable and sociable by nature. Grotius re-secularized Natural Law theory by asserting that Natural Law would be valid even if there were no God, or even if God didn't care how humans acted. With or without a

God, humans will find reasonable, or nature given ways, to live together. Grotius added another touch which harkened back to the Stoics. He said that human insight into Natural Law did not come from experience. It came from intellectual reflexion. This throwback was equivalent to saying what the pantheistic Stoics had said. Humans know about Natural Law because human intelligence is a participation in the conscious Logos of the Universe. In other words, humans don't have to acquire the precepts of Natural Law by investigation. Natural Law is built into our human nature. We instinctively know that it isn't nice to crack open someone else's skull. To find Natural Law, we just have to look inside ourselves. In spite of instinctively different opinions on some issues, there is a certain amount of truth in this; because our best insight into human nature is our insight into self. We have a more penetrating grasp of our own insides than we do of anyone else's. Of course, if someone has vitiated self, their subjective view of self is thereby bound to corrupt their view of Natural Law. From his notion of natural, and thus *universal*, human sociability; Grotius created the first comprehensive treatment of international law. John Locke used a Natural Law approach when he created inalienable individual rights and governments obliged to foster and protect them. The United States Declaration of Independence is basically a statement of Natural Law in the area of government and citizens. In 1948, the United Nations adopted a similar Declaration of Human Rights.

Although the notion of Natural Law was mitigated by Jeremy Bentham's utilitarian "greatest good for the greatest number", and by legal theory that says human laws bind simply because the ruler says so; the opinion that *positive human law* is subject to, or measured by, Natural Law has never died. There is still potent, legal and Christian doctrine that says any law posited by a human lawgiver that is not in harmony with Natural Law is invalid. The reason this notion has endured is due to the fact that for most of European history positive law was used as a weapon

against the ordinary person. Western law, including American law, because it is usually formulated by the rich and the powerful, has always favored the rich and the powerful. Insisting that man made law conform to Natural Law puts somewhat of a brake on the misuse of power. If a posited, man made law or individual command is immoral under Natural Law, it does not oblige; and it must not be obeyed. You cannot be validly ordered to jump out of a 20 story window for no other reason than the command.

Religious issues stemming from the Enlightenment

With Nature the source of information about the Universe rather than the Bible, the trend away from religion and toward science changed, in many, their view of God. Most Enlightenment thinkers did not deny the existence of God; but they more or less made God irrelevant. They admitted to a God who had created the Universe; but they then claimed God gave it a push and that it has been running on its own ever since. The secular doctrine that there is a God is called Deism. But the notion that the universe is a *projectile is untenable* if a person believes God created the world *out of nothing*. Why? Because effects exist *only so long as they are being caused*. The moment you were born, your existence ceased being an effect of your mother. But you remained in existence *as the effect of the materials out of which you are made*. Your parents caused you *to become*, but the pre existing matter they transformed into you, causes you *to remain*. In other words, your parents did not create you from nothing. The kicker with creation of the universe from nothing is the fact that the materials that keep the universe in existence *were also caused by the Creator and they require continual or streaming causality to keep them in existence*. In other words, pull the plug and the light goes out. Hence, the view that the universe is a projectile is based upon mistaking something made out of nothing with something made out of pre existing matter. The mistaken projectile view of the universe contains the assumption that the

materials of the universe, once created, are *self caused*. But any entity that is self caused at any point has to be eternal; otherwise the “self” that does the causing of the caused part, itself had a beginning. The Greek philosophers, including Aristotle, thought and taught that the “matter” out of which the universe is made was eternal; because they had no Bible to tell them what cannot be discovered from the nature of matter - namely, that matter had a beginning. A projectile universe is a claim that the singularity which blew up into this “big bang” universe *was always there without a beginning - i.e. not made*. So take your pick; is the [Christian] universe an eternal self-causing projectile, or does being created rule out being self-caused? When you focus precisely on God’s causality of the universe, it is obvious that both the becoming *and the remaining* fall under a single Divine act of causality. There is no sub matter and no other God to undertake keeping created matter in existence. In other words, take away your material body and you immediately cease being in this world. Hence, if God stops causing their body, anything without an eternal soul is a goner. Likewise, if God stops continually causing matter to remain - bingo! No universe. **[See: Hebrews 1:3]** The lesson to be learned is: if you want to call God a Creator from nothing; do not run around claiming matter is self caused rather than God caused. [Another example of glib thinking about the claim of creation from nothing is the following. *Possibility* is a real factual entity just like impossibility. But if so, when God created *from nothing* there was no possibility that this world could exist. So how did God do it?]

In the latter part of the 18th century the rigid rational character of the Enlightenment began to soften. Pure scientific reason was not leading to unending progress and to a Utopia. In consequence, emotion and sentiment by thinkers such as Rousseau was added to cold calculating pure reason This should have tended to unite soul and body and diminish the body soul dualism characteristic of Western

thought, but it didn't. True to human form, the pendulum of thought went to the emotional extreme. The trend of thought headed for what was called Romanticism and the deification of emotion and imagination.

The end of Enlightenment

The Enlightenment period of Western culture is considered to have ended with the French Revolution and Napoleon. Enlightenment thinkers had said that on the basis of a rational understanding of nature and of ourselves a successful rational society can be created. This idealism was crushed by brutal reality. Many found out that pure reason isn't so pure. It gets corrupted by prejudice, greed, selfishness and even vicious malice. Although it did produce the political architecture of the United States; reform of governments into enlightened, benign protectors of their subjects, as based upon reason and science, generated some gruesome results. Utopia was downgraded from a goal to an ideal. Subsequently, the Western world fell into the hands of wealthy businessmen who were products of the Industrial Revolution. In order to beat competition and acquire economies of scale, businesses grew larger and larger. The result was that a relatively few huge firms dominated their entire industry, and some held monopolies which ultimately forced the creation of laws to control them. Today, because of their ability to buy congressional votes under the artifice of campaign contributions and lobbying, America is, in effect, owned by big corporations, and the current Republican Party is their lackey. Did you know that the Federal Reserve which guarantees the value of our money and is the base of America's entire economy *is a private bank and not a Federal Agency*? Did you know that the drug industry pays the salaries of top FDA officials. Talk about the wolf guarding the sheep. The FDA in spite of Vioxx® and Celebrex®, had the gall to claim *non-American manufactured* drugs are *unsafe* and should not be allowed into this Country. Of course, the real reason for the declaration of unsafe is not foreign drug quality; but the fact that foreign

manufactured drugs are not exorbitantly priced as are American produced drugs. The FDA and Republicans have to protect the profits of their masters. Don't you dare go to Canada to get an aspirin. And don't believe the current propaganda of these lackeys that if the drug company prices of America are subjected to competitive bidding, American drug manufacturers will collapse.

The Protestant Reformation and the secularizing of sex

The Reformation of Christianity was initiated by a German monk named Martin Luther. Luther nailed a list of 95 theses onto a cathedral door in Wittenberg, Germany. These assertions primarily railed at the Roman practice of selling indulgences and at forgiveness from sin. Other reformers picked up the challenge to the malpractices of the Roman Church. The Frenchman, John Calvin was among many. Henry VIII of England partially jumped on the bandwagon due to his desire to divorce and remarry several times. Henry then created a national church of England. The Jesuits were founded as part of a counter reformation effort by the Papal Church. Additionally, the Spanish inquisition was expanded to include all of Christendom, and the Council of Trent was convened in order to correct some of the patent abuses found in the Church itself.

The Catholic response to the Reformation, called the counter reformation, consisted primarily of:

1. the creation of the Jesuits, the papal thought police whose motto was: If the church preaches that a thing which is factually white is black, we must proclaim it black immediately;
2. the declaration of papal infallibility;
3. the Index of Forbidden books; and
4. the revival of the Inquisition, which among thousands of other despicable actions,

- burned Giordano Bruno alive for asserting that the Greeks, Romans and Chaldeans knew about evolution,
- burned the dead body of Archbishop Antonio de Dominis' along with his work on the nature of light , and
- imprisoned Galileo for confirming by actual observation through a telescope what Copernicus had already said, namely, that the earth revolves around the sun.

Not all motivations on either side were pure and religious. A great deal of secular power and wealth was also at stake. Consequently the Reformation produced a number of secular wars as well as religious reformation.

One would think that a reformation of Christian thinking and doctrine would have produced some new Christian thoughts on the nature of sex and marriage, as well as on the unassailable dictum of female inferiority. It didn't. The reformers were still mired in Greco-Roman security sex-lore and were unable to dig themselves out. The reformers politely granted that women cooperated in their own salvation, but nevertheless identified women as servants of their husbands to be restricted to the home. In addition, women were still denied citizenship. Martin Luther discarded the notion that marriage was a sacrament, but clung to the notion of mutual "consensus" and the *subjection of marriage to civil authority*. Because of these beliefs, marriages in early America were performed by civil authorities rather than clergy. Only later were clergy made civic officials of the body politic so that they could officiate at marriages in America. American clergy cannot perform marriages simply because they are clergy. In order to officiate at marriages, American clergy have to be deputized by civil authorities. Control over American marriages and marriage law, by reason of the American Constitution, belongs to each State to legislate as it will.

Because the Reformers didn't create a new Christianity, they went back to the old harsher, pre Renaissance sexual morality. Calvin was a firm believer in Original Sin and in man's depravity. John Wesley, another influential reformer, believed in witchcraft. Although there is nothing whatsoever said about government or church in the description of the six days of creation; Calvin set about creating a Geneva government subject to the Church, because he saw this as part of the Biblical order created by God. Calvin doted on authority whether it was God's, his own, or paternal authority. Authoritarian morality is a favorite of those who were abused as children. Both Calvin and Luther were. Luther, was abused by his mother who once beat him bloody for eating a nut, and his father was so abusive that Luther ran away from home. Calvin, who also was abused in childhood, allowed a child to be beheaded for striking its father. There were even penalties for calling Calvin, just plain Calvin, rather than Mr. Calvin. Those who didn't like his sermons were punished with 3 days on bread and water. Gruet, who wrote the word "nonsense" in the margin of one of Calvin's books was beheaded. So was Bethelieu and several of his followers for challenging the right to excommunicate. Calvin also, after deceiving him into coming, burned alive his competitor Michael Servetus who disagreed with Calvin on the nature of the Trinity. Freedom, especially intellectual freedom, was not one of Calvin's pets. It was one of his pet peeves. Calvin and his followers succeeded in expanding the concept of evil sex pleasure to the evilness of any and all pleasure; even that of a mother for her child. Bridesmaids were arrested for excessively decorating a bride. People were punished for dancing, being in taverns, eating fish on Good Friday, having their fortunes told, arranging marriages between people of disparate ages, and for singing songs. Pierre Ami who helped bring Calvin to Geneva was imprisoned for dancing with his wife at a wedding. His wife had to flee the country. Police went through the shops on Wednesdays and Sundays to

make sure all attended compulsory church services on those days. Calvin executed at least 150 people who disagreed with him. Sexual suppression many times causes a reaction consisting of the very sex behavior that is suppressed. Calvin's preoccupation with adultery caused this type of reaction in his own daughter and in his sister-in-law. Both committed adultery. John Knox brought Calvinism to Scotland, and the Puritans brought it to America. Calvin's doctrine of predestination basically proclaimed that all but staunch Calvinists were predestined by God for Hell. This doctrine included all non-Christians and all who lived before Christ – perhaps all who lived before Calvin. It certainly included all who disagreed with Calvin.

[Predestination is another “upsetting” conclusion that comes with glib unthinking assertions of creation by those who have no clue as to the conclusions that follow and which must therefore be accepted. The truth is that Predestination is an *inexorable conclusion* following from the assertion that God created the Universe from nothing and thus God created anything and everything that did, does, or will, exist outside of God Himself. If you just sneezed, was that a new reality? Anyone who believes that God created the Universe must believe in absolute predestination. The reason is simple. If salvation, the road to salvation and Heaven and Hell and *actual attainment of Heaven* are real; they must be God's creations. If salvation is not a fiction but a reality, it has to be objectively created. But the creation by God of the salvation of any individual who is actually saved is precisely what is meant by predestination. God, **as Creator, must predetermine** *whose salvation He will create* and whose salvation He will not. Otherwise it won't happen. However, a valid doctrine of predestination, unlike that of Calvin, does not include information about *whom God has chosen to save* and whom He has not. The existence of predestination is one thing. The matter of who will and will not be saved is quite another. The certainty of

predestination does not conclude to the certainty that one's self is among the saved – no matter who one is or what one believes or how one acts. As the book of Ecclesiastes warns: **“Again, I considered all travail, and every right work, that for this a man is envied of his neighbour. This is also vanity and vexation of spirit”. (Ecclesiastes 4:4)** **“All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous, and to the wicked; to the good and to the clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not: as is the good [person], so is the sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath”. (Ecclesiastes 9:2)** **“All things have I seen in the days of my vanity: there is a just man that perisheth in his righteousness, and there is a wicked man that longeth his life in his wickedness”. (Ecclesiastes 7:15)** The only certainty about individual predestination is the certainty that anyone who arrogantly presumes to be among the saved is most likely not, Pharisees included. A final difference between Calvin's doctrine of predestination and a logical doctrine of predestination is the fact that *not creating salvation* for a given person is entirely different from causing them to sin and wind up causing them to be damned. Genuine predestination doctrine does not assert that God positively causes people to go to Hell. Unlike Calvinistic predestination, God does not create sin or cause damnation. He simply doesn't prevent sin in some people who have their own urgent desire to step off the deep end, and they do not need God's help to do it. Just as ignorance and stupidity don't require long hard hours of study or God's causality; *sin*, being a defect, being the absence of reality, doesn't need God's creative help. Sin does not require God to create it, even though eternal punishment does. The Puritan teaching that experience of personal conversion by the Holy Spirit is an indication of being one of the elect is interesting. In effect a personal *conversion implies a sinful start*, which means that being one of the elect presupposes that one was originally and personally a

sinner. Since personal sin is not Original Sin, personal conversion is not a redemption from Original Sin. Jesus did that for everyone years ago. According to the Puritan doctrine of personal conversion, adopted today by many Ultra-Conservative moral Nazis, *only converted sinners* are among the elect. Consequently, those who have never personally sinned, even though redeemed from Original Sin, are not among the saved. I hope the mother of Jesus, the Virgin Mary, never heard of this doctrine. She might awake to the fact that she is really in Hell, not in Heaven. Since Jesus, by way of Christian doctrine, is also a true man, personal conversion doctrine puts Jesus in Hell as well as His mother. At any rate, those who believe this doctrine and believe that they personally have experienced this conversion are sufficiently convinced that they are the elect to conclude that they have the right to demand that all others adopt their morality. The American psyche of moral superiority over all other countries, and the right to *impose* “democracy” on the world, is a child of this Fundamentalist “I’m better than you” doctrine.

American Puritanism and State Authority Over Sex

American Puritanism was never a single entity. Neither was it a movement aimed at reforming the Roman Catholic church as it was in England. American Puritanism was aimed at getting totally rid of Catholicism. Puritan was the name given to several extreme Reformist Protestant denominations in Europe; particularly Calvinists, Anabaptists and Congregationalists. These European denominations had two common objectives which caused them to be lumped under the name Puritan.

First: Puritans tried to purify the Church of England of all “popery” and Catholic liturgy as well as religious images and instrumental music in church. Because the Anglican Church is a State Church, the Puritan reforms affected the English crown as well as the Anglican Church. King James the First began a

persecution of Puritans and his son, King Charles the First, said he would make the Puritans conform or drive them out of England. The major conflict was between king and Parliament. It was a “war” between King James's idea of *monarchy by divine right*, and Parliament's insistence on its own independent rights. Charles attempted to rule without Parliament from 1629 to 1640. His efforts to obtain money without the aid of Parliament by resorting to all sorts of extraordinary levies became notorious. James’s son, Charles I gathered an army. So did Cromwell, and his anti-Catholic Puritans beat James and his army. The subsequent *rump* parliament [the post-war parliament ruled by Cromwell who purged it of King Charles’s supporters] voted to execute King Charles. Cromwell also tried to exterminate the Anglican Church because it was too much like Catholicism. Charles I was beheaded in 1649. For more than a decade, England was kingless and under the rule of the Puritan Commonwealth and the Protectorate. Oliver Cromwell was virtual dictator of England until he died in 1658. Cromwell was the epitome of Ultra-Conservatism. He hated art, learning and freedom. His Puritan rule was so harsh that immediately on his death, the English people got rid of Puritan rule and re-established the monarchy by recalling Charles II from exile. Charles II, the eldest son of Charles I, showed his gratitude by executing the judges who had condemned his dad. *“You shall go from hence to the place from whence you came, and from that place shall be drawn upon a hurdle to the place of execution, and there shall be hung by the neck till you are half dead, and shall be cut down alive, and your privy members cut off before your face and thrown into the fire, your belly ripped up and your bowels burnt, your head to be severed from your body, your body shall be divided into four quarters, and disposed as His Majesty shall think fit”*.

Second: Puritans attempted to reform a civil culture that had changed from a religiously uniform, subservient, ascetical regimen to an individualistic, secular,

earthy gratification regimen. During Cromwell's ascetical régime, he had abolished maypoles, Christmas, Easter and Whitsun for being pagan festivals. These holidays were replaced with days of "Public Humiliation" during which all shops were shut down - becoming one of the sources of American Blue Laws. Theaters were banned and the Puritans opposed dancing, drinking, sports, games, carnivals, masquerades, mumming [running around in a disguise at Christmas], idleness, and wasting of money, richness of decoration; which resulted in somber clothes and bleak churches. Adultery carried the death penalty. Having to appear in church every Sunday for a year in order to be publicly castigated by the pastor while fastened to the wall with an iron collar was a great deterrent. The pillory, the stocks and the scarlet letter were Puritan inventions. The Puritans drove sexual *repression* into a moral madness which declared that everything natural was sinful, rather than expressing the axiomatic truth that everything natural is the moral.

When the Puritans, upon the death of Cromwell, lost political power in England; they became the targets of bitter repression and death sentences. Continuing persecution of the Puritans, especially by the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud; caused a wave of Puritans to emigrate to America. The Puritans came to America to escape the vengeful persecution that resulted from losing power in England where they, when in power, had viciously treated all non Puritans. Contrary to the commonly accepted fairy tale, the Puritans did not come to America to create religious freedom. They came to America so they could again be in power; and impose their fanatical, strict and rigid, aberrant religiosity upon a State of their own. Dancing on Sunday meant the stocks or a session on the ducking stool. Heretics and witches [those who disagreed with Puritan rulers] were hung. Trial by jury was outlawed in Connecticut. In many Puritan colonies only Puritan big-wigs could hold office, and civil law was

derived from the Puritan interpretation of Scripture. The puritan minded Anabaptists believed Baptism should be withheld until adulthood. They also believed that the “saved” should create their own community of saints. Other Puritans, the Congregationalists, wanted to make local congregations self-managing. Plymouth colony was founded by a group of Congregationalists, and under the auspices of the Massachusetts Bay Company a major migration of Puritans followed. These Puritans saw themselves as God’s chosen few and they attempted to build in America a model Christian community. Civil society must conform to God’s commandments; as interpreted of course, by the Puritans. As God’s elect, the Puritans felt that they had the right to direct civil affairs according to the Bible. This blending of Church and State gave American Puritans a religious/civil control over most colonial activity; a control which lasted until the 1800s. Constitutional Separation of Church and State notwithstanding, Puritan control over the States, over American Law and over political bodies is what contemporary Ultra-Conservative Christians are trying to restore.

Contemporary Puritan doctrine

Contemporary, Ultra-Conservative Puritanism is a doctrine of gloom and doom. It represents believers whose God is more afraid of His unfettered creatures than are the frightened to death Puritans. Puritans believe in fallen mankind and they carry a Calvinist view of the predestined salvation of a few who know they are saved because of their awareness of being touched by the Holy Spirit. The born again experience of conversion is an indication of being one of the saved. The notion of utter human depravity, which contains the idea that all human bodily experiences and emotions are evil; is the doctrine that gives rise to the Puritan reputation for being anti sexual, anti pleasure and anti humorous. Puritan doctrine also retains the Greco-Roman notion that a woman’s place is in the home.

Puritanism has influenced, among others, American Baptists, Methodists and Evangelists. Many of today's ultra conservative Christians look upon life through an elitist, moralistic Puritan type of vision. These Conservatives are absolutely convinced that they are the saved and that they should direct the lives of all others and all the *civil* governments in America. These Conservatives represent the attempted imposition of Puritan morality upon contemporary America. What does not make any sense within the Puritan and predestination mentality of those who believe they are the saved, is this attempt to enforce their morality upon those they consider unsaved. According to Calvinist predestination doctrine nothing will change the fact that the lost are irretrievably lost; so it matters not a whit how the lost act or live. Society can be purely secular or purely religious. It can be moral or immoral. Nevertheless, the unsaved will be lost within either context; and the saved will be saved within either context. Fretting over American morality is futile under Puritan and conservative Christian predestinative thinking. It makes a person suspect that the **Dominionist** morality of Ultra Conservative Fundamentalist Christians is not so religiously motivated as they claim. At least the true original Puritans did not claim total assurance of salvation. They believed in the necessity of constant lifelong discipline and introspection in order to determine whether their religious experience of being saved was genuine. But being born again was also an experience that left your sinful nature, your evil body and its evil passions, intact. Consequently, like a wandering, questful young person of a sentimental novel; the born again had to push on to *full* redemption through an experience of pure, whole-souled human love. The Puritans called this experience "entire sanctification". Only through this emotional cleansing could a person reach their true goal: a heart filled with perfect love for God, with no affection stinted or spared for lavishing on anyone else. Sound intense? It was. Puritans wrestling for sanctification often reported that God challenged them in the manner of Abraham's near-sacrifice of

Isaac. God seemed to be thundering at them to give up affection for their spouse, or their child, and give whole hearted commitment to Jesus alone. Only when they made this "entire consecration", could the holiness folk receive the desired heart cleansing and the new level of loving union with God. On a wider scale, Americans, following the lead of Puritan forefathers, still feel they are chosen of God. Probably because many puritan minded Ultra-Conservatives believe that material wealth is a sign of Predestination; the Puritan ethic is favorable to free enterprise. This orientation allowed the industrial revolution to flourish in both Puritanical Britain and Puritanical America.

CHAPTER SIX: ROMANTIC SEX-LORE

“Falling in love with love is falling for make believe”.

[Song writers Rogers and Hart].

Courtly Love

In 12th century France traveling troubadours began singing about romantic love. This was love outside of marriage, because the beloved female already had a husband. The implication was that marriage, as an economic relationship, was not built upon love. Romantic love, therefore, existed only outside of marriage. And because civil marriage, not the nature of human sex, determined the morality, or right and wrong ways to use sexual powers; unrequited love was the moral type of intimate male/female relationship for the unmarried. Absence of love then became one of grounds a female could call on to refuse an arranged marriage; thereby lessening daddy's power over marriage as a property deal and causing a daughter's chosen love to be the reason for her marriage. Love and loving union thereby replaced reproduction as the purpose of marriage, but reproduction remained anyway in the minds of those terminally stricken with agricultural sex. For those spellbound by farming sex, love and reproductive sex were not the same thing. But

if the daughter succeeded in her refusal, she wound up a “spinster”. The name is derived from the fact that one of the major occupations of a single woman was to spin yarn. A spinster is a woman who is not married by age 20. At age 20 a spinster is an “old maid” As part of the rise of secularism during the late Middle Ages, the literature of the age began to address this secular love in contrast to a previous preoccupation with divine love. In its origins, Romantic love was a reaction to dismal Christian doctrines about sex and marriage as well as a reaction to arranged marriages. Christianity saw women as the source of all ills. Romantic lovers perceived noble women as the source of heavenly delights. Arranged marriages were marriages that in regard to impending spouses discounted personal preferences, as well as likes and loves; while on the other hand, romantic love affairs glorified personal lust and love.

Courtly love gets its name from the fact that the ladies involved were mainly married women who were blue blooded enough to serve at a king’s Court. Some of the schooled women in French Courts even debated the nature of love. Originally sex was not a part of courtly love. Courtly love was unrequited love from afar. Basically it turned a noble woman into an impersonal “sex object”. But as a reward for some noble deed dedicated to a woman of the Court, a knight might get a kiss on the forehead. Then the knight would return to his “lower class” women and treat lower class women as objects who actually provided sex. But somewhere along the line the kiss on the forehead turned into forbidden sex. In fact, even in its early days knights were allowed to undress their beloved and put her to bed, with no sex allowed. If a knight swore he would not touch his lady, he could spend the night. Obviously, this arrangement did not work. Middle class women liked the idea of romantic love and the idea of a suitor, but were quite a bit more uptight regarding sex than were the upper classes. The solution was to make purely romantic, sexless love a prelude to marriage; which, in turn was a prelude to modern dating.

Many a minstrel used the erotic works of Ovid, a first century Roman writer and poet, as a source of inspiration. Among other outputs, Ovid wrote works called Loves, The Art of Love and The Cure for Love. The Art of Love is an instruction to men on how to seduce women. It is explicitly sexual. A supplemental format for secular love was contained in an eleventh century Arabic work called The Ring of the Dove, by Ibn Hazm. The Ring of the Dove contains a theme similar to that of courtly love; namely, an admiring lover and an unfeasible beloved. That basic theme represented the rules for the exercise of Romantic love. In effect, sex and women were idealized and substituted for God; and the practice of Romantic love became a sort of religion. Instead of God, women became the objects of eternal happiness, provided they returned their suitor's love. If they didn't, the noble lover was condemned to an eternity of anguish. Like the attainment of God in heaven as depicted by Medieval Christianity, women became prizes to be won by agonizing struggle and heroic efforts. Women already married, because theoretically unattainable, became the more desirable targets in contrast to obtainable single women. As practiced by the aristocracy, courtly love involved a highly honorable nobleman or knight fortuitously and hopelessly in love with a married noble woman. The musical, Camelot, by Lerner and Loewe, revolves around such a happenstance. Camelot, as a place, is the fictional utopian homeland of the fictional King Arthur. The Camelot of Lerner and Loewe is the Medieval story of a saintly knight called Lancelot, and his contraband love for Guinevere, the wife of King Arthur. For the edification and seduction of a beloved, the nobleman, wearing some object of his beloved, had to climb mountains, slay dragons and write love letters to her. Once she was seduced, the two entered into a rather sustained clandestine and adulterous love affair. Many a lady who was in a loveless arranged marriage, was thrilled by the attentions of a forbidden suitor. Many a suitor was thrilled by his success in seducing a married woman. The popularity of idealized

courtly love undoubtedly was enhanced by the fact of forbidden fruit. Forbidden Romantic love was called courtly love because it flowered in the courts of Eleanor of Aquitaine and her daughter, Marie de Champagne. Eleanor went on crusade with her husband. While on crusade, she had an affair with her uncle. Many of the famous tales of courtly love were written under the patronage of Eleanor and her daughter. When the ideals of courtly love reached the middle class, the illicit aspects were somewhat mitigated. Since middle class married couples were more likely to play by Christian rules and less likely to be within arranged marriages; the notion of illicit romantic love and affection became associated with marital relations rather than with extra marital relations. Eventually, the notions of romance and affection and prize to be won were applied to the licit courting of unmarried women.

Knighthood and Chivalry

Some of the barbarians who overran Europe in the early Middle Ages used horsemen. In the 800's Charlemagne's army had a cavalry whose horsemen wore armour. Trained cavalry forces were used against invading Muslims, Vikings, and Magyars. These horsemen, most of whom were of "noble", blue blooded descent, served as the leaders of the personal armies of feudal lords. They many times were paid with property by the kings or lords who had hired them. This made many of the knights, feudal lords - and everyone knows what a feud is. Every lord or knight who owned property was fighting every other lord and knight for more property. In spite of the feuding, knighthood became a recognized upper class social status. The incessant wars between them had caused these noble knights, for their own survival, to develop a code of behavior called "chivalry". Since knighthood was basically a matter of practice and not "book learning", it involved an apprenticeship. The first stage was a youngster who served as a "page" to a knight who taught the "page" how to fight. At puberty the "page" became an "esquire"

and actually served his master in the battlefield. An “esquire” became a full blown knight when he was good enough to impress a knight with his fighting skills. That knight would give the “esquire” a whack and dub him "Sir Knight." Later, knighting became far more ceremonious. The Church made an esquire dedicate his armor to the service of the Church. The esquire had to pray and fast all night and then bathe before donning his armor. He would then be ceremoniously dubbed “sir knight” by some high up nobleman. Few “esquires” could afford the ritual, the armor and the horse; so fewer and fewer men aspired to become knights. However, select bands of knights were created, such as the Order of the Garter in England. The title knight, like baron or count, became an unearned status acquired simply by blue blooded birth. Likewise, the Code of Chivalry persisted. The word “chivalry” is apparently taken from the French word for horseman. The French word is “chevalier”. During the middle ages knighthood and chivalry acquired a mystique that included aristocratic qualities, Christian virtues, and the courtly love of women. The ideal knight was a man of prowess, loyalty, and generosity like the heroes of epic poetry. In the eyes of the Church, he should put his sword at the service of the poor and needy and especially at the service of the Crusades to the Holy Land. From Southern France came the idea that a knight should serve a lady (often promised or married to another) whom he loved passionately, if hopelessly. The French epic poem Chansons de Geste [song of heroic deeds] and romances reflect this chivalric ethos. Chivalry flowered in the 13th century, spreading throughout Europe and the Holy Land and dominating much of the popular literature. Dante's Vita Nuova exposing his love for Beatrice shows how the ideas of courtly love passed into the possession of the bourgeois patriciate of Florence. Castiglione's Book of the Courtier reveals the adoption of many chivalric ideas by the Renaissance gentleman. Chivalric ideals influenced the founding of religious military orders during the period of the Crusades. These included the Templars. In

the 13th century, a philosopher and mystic by the name of Raymond Lully wrote a book called the Book of the Order of Chivalry. The book was popular all the way into the 15th century. In 1605-1615, a Spaniard named Miguel de Cervantes thought knighthood was at that time a bit of a joke. Cervantes wrote a very popular book called Don Quixote - from which comes the designation of a useless enterprise as a matter of “jousting with windmills”.

Romanticism

Disillusion with the Enlightenment and its deification of reason brought a reaction. That reaction was called Romanticism. The term “*Romanticism*” was introduced as a harkening to the somewhat bizarre and Gothic fantasy world of early medieval romance and courtly love fables, as well as to the 19th century investigations of local mythology such as the works of the Brothers Grimm. The original Romance novel portrayed a medieval world of ruined castles, ancient monasteries, and wild landscapes. Within a plot designed for suspense, a reader is presented with fundamental forces of good and evil. Chastity is constantly vulnerable, and evil is about to annihilate civilization. Like the nomenclature of the Romance Languages, these fables were not called romantic because they were fantasies of love. Tales of Frankenstein and Dracula, tales of mystery and the supernatural, tales of King Arthur and Ivanhoe as well as tales of passionate or tortuous or clandestine love, were called romances because they were expressed in one of the Romance Languages. Tales of romance were not romantic because of content; they were romantic because of language. Contemporary horror novels are direct progeny of Romantic writing every bit as much as contemporary love novels. The arrival of romantic sex within Western culture, however, clearly matches Maslow’s belonging level of motivation.

Because “**a prophet is not without honor save in his own country, and in his own house**”; (**Matthew 13:57**) being an “expert” and an “authority” on some

subject matter requires that a person come from at least 50 miles away. Likewise, the exotic is that which is found at least a few miles away. To a city dweller, rural nature is exotic; and to a country bumpkin, a glamorous woman is she who is from at least a few miles away. Romance novels spun tales of exotic women, who, to this day, are imagined stereotypically as having greater sexuality and acquiescence than the girl next door. Today a Romance novel equals a love story; and like the Medieval fables, there is an association between amour and fantasizing. If that association stayed within limits and did not become an expectation of impossible perfection, all would be better. But the *realities* of love many times are made to function in the romantic world of fancy. The fact is that love is not always a dream; and in spite of Sir Thomas Malory, there is no Sir Galahad. Subjectivity, imagination and emotion were the gods of Romanticism along with rural Mother Nature. As a revolt against the conventions of a severe rationality, Romanticism brought freedom of thought and creativity. Romanticism, as a collection of *individualized reactions* to existing generalized or standardized culture, is considered by some to be one of the most fundamental changes that ever occurred in Western culture. Culture structure contains the norms people live by, and *classical* structure had imposed a universalized set of moral imperatives upon the societies of both church and state that forced individuals to behave as, and to become, standardized robots.

Human reason is not capable of essential insight into any *individual* entity as *individual*. Because it abstracts from numerical or individual aspects in order to get at the *required core pieces* of a reality, human reason attains essential insight only into **specifics**. Human reason can get a hold on specific human nature, but it can't fathom what makes this individual to be essentially different from that individual. Human reason attains essential generalities and universalities, but not essential individualities. Human reason can *describe* individual aspects to the point that they

necessarily point to a single individual and no one else, but it cannot *define* the core essentials of an individual as an individual. Consequently, classical thinking, as it found its way into the Age of Reason, was an approach to the Universe and to people that *generalized and classified the rules* in strict orderly fashion. There were rigid *universal* formulas for life, for politics, for science and for art. Classical Western culture contained the same type of thinking that made the Greeks turn human society into ordered hierarchies of good, better, best; rather than “all humans are created equal”. The plus side of such superior versus inferior thinking is the fact that universalized ideas can be communicated and shared with others, because all humans can grasp generalized concepts. The negative side is the fact that essentials don’t communicate individual feelings nor the individual personality and self very well. That is one of the reasons why mutual personal intimacy is so tough. Applying generalized thinking to individuals and to societies turns individual humans into generalities; and no one appreciates being a generality, or a “number”. One of the basic, common dimensions of the various Romantic reactions, that made them to be “romantic”, was precisely the revolt of the individual against being a generality, or as it is labeled today, being a statistic. Feelings and sentiments and passions are the stuff of the individual, so Romanticism glorified these. As a result, the various forms of revolt against being a statistic all contained emotion and the individual as the primary values. The supremacy of government along with social order and political power was changed into the supremacy of the individual. Under the aegis of individual value, cultural Romanticism triggered the creation of modern Communism and the French Revolution. The rules of engagement between government and citizens were changed. What was due and fitting to individual persons became ascendant. Romanticism, for example, tried to remedy the dehumanizing effect of the industrial revolution. The rules of engagement between employees and employers

were changed. The notion of individual value resulted in the formation of labor unions. Employees were no longer worker drones in a bee colony. Employers had to respect individuals and bargain with employees rather than dictatorially impose wages and conditions. In the same vein, the YWCA owes its origins to the notion of personal value. It was a response to the dehumanizing effects on women of the Industrial Revolution. The rules of creativity in the arts were changed into non-rules. Romping in an imaginative world of fantasy is not the same as tedious plodding within classical and Enlightenment artistic realism. The pursuers of Romance deliberately broke the classical rules of artistry. Romantic artists and writers focused on subjects that included anything from the sublime to the frightening, from the mundane to the exotic, from the beautiful to the ugly and from past and primitive myth to the picturesque natural. Classical rules were replaced by spontaneity and probing. Writers like Shakespeare deliberately massacred the classical rules of drama. Some composers turned music into a throw of the dice. The Latin word "*alea*" means dice, and music derived from chance is called *aleatory* music. Improvisation was generated on the basis of random occurrences such as throwing dice, splattering ink on music paper, drawing of cards, etc. On the other hand, not all romantic music was silliness. German music was transformed from that of Mozart to that of Beethoven.

The classical attempt to define beauty rationally was replaced by a quest for the sublime. Because the rejection of a classically ordered Universe erased most traditional absolutes; the courtly, Romantic pursuit of an unattainable heavenly woman was transformed into a quest for the Holy Grail; and an over emphasis on the separation of individuals from each other, created a sense that each person was a totally isolated and somewhat helpless self, leading to a bit of melodramatics and a touch of melancholy. Romanticism also led to a new criterion for artistic work. Artists became the criterion of their own work. The satisfaction of artists in their

ability to represent their own visions became the standard of good art. It was good art if the artists were satisfied with what they had done, no matter what it was that they had done.

Romanticism also generated new *intuitive* approaches to science and scientific investigation; and most frightening to insecure Conservatives, it caused a rejection of traditional, but generalized, religious and moral precepts in favor of self determination and personal moral values. The intuitive Transcendentalism of Emerson and Thoreau, as well as the Dial journal, were American forms of Christian reaction to the stifling conservatism of Unitarian authorities. Like those who consider sex outside of marriage to be immoral because it is outside of artificial human designed contractual marriage, some Conservative moralists consider Romantic love to be immoral simply because it is romantic rather than straight laced subservient duty. Both religious behavioral precepts and civil laws are moral norms within their own spheres. Both have one aspect in common. Unless they are bought and paid for by special interests; laws for the most part, are good for everyone in general, but no one in particular. That is why judges exist. It is the nature and function of a judge to apply general norms to a particular person under particular circumstances. However, few people wish to go to Court for every behavioral judgment, so they judge for themselves. It's called self-governance. Nonetheless, most Americans are still trying to extricate themselves from the overly paternal dictates of contemporary ecclesiastic and civil authority. The Republicans claim that one of their objectives is to remove government intrusion from areas that it should not infringe. But when Republicans speak of getting rid of government intrusion, they mean removal of government regulations that protect you from corrupt businesses and special interests. The regulations that Republicans want to remove are obstacles to the predatory practices of the rich so that these buddies and contributors to the Party can more easily gouge the public and get

richer. Republicans mean removing laws that “*intrude*” on *big business and the rich* which prevent big business and the rich from appropriating for themselves the resources of America that belong to the people. Republicans do not mean getting rid of government intrusions into the areas governed by *individual free-will*. Republicans do not mean removal of government intrusion into the private spheres of your life that you have the right to self govern in order to be your self. Ultra-Conservative Republican officials are gung ho to force their warped personal morality onto you and remove your individuality, your self management, and your personality. Being *imperial* moralists at heart, they attempt to intrude more and more into the private lives of ordinary citizens calling this “the preservation of the sanctity of marriage” - meaning preservation of pseudo Christian heterosexual marriage à la moral Nazism. Some Romantics, in exalting sentiment and personal independence, went so far as declaring that there are no objective values. They proposed that all morality and human behavior is relative. In that light, Romanticism represents a rejection of imperialistic fascist exercise of authority, whether of Church or State or the American Republican Party. Both the Libertarian and anti-slavery Abolitionist movements in America were spawned by the Romantic approach. Some theologians, like the German, Friedrich Schleiermacher, tried to reclaim the former status of Christianity by re-presenting it in Romantic clothing. He described Christian religiosity as a form of feeling and intuition of a Supreme Being. Many Ultra-Conservatives are not so benign. Fundamentalists fanatics within Christianity and within Islam, as well as in other religions, are trying to restore the *former dictatorial status* of their religion by cramming their imperial self made precepts down their neighbors’ throats.

It is hard to escape the fact that Romanticism represents the progression from a security oriented culture to a belonging culture. Until the dawn of Romanticism, civil governments and the Church had paternally ruled everyone as

if everyone was a child. Romanticism arrived when the children of the West had grown up and wanted out from the security of familial governance and surround. Medieval serfs never looked for personal identity, because they had never heard of it. But the Romantics did, and in turning to personal identity they changed the Western definition of a human being. The age of Romanticism is the age in which Westerners became self governing adults; and their secular and religious “daddies” didn’t, and don’t, like it one bit. Currently, the various American States, as well as the Church, with their over paternal, over reaching governance, still react violently when told by American citizens; “*get out of my private sex life and my personal choices of marriage partner*”. What is a bit astounding is the speed at which Romanticism occurred. The cultural change was, in historical terms, almost instantaneous. Interestingly, it was neither civil authority nor ecclesiastical authority, with their vested interests, that initiated the change. It was the people who changed; and the new bourgeoisie shook some of the foundations of the old order. They shook old order far harder, and far more fundamentally, than any of the cultural movements, such as the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, initiated by philosophers and scientists and writers and poets.

In spite of the fact that Romantics more or less glorified rural nature in a reaction to the Christian concept of an evil and tempting natural world which had to be escaped from by means of asceticism; they didn’t obliterate “evil” nature. Romanticism contains the same diabolical, body soul duality that has always plagued Western culture. Extremist Romantics rejected reason in favor of an over-extreme exaltation of emotion, imagination, individuality and personal sex formats. But while doing so, they maintained the historically perceived body soul antipathy. They created emotion against reason, rather than emotion with reason. A professor of mine used to call the absolute orientation to emotion without reason, “all bleeding heart and no bloody head”. Star Wars movies described it as, “don’t

think, feel the Force”. In matters of love and sex it is called, “follow your heart, not your head”– which is a lovely way to step in front of an oncoming bus; particularly when interpreted as not using a condom or marrying without means of support, or thinking to reform an abusive mate, etc. etc. Romanticism, in its extreme anti intellectual form, might be described as walking blind. It leads to emotional excesses. It leads to an ill fitting Romantic sex-lore that is little better than Agricultural sex-lore. Aristotle’s body soul composite is still an unattained reality.

Because our intellects can discern necessity and from necessity infer universality; humans can make anything a sexual object. Humans can react sexually to anything from a shoe to animals, to same sex, to heterosex. The precise reason is the fact that our emotions and choices are cognitively guided. Our emotions and free-will are not cognitive powers. Our various *cognitive powers to know*, powers such as our outer senses and inner powers, including free-will; display to our emotions and free-will the things that the emotions and free-will act upon. Consequently, we do not desire or reject objective realities as they are; but *as each of us perceives them*. The fact that we react, not to reality but to reality as we perceive it; has been recognized by moralists from day one. With the exception of certain things that simply cannot be misjudged; the moral principle which enunciates this is the norm that a person must follow their good conscience. In other words, in order to be moral; a person must call things as that person sees them.

In contrast to what it used to be; our contemporary modern world is not primarily a world ruled by *universal rules, procedures and precepts of behavior*. These former universal principles of behavior basically had only one effect, and that was to force everyone to behave like clones. Today’s America is a world that recognizes individuality and creativity; and to a degree, America fosters individuality. Many, however, are not happy, nor enthralled nor comfortable with

this brave new world which removes pat answers. They are absolutely alarmed by, and insecure with, a culture that tells them they are no longer children led around by a parental government and Church. The insecure are terrified by the very thought that cultural rules have changed from rigid historical transmission of homogenous culture structures with their universal, one size fits all, traditional values; to an approach which might be described as the adventures of American culture. Romanticism is the soul of the American frontier spirit. That spirit declares people can create a whole new world, not by stagnating within past confines; but by being free to explore the new and not yet attained. Shades of stem cell research. The Ultra-Conservative part of the Republican party, which is basically an anti-Romantic party, promotes itself as the staunch advocate of Enlightenment human rights. But the Republicans are the WASP [White Anglo Saxon Protestant] political party. They have chastised other countries for violating or denying human rights to their own citizens, and then they oppose gay marriages and persecute gays and suppress women. How ironic that the party of the individual's right to bear arms is opposed to the right of gays to marry. Apparently many Republicans think that the right to own a semi-automatic AK-47 is superior to the natural right to be intimate with the person of one's choice. I guess the Ultra-Conservative wing of the Republican Party does not think that America is for all Americans. They apparently think America is only for "straight" whites who can handle an Uzi. And then there were the tortures and human rights violations at the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq and at the Guantanamo prison in Cuba which occurred under Republican auspices. Who is kidding whom? In the name of their misguided repressive anti individual morality, the Republicans are desperately trying to hang onto artificial cultural traditions that are not religious and not Christian. Although I'm sure many others along with the authoritarian Republicans think it is revealed doctrine, the American format for marriage is not basically Christian. American marriage is

from Christianity; but Christianity did not get it from God. Christianity got it from the Romans. While the right to marry is natural, the format of marriage is artificial and cultural. Contractual mutual consent is an artificial and cultural Roman construct. American marriage is a human designed *bilateral contract*. It is essentially an exchange by *equal partners*. Nevertheless, for nearly 4/5 of the history of Western marriage; marriage has included the agricultural notion of males planting seeds in a woman. The average American male still considers marriage as his acquisition of ownership over a woman. Marriage, as described in the Bible, follows that format. Marriage, as presented in the Old Testament, is not mutual consent. It is the passing *of title* to a bride, by the bride's father, to a new owner, the groom. Furthermore, Old Testament marriage is described as polygamous. If Christian marital morality is to be based upon the Ultra-Conservative interpretations of the Bible, it had better return to polygamous male ownership of women. Republicans proclaim identification with authoritarian, regulation laced, ultra conservative Christianity; but contrary to popular belief, genuine Christianity is not a religion of moral precepts as is Confucianism. True Christianity is a religion of the supremacy of charity.

Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profits me nothing.

(I Corinthians. 13: 1– 3)

Belonging Peer Groups

A peer group provides a collective standard by which individuals can measure themselves during the process of identity formation of self. Within a peer group, a young person can try out a variety of roles that involve either lead or follow, as well as conformist or rebellious. The values and norms of the group permit adolescents to acquire a perspective on their own values and attitudes. A peer group can also help them make the transition from reliance on the family to relative independence. The common language, clothing, music, and customs adopted by their generation allow them to express a distinct identity that in turn eases the anxiety of separation from past sources of reference and identity. Belonging at the level of need produces copy cat adaptive, or conformist behavior. The need to fit in, produces a fitting of one's self into the tastes and behaviors of the group. The 'self' is adapted to the desires and tastes of others in order to gain their appreciation and acceptance. The need to be loved or to belong is the need of young people to belong to a group or clique. It amounts to following the fads. Today we call it 'peer pressure'. Peer groups hate the same school subjects, and dance the same dances. The need to belong tends to make a person wear what the group wears, be fond of the same movies as the group, and hate the same things as the clique does. Boys these days wear the same "cut with a soup bowl" hairdo, baggy pants with crotch at the knees, sneakers, etc. Today's peer fads include mutilations by pins and rings in ears, eyebrows, noses, tongues, navels and genitals. And both adolescent sexes have to have the latest name brand clothes. Helping their kids belong can cost parents a fortune; and don't manufacturers know it. Some authors have a less flattering description of the human need to belong particularly in reference to copy cat behavior. They call it the 'herd' instinct. Ever notice that when driving a car on a crowded highway the other drivers [not you, of course] always tend to bunch together? You can see ahead of

you a separate and dangerous, cluster of autos caused by drivers who have bunched together. You can watch while the drivers of a separate cluster behind you speed past you in order to catch up with the cluster ahead. Join the herd.

Romantic Tales

Classical romance tales, or love stories, normally dwell on a plot in which a young man wins the hand of a princess from her father, the king, by performing some astounding deed or otherwise pleasing the royal father. Somewhat like the American Horatio Alger stories of the 19th century, the point of a romance tale is that everyone has a personal destiny they can fulfill. Romance novels end with “living happily ever after”; and the romantic “happily ever after” destiny is contained within the self. Merited rewards will be attained unfailingly by the worthy, and fitting punishments will be imposed inescapably upon the unworthy. Some people become rich and powerful by dint of colossal effort, while others who plot and scheme come to a deserved miserable end. Among other things, these tales are tales of social mobility. These romantic fairy tales are a reaction to Medieval Divine rights and fixed status that must not be challenged and cannot be overcome. The other dimension is the love and passion which provides the motivation to overcome all odds. Romantic tales are expressions of the myth that love conquers all.

American Romantic Sex-lore

Is sex without love moral? Yes according to Fundamentalist Christian churches; because the purpose of sex is procreation not the communion of love. Married couples can morally procreate without love, but cannot morally make love without procreation.

The traditional institutionalizing of human sexuality in Western culture put sexuality under the control of a sort of patriarchal autocracy. Because of the

connection that was made between human sex and the sacred, the ethical control of human sex was assumed by the Christian religion, although most secular societies assume the same paternal attitude as is evidenced by the sexual laws existing in this Country. As a romantic reaction to this loveless, highly ordered autocratic control; a new form of sexual folklore developed which focused entirely on the individual and on the affective dimension rather than on the intellectually oriented and organized '*civilized*' social purposes of human sexuality. In the context of the more general movement toward individual autonomy and the affective side of human life which characterized the Age of Romance, American sex-lore was '*Romanticized*'. The Romantic myth, the myth of 'all bleeding heart and no bloody head' says that the heart rules. Love is a feeling of tenderness and emotion and sex is the strongest of the positive human emotions; so love and sex are treated as the same thing. [There is some truth in this, provided the sex is an act of giving self rather than an act of taking control of the partner for one's own pleasure alone.] The act of sex becomes the act of love, and the sacredness of human sexuality is found in the cult of orgasm.

Initial Romantic Sex-lore

1. Obsession with the beauty and character of another such that there was a one and only true love that brought eternal happiness if found, and eternal damnation if not found.
2. A woman is not a gate to hell, but an angel.
3. Love is maintained by wearing an object from one's beloved, such as a handkerchief around the neck.
4. Love and marriage don't mix, so love a mistress, and have kids by a wife.
5. Love may not, but sex contains tenderness and affection.
6. Sex is a reward for devotion [persistence].
7. Because of sex as the driving force, marriage is no longer a union of

families, but of individuals.

8. Sex, unlike seeing and hearing, requires justification.

9. If romance threatens marriage, don't get rid of romance; get rid of marriage.

Effects of Romanticism on the Family

1. Freedom from domination within the family: The wife is not obliged to obey her husband, and parents and kids are buddies.

2. Changed purpose: The purpose of conjugal marriage is no longer the creating of a new unit within an extended family. Childless marriages [and thus all marriages] need a new purpose which pertains to the full development of individuals. Personal fulfillment is the new reason for getting married.

The existence of a formidable middle class resulting from the industrial revolution caused an acceptance of romance and marriages "arranged" by love and free choice of mates, instead of mates imposed by "daddy". What changed along with this was the feudal notion of social status *fixed* by birth as low or high class. This change in the fixed hierarchical feudal family caused a change in government laws concerning the identity and status of the family. Family law had to now cope with cohabitation of the unmarried, homosexual relationships, and single parent families along with greater instances of divorce. In America, because male jobs kept a lot of husbands out of the home for prolonged periods, divorces increased; many due to women seeking divorce because their husbands were never home. This caused a change in divorce laws. They became more available to women. In the late 1880s women had an access to divorce which was equal to that of men. Since the separate States in America can form their own laws of marriage and divorce, and since their legislatures do not normally cooperate with each other; the new forms of family law that the various States adopted does not match very well. A couple legitimately married in one State could move to another and find out that

in the new State they were not legally married. State by State divorce law also meant that a couple living in a State with stringent divorce laws could establish legal residence in another State with easy divorce laws. This was called “migratory divorce”. For example; until 1967 adultery was the only legal basis for divorce in New York. But in Nevada, a nebulous thing called “mental cruelty” was an accepted cause. The population of Nevada grew immensely, but only for a time. Once divorced in Nevada, most new Nevadans moved back home. In consequence of the messed up divorce laws which included grounds such as mental cruelty, divorce law in many States became focused on the *actual relationship of the spouses, the Biblical “one flesh”*, in contrast to focus on the legalities of “null and void” marriages. Alcoholism, drug addiction, no support, and even voluntary separation became grounds. New York divorce law, for example, was changed to include 2 years of spousal living apart. In 1969, California invented “no fault” divorce and set up as grounds for divorce “irreconcilable differences”. In regard to laws governing legitimacy, adoption, custody, education, and control of a child's welfare, the focus likewise shifted from legitimacy to biological parentage. For example; even the child of a single woman is allowed to inherit, and the obligation of child support is laid on the real parents. Adoption and legitimizing remove illegitimacy and grant the child status in society. Cohabitation is now common, and so is the decision to remain childless. Likewise, the number of single parent families has dramatically increased. This is not simply due to rising divorce rates, but also to a growing tendency not to remarry. **[See: [The Software Toolworks®](#), [Multimedia Encyclopedia](#); CD version 1.5, 1992; Jan Dizard, [Family](#).]**

Roughly 50% of all first marriages end in divorce, and a person would think that experience would make a second marriage more stable and successful. But the sad fact is that second marriages fail 70% of the time.

Effects of Romanticism on American Males and Females.

1. Girls must make themselves attractive to men. They must change and enhance their physical attributes.
2. Boys must win a female, and keep her by pleasing her.
3. Sexual desire is okay for females as well as males.
4. Sexual license - the cult of orgasm - is okay, because sex is not evil.
5. Dating is **conquest**; and necking, and petting and premarital sex are okay.
6. Engagement is a sexual trial period, not a betrothal.
7. Sex in a romance is better than sex in a marriage, although the two are not incompatible
8. People automatically fall in love, but they marry by mutual choice. Matchmaking is passé.
9. The choice of a good partner depends upon self.
10. Love at first sight exists.
11. There is automatic bliss upon finding the perfect mate.
12. Affection can substitute for enduring love, and rapport can sub for affection. So an enduring sexual relation can be built upon rapport without love or affection.
13. Marriage is a higher state than celibacy, but celibacy is acceptable.
14. Sex will cause and reinforce true love.
15. If female orgasm does not occur something is wrong – with the guy.
16. To inhibit or suppress one's sexuality is bad.
17. Pre marital sex is okay when love, affection or an engagement exists. Pre marital sex is also okay and is not rape if **conquest** has produced consent.
18. Sex is the total meaning of life and love.

The American Mating Game

Asexual reproduction results in clones. Asexual reproduction by cutting

one's self in half results in unbelievable numbers of offspring. Asexual reproduction is geometric. One becomes 2, 2 become 4, 4 become 8, etc. It is estimated that an asexual bacterium can produce a million, trillion offspring per day. The bad news is that a single disease [or anti-biotic] can wipe out all of them in one stroke. The good news for bi-sexual reproducers is the fact that each individual offspring differs and thus no single agent can wipe out an entire population. The bad news is that bi-sexual reproduction requires a mate, and not all of one sex are enthralled by every individual of the opposite sex. As a matter of fact, very few of them are. Compatible mates are hard to find, hard to attract and even harder to keep. When other individuals searching for a mate are factored in, bi-sexual mating becomes a competition. Bi-sexual reproduction equals the mating game.

In brute animals, including birds, there are biological features which serve no other purpose than to attract mates. These are features such as a peacock's tail and a songbird's song. Each species has its own idea of natural beauty. In most cases, natural beauty indicates the health, strength and fecundity of an individual. This includes humans. *[I disclaim any original authorship of the following: certain human facial features, for example, full lips on a female are generally considered attractive. At the same time, full lips indicate high estrogen which, in turn, is part of high fertility. Estrogen is a hormone that produces female physical structures during puberty and organic readiness for conception during the menstrual cycle. Women with short lower jaws are among the beautiful; but a shorter lower jaw indicates lower testosterone, and thus, a shorter chin signifies a softer, gentler woman. Protruding lower jaws on a female are considered ugly; and such chins, along with a wart, are consistently portrayed on evil witches. Virile features in a man's face are a sign of high testosterone. Testosterone is a predominantly male hormone which maintains male reproductive capacity,*

including production of sperm, and strong sexual behavior.]

Natural beauty is enhanced by learned skills such as nest making, and is further enhanced by courtship rituals. In brutes, the rituals are instinctive. In humans, the rituals are semi instinctive, individual creations in addition to those that are culturally dictated. Humans males have “come on” strategies and a “line”; while human females have cosmetics and dress, as well as “sexy” posturing. Because human females display no biological indications of ability to conceive and have no short term or noticeable estrus cycle, the problem for human females is to maintain constant male attention. Many brute animals instinctively time their mating such that their offspring are born in a time of plenty. Grazing animals time their mating right before a rainy season so that when their offspring are born there is plenty of new grass around. Many animals mate in the Fall so that their offspring arrive in Springtime, when anything from grass to bugs to large prey are plentiful. Humans are different, they, like squirrels, are smart enough to plan ahead and store food. They are also smart enough to build long-lasting artificial shelters. In terms of food, shelter and ability to care for their young, humans alone, among all animals, are ready to go sexually at any time. Young human males bring smiles to the faces of all who see them, because young males are continually on the prowl. There is no season of rut for human males other than all the time; and well neigh with any female. Human females, in turn, are the only mammals that have constantly swollen breasts. Most brute females can mate only during sparse periods of estrus or heat and at that time they display unmistakable biological evidence of receptivity and fertility. Some don't ovulate until they copulate. Human females, on the other hand, ovulate monthly, and aside from PMS, neither the onset of ovulation nor ovulation is displayed outwardly by changes in complexion or by enlargement of breasts or genitals, or by pheromone release. Neither human females nor males can tell whether or not a human female is capable of conceiving

on any given day. Consequently, human females are also ready to go at any time. Because of estrus periods, most animals except for humans wind up copulating when the female is ovulating. In some animals, such as lions, copulation causes the female to ovulate. The upshot is that brute animals, by nature, copulate when conception is highly probable. If the female does not conceive, that is rare and accidental. Since humans can and constantly do copulate when there is no chance of conception, a serious question arises about the assertion that the Nature given “purpose” of human sexual intercourse is reproduction. Human nature does not seem to agree. The human desire for intercourse, by nature, operates all the time; and intercourse is possible all the time. What is not naturally possible for humans all of the time is conception. So why is a good part of human sexual intercourse useless for reproduction? Human sexual intercourse cannot be defined as reproductive by nature, if by nature it does not and cannot reproduce 96% of the time. But there is no time restriction on using sex to create a close or intimate *union*. It seems the Bible is correct. The purpose of human sex is **one flesh**.

In Western culture, the human search for a mate was originally not too tough on potential spouses. That was because the patriarchs of two extended families got together, and for political and economic reasons, entered a betrothal contract involving their offspring. Hence, before being joined, bride and groom may not have known each other, let alone liked each other. Not only that, they may never develop a liking for each other once they are forced upon each other. Humans, like other animals, display and compete; but since the beginnings of the Romantic approach in Western culture humans have complicated courtship by adding to it the search for love. The first historical signs of potential mates having a say in the choice of partner occurred with the Roman “**affectio maritalis**”. The contemporary result is the fact that in America, potential spouses have to find each other. Given the huge population of America, and given the fact that we are not

organized on the basis of agricultural, extended families; personal contacts occur “naturally” only in the workplace and in neighborhoods. However, it is not considered cool to do your courting in the workplace, especially in the face of sexual harassment conditions; so that leaves the neighborhood. But neighborhoods consist mainly of already married couples. Unless a person is game for a bit of adultery, the neighborhood is not a very good source of mates either. In consequence, Americans have turned to artificial sources. Some consider the grocery store a good place to meet the opposite sex. Then there are bars and clubs, not to mention lonely hearts advertising in newspapers and magazines along with computer matching. These days the internet is a major source of contacts provided it isn't a sexual predator looking for kids to prey on. There are dating services that offer everything from simple personal profiles to staged mass orgies. The lights, camera, action and music dimensions of artificially created contacts is quite perceptive. Human sexual passion, like other emotions, can be triggered by the imagination rather than reality. Fantasy is a large part of human sexuality. Hence, most artificial settings for meeting others are designed to stimulate the imagination. They create a fantasy atmosphere which says to patrons that they will find there, the perfect mate. The problem is that a lot of people believe it.

There is also a new historical phenomenon connected with the search for a mate in America. Many of today's searches are not a search for a marital partner. Human males have always had an orientation to hit and run. Human females have always had a reputation for wanting long term, reliable and stable relationships. These are asserted as natural characteristics because males have a lot of sperm to spread around, while females have relatively fewer eggs and invest substantially more time and effort in raising children than do men. Sex-lore says that women will try to get a desirable man to marry them, but it also says that desirable men are constantly finding excuses not to do so. These characteristics are perceived as

“natural”, but they appear to be natural only when sex is viewed as *male seed planting sex-lore*. These *botanical conquest type* of sex roles, in fact, are not as natural as formerly believed. The desire for companionship and friends is natural, and is oriented to bonding even if having kids is not the objective. The drive for companionship lasts a lifetime. It remains in the elderly. Old folks look for friends and companions and they certainly aren’t planning on being parents. Dr. Maslow called these orientations the *need to belong*; but he never asserted that the need to belong is a need to sexually conquer or submit to the opposite sex.

American females have gotten themselves educated. They have attained new success in the workplace and in the development of personal careers. They have ceased being perpetual children under the non ending tutelage, directives and ownership of males. Given the independence and self sufficiency attained by many American females, it turns out that a significant number of them have no desire whatsoever to get married. They feel no need to be cared for and supported by a male. Some of these woman may want companionship and sexual partners now and then; but contractual, long term mating has no appeal. This does not indicate a change in the nature of women; *but it does highlight the artificiality of marriage*. Contractual marriage is not a biologically inbuilt need or orientation of women – nor of men. The particular manner in which a given male American courts a woman or has particular desires for a specific type of woman and a specific type of sexual relationships is a matter of learned behavior. Individualistic aspects of courting are not inbuilt. They are acquired, and they represent the individual as an individual. So is the cultural practice of a man initiating sexual relationships. In our society, with its male superiority sex-lore, the male is supposed to make the original advances. This is not true of all cultures. Some like ours are male dominant; but some cultures are indifferent and in some it is the female who initiates romantic or sexual relationships.

Physical appearance plays an important role in the establishment of sexual partnerships among human beings. Among all peoples sexual attraction is based in part upon external bodily characteristics. In our own society the beautiful woman and handsome man are, other things being equal, considered sexually more attractive than ugly individuals. There is, of course, wide variation in taste, but in general terms most members of Americans society would probably agree that certain individuals are more attractive to the majority of the opposite sex than are others. For example, relative youthfulness in the female tends to arouse more masculine interest than does elderliness. Masculine-like women are in general considered less attractive than are those whose bodily structure is unmistakably feminine. Extreme corpulence, a poor complexion, or baldness in either sex tends to lessen the individual's sexual attractiveness. . . . The cross-cultural evidence makes it clear that there are few if any universal inbuilt standards of human sexual attractiveness. Instead, the physical characteristics which are regarded as sexually stimulating vary appreciably from one society to another. A thin woman is regarded as more attractive than a plump one in some societies; the reverse is true in others. Furthermore, there are great differences between cultures with respect to particular bodily organs or characters that are considered critical determiners of beauty. For some peoples, the shape and color of the eyes are extremely important factors contributing to sexual attractiveness; for others the formation of the ears seems to be of greater significance. One very interesting generalization is that in most societies the physical beauty of the female receives more explicit consideration than does the

handsomeness of the male. The attractiveness of the man usually depends upon his skill and prowess rather than upon his physical appearance. **Patterns of Sexual Behavior by Yale professors Clellan Ford and Frank Beach (New York: Harper and Brothers, and Paul B. Hoeber, Inc., Medical Books, 1951)**

Odor is a strong sexual stimulant and filthiness seems to be repulsive to most peoples. In many societies cleanliness of the body is especially stressed as the *sine qua non* of sexual attraction. In consequence, the use of perfume is widespread as is wearing sweet smelling flowers on the body or in the hair. The use of sound is found in love songs and in the noisy racket that today's teenagers find attractive. In the same vein, symbols are extensively used by humans. Language or talk is the most basic among humans. Males have their favorite "lines"; and sometimes even write love letters, or at least send a valentine. Another favorite symbol in America is flowers and sometimes candy. In America a direct and explicit request for sex upon initial meeting is not necessarily considered immoral, but it is normally considered bad taste. The use of "magic" is well nigh universal. Almost all societies have their favorite love charms and aphrodisiacs.

Dating became an activity done for social pleasure as well as a device for discovering compatibility. Outside of the Western world - among many other cultures - the notion of romantic love is today laughed at, scorned, and thought to be ludicrous and impractical. These people cannot conceive of picking a life-mate on the basis of an emotion. This is a clear example of the spread and integration of an idea to one part of the world, and its consequent appearance as a perfectly "natural" and right form of behavior, while another part of the world

looks with amazement on such behavior. [**Ira L. Reiss, Premarital Sex Standards in America (London: The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-Macmillan Limited) P.58]**

The original accent on a “one and only love” which would lead to “eternal happiness” has survived but in altered form. With increased contact between young people, and with so many of them “falling in love” several times within their courtship period, and a 1 in 2 divorce rate it is difficult to believe in a “one and only”. It is important to note that the merging of love and sexual behavior by the Romantic movement, formed the basis for love to become the justification of non marital sex. People increasingly justify sexual behavior by claiming love; which, incidentally, is a highly Christian notion. Christian life is aimed at love for God and love for neighbor. Romanticism generated this new love norm and related new sexual behaviors, but the old fashioned middle ages Christian institutional and cultural norms are still with us. Among American Christian Conservatives and Fundamentalists, there is a strong reaction to female self governance, to extra marital sex, to homosexuality and to women’s equality. These Conservatives are still functioning at security levels rather than belonging levels. They are trying, with a significant amount of success, to restore blanket universalized uniform sexual morality which is the opposite of personal self governed morality and personal self governed life. Ultra Conservatives have never heard of individual style. They do not think common functions such as sex allow for style. But anyone who likes music knows the every performer who presents the same musical number does it in their own style. So also sex. [and so also the specific behaviors necessary for attaining salvation. Every individual has their own style for attaining salvation.] Nature gives everyone their own sexual style. In contrast, Ultra Conservative and Fundamentalist individuals have a dire emotional need for

control and security and sameness. Everyone must be a moral robot programmed to function in exactly the same manner as Conservatives otherwise they are really scary “strange (rs)”. Under insecure and frightened Conservatives, the *individuality* that derives from sexual reproduction must not be allowed to function even if it functions as the nature-given unique style of participation by each individual person in human nature, and in universal morality, and in Natural Law, and in Divine Law. For Ultra Conservatives, no individual conscience or individuality is allowed. Non conformists are called “liberals”. For the security driven, individuals are not really unique participants or stylized members of one same human species. They are all clones, and therefore the morality of each individual must be the clone of every other individual. Idiosyncratic Christian behavior, even when tightly adhering to universal Christian morality, is a no no. There is no such thing as individual application or style. Everyone must behave in exactly the same manner. If this view were pursued in the area of medicine, all of us would be taking the exact same pills and undergoing the exact same surgeries, whether we needed them or not. Pushed to extremes, this clone morality could result in demands that everyone marry a person of the opposite sex, do it at age 25 with the male as lord and master of the female, have missionary sex once every fortnight, cut their toenails once a week, and produce 2 ½ children within three years. Sex-lore is a piker when compared to this robotic type of Fundamentalist morality.

The double Standard

Traditionally an American male was not supposed to seduce a ‘nice’ girl. But all women are virginal in the beginning, so there must be a way for a Don Juan to label women as ‘not nice’ *while they are still virginal*. The problem is that virginity as the single criterion of who is a ‘bad’ woman is clearly not sufficient as a means of determining which ‘nice’ women are ‘loose’ at heart. So double standard chauvinist males pick their recruits from women *who are thought to*

display some desire to engage in sex through their dress and their actions *which are perceived* as in invitation.

Americans are raised to be overly-competitive about sex. Boys and girls are made to feel that, above all else, they must succeed, achieve, win out in the social-sexual game. They must not merely enjoy themselves on their dates and eventually achieve good marriages – nay, they must date the best boy or girl in the neighborhood; be the finest lover for miles around; have the greatest home and family.

[Albert Ellis, [Sex Without Guilt](#) (New York: Grove Press, Inc., Rev. Ed. 1965) P78.]

Dating to Find Sex Not Marriage: the Game of Conquest

Have you ever heard the joke about the guy who says to a woman; “would you sleep with me for a million dollars?” She says yes, so he then says to her; “how about 50 bucks?”. She replies; “what do you think I am, a prostitute”. His answer is; “we’ve already established that. Now we’re just haggling about price”. Sexual games are games in which sexual satisfaction is displaced from the sexual act and made to be the payoff of a game. Keep in mind that the dating game requires at least two players; someone who initiates the game and someone else who responds to the invitation to play. Also keep in mind that these are competitive games. Their outcome is a winner along with a loser. The loser however, is not always the other player.

Sexual Games Played by the Married:

Corner, played as a disingenuous refusal to play another’s game; the passive aggression cuts off communication and avoids intimacy. Husband talks about the

house. Wife says it needs painting. He reacts with hostility. Both leave in a pique. Evidence indicates that when parents play the game with their children by responding to a question with a question, the game can be an etiological factor in producing asthma in the child.

Courtroom, played as a mutual complaint to a third party in order to justify self and to win approval for one's behavior. *Wife*, "This is what he did". *Husband*, "No, what I did was that". This interaction is part of a competitive dominance-submission marital relationship.

Frigid woman [A form of now I've got you, you SOB.], played as a form of vindication for frigidity. Wife, when confronted by amorous husband, complains that all he ever wants is sex. He cools down, she responds by alluring him. When he reacts, she claims foul. The ensuing fight substitutes for sex.

Look how hard I've tried, played as a form of vindication for remote behavior. The marriage is disintegrating. Husband reluctantly goes to counseling with wife; but does not really try to rebuild. When marriage fails, he is innocent because he went for counseling and did his best.

Sweetheart, played as a form of derogation clothed in sweet talk, and accepted by the other as a form of letting spouse expose failings rather than having to admit them one's self. "You really messed up that time, didn't you sweetheart".

[See: Games People Play (The Psychology of Human Relationships), Eric Berne M.D., New York: Grove Press Inc.; 1964]

The male side of the game of conquest: How does one distinguish ready to go sluts from reticent virgins? Who is on the pill? You ask your buddies about which women will "put out" and which won't. Sluts allegedly display their willingness by dress and manner and responses. Sluts are from inferior races or those from inferior social status such as lower income or different religion, as well as those who live at a distance. Most direct of all, simply propositioning any and

all women will tell you which women will and which won't. The Russian immigrant and comedian, Yacov Smirnoff, tells a story about his original arrival in America. He says that when he got off the train he was immediately propositioned by a prostitute. He says that he thought to himself: "What a Country!". Another approach in the male way to find out if women will respond sexually is to bedazzle them. Spend a lot of money on them. Make women think you are the best thing that has ever happened to them. Wine them and dine them *to purchase* their sexual favors. Get them carried away by your insincere protestations of love; and when you think you have spent enough time and money on them insist they "put out". Having conquered one or other, leave her for a new conquest.

The female side of game: Be coy, and be a flirt. Play sexual yes -no - maybe, catch me if you can. If a woman has allowed a courting male to pursue her and has allowed him to pay her a due amount of attention [plied her with a sufficient number of goodies], she must sexually submit. She must disregard the cultural taboo about being married in order to justify sex. To win this game a woman must allow a suitor to become serious and then tell him to "buzz off pervert".

Dating to Find a Mate

For females: Do not go near the game of conquest and tease. Playing hard to get means faking the relationship. Not being yourself will get you a mate who, like you, did not show you who he really is. The guys who are busy playing the game of conquest are keeping score. If you are a woman who is tempted to play the game, you will wind up on some guy's scorecard; but without the guy. If you are looking for a lifetime of shallow, superficial, short-lived unsatisfying relationships with men; by all means play the game. But if you desire a deep, intimate, long lasting reciprocal love relationship with a man; you had better run from the game of conquest as if it was poison, because it is. Men who are playing the game are not looking for a mate. They are looking for sex not marriage. They function in a

world of artificial, superficial, selfish and temporary relationships; not in a world of genuine, deep, unselfish, loving and permanent relationships. The appearance is appetizing; but the object does not fulfill. The *game* of conquest [which is not the genuine essence of dating] basically means that the participants are not really interested in developing a loving long-term relationship. They are more interested in conquest or submission of a sexual type on the part of the other. The sex is not evil, but the conquest is. **The game of conquest puts the female into the category of prey,** and prey do not get to discuss whether they should be attacked.

A Summary of Romantic Myths

CONSERVATIVE [security myths]

LIBERAL [belonging myths]

“Irrational Eros”

“Romantic Pathos”

Reason leads instinct	Instinct leads reason but reason exists for implementing instinctual needs and desires
Individual instinctive sex is contrary to reason and to social order.	Individual instinctive sex is the totality of reason and order. It is the only reasonable use of sex. Social, institutionalized sex is irrational; i.e. deliberately planned and socially ordered sex is contrary to reason. Sex and love are affective not ‘reasoned’ into. Romantic love is reasonable. ‘Planned’ love [such as arranged marriages] is not.
Sex is a ‘lower’ irrational instinct.	Sex is personality, sex is the highest

	impulsive behavior
Sex is totally public	Sex is totally private
Sex is a problem not a solution	Love [sex] solves everything
Sex is a pure means to reproduction	Sex is an end in itself

Romance and Politics

In the realm of politics, those committed to the Romantic ideal really did function in a dream world. Like the goals of both the Eugenicists and the Behaviorists of modern America, the goal was to create a perfect society. Perfect society for the Romantics meant getting rid of hierarchical legal structures. Unlike the Enlightenment which defined politics as the rights of people who are to be served by governments created by the will of the people; the Romantic notion was that of a Utopia wherein all the people ruled with fraternity and equality. Fraternity and equality were the motto of the French revolution. The change from an Enlightened notion of a perfect society to a Romantic notion of a perfect society is the reason why the French revolution is considered to be the end of the Enlightenment. In France, Enlightened reason crashed when the French people became the “rulers”. During the French revolution, *people power* resulted in guillotines working overtime. The people turned out to be far more vicious and cruel than any French king. In its extreme, Romanticism produced a movement called Anarchism. The idea was to get rid of all government and government authority. It was a believer in anarchism who assassinated President William McKinley. The Romantic ideal of government is akin to direct democracy rather than representative democracy. Everyone has an equal voice in government. The problem is that pure, direct democracy simply cannot work with huge populations.

It is difficult to get consensus out of a group of ten people, let alone ten million. Although it does not appear so on the surface, there is a common ground between the Romantics who wished to create a future utopia and the contemporary Ultra Conservatives who wish to hearken back to a never existed golden age of morality as a cure to their notion that contemporary American society has gone to the moral dogs. That common ground is a desire to live anywhere but in the present. The ideal Utopia was in the past or will be in the future; but the Utopia is never now. Neither the Conservative nor the Romantic wants to face the fact that life can be lived only in the present; and trying to live in some past time and place, or trying to recreate some past time or place, is an escapist point of view. Trying to live where and when it is not possible is a rejection of the fact that life is to be lived, not escaped from. If a person examines history for that past golden age of actually existing blanket moral imperialism of the kind that Conservatives are trying to reincarnate in America, the only thing one finds is the Inquisition.

Victorianism: a Backlash to Romanticism

George III, the king who lost the war of American independence, created a rampage against vice called the Victorian age. The uptight upright English government anti vice campaign, however, got attributed to His granddaughter Queen Victoria. Although Victoria gets blamed, it was her husband, prince Albert, who was the principle uptight influence. The campaign tried, and succeeded in large measure, in returning England to the previous idea that nature and pleasure and all emotions are evil. The only difference was that Victorian women were no longer devilish snakes, they were pure, i.e. sexless. The Victorian age is also the hypocritical age when England ruthlessly enslaved several other countries but called it colonization. Victorian colonization meant walking, with superior weaponry, into someone else's country and claiming rightful ownership - but don't you dare go near immoral sex.

Throughout Western history, and as illustrated by the studies of Kinsey and the like, the elite and educated classes of society usually practice a less restrained variety of sexual morality than the lower classes. The lower classes and those less educated are more likely to eschew “adventurous” or “exotic” forms of sex and restrict their activities to vanilla sex. The lower classes and less educated are also far more likely to buy into and to practice a rigid sexual morality. As professor Higgins tells Eliza Doolittle, in the movie My Fair Lady, he wants none of her *slum prudery*. Insecurity can also be a factor in the adoption of rigid moral codes, because such codes create a sense of sustained structure relative to inner self and a semblance of control relative to the external world around. The moralistic Victorians fit these dimensions. Not far removed from Puritan morality, and not far removed from their lower class status; the middle class Victorians used Puritan morality as their safety net and their claim to status. The industrial revolution created the middle class. But in Victorian England where they were first appearing, the new middle class were insecure about their new wealth and uncertain regarding their newfound status.

In their anxiety to be ladies and gentlemen they struck exaggerated postures of propriety, flattered their superiors, bullied their inferiors and set great store on following a strict code of conduct. In the course of their advancement they brought with them, usually from humbler origins, an assertive prudishness -- part of the paraphernalia of respectability – a worship of industry for its own sake, a suspicion of pleasure as being a trap of the Devil and a complete lack of aesthetic taste or tradition ...Standards no longer evolved from or through the aristocracy....They developed a veritable obsession with sin, especially sexual sin, and since the only way they

could with propriety maintain constant contact with the forbidden pleasure was by censoring its presence in others, they nosed out sex with an industry as indefatigable as it was ingenious”. **[John Chandos, To Deprave and Corrupt, Association Press – an affiliate of the YMCA.]**

Victorian hard liners tried to get parliament to impose the death penalty for adultery. Parliament refused. But Conservative private societies bent upon imposing their twisted views and utter terror of sex were responsible for a great number of legal prosecutions [persecutions]. A group called the Society for the Reformation on Manners lasted for five years, but was disbanded after being convicted of rather consistently using false testimony - a tactic recently employed in America by some of the fanatics who are against Planned Parenthood. In the meantime the unmannerly Society for Manners had instituted over 10,000 lawsuits. In 1789 there was a *royal* Proclamation Against Vice which was used by the private societies as a cover to suppress all free speech on matters the Puritan Victorians didn't like. These societies were the reason Thomas Paine, after writing a work called the Rights of Man had to flee England; but in America his work called The Age of Reason was also condemned. Paine's works were basically political; but "moral" censors think they have the right to suppress anything contrary to their warped ideology. The personal and subjective nature of censorship shows up because each censor views with horror a different form of sex. This causes most censorship to be totally variable and arbitrary with no valid morality behind it. In 1793, the Evangelical Magazine declared; "*All novels, generally speaking, are instruments of abomination and ruin*". Another Victorian prude pronounced that: "*It is much to be questioned whether any sort of fictional representation ought to be put into the hands of youth*". It was asserted that any

book containing fiction, not being a depiction of the real, was a lie. Theater, for the puritan Victorians was an abomination. John Styles, a Methodist minister, said that it was a “luckless hour” when Shakespeare became a writer for the stage. The super prudish, superstitious Victorians also ‘invented’ the abhorrence of words as words. If you were cursed by someone, the Devil really would come and get you; and additionally you had better look out for the *evil eye*. The medieval church hated sex but did not hesitate to describe it when condemning it. In contrast, the Victorians “Bowdlerized” the Bible of such words as “whore” and “sodomy”. The word “sodomy” proved a bit hard to get rid of in the Bible because of the stories of Sodom and Gomorra. An apparently illiterate American preacher bent upon purifying the Bible substituted the word “stomach” for the Biblical word “belly”, and the expression “certain fowl” for the word “cock” [a male]. The Biblical expression “with child” was replaced by the word “pregnant”, a word that has no bearing on reproduction; because “pregnant” actually means full of promise. True to their pure subjectivity, the Victorian moral midgets soon found the word “pregnant” too sexy, so it was replaced by “in an interesting condition”. In the mean time, underwear became unmentionables, breasts became bosoms, sweat became perspiration, and legs became limbs. Not being as creative as today’s word spinners, the Victorians never designed such elegant euphemisms as “sanitary engineer” to describe garbage collectors. Women would not sleep in rooms containing the portrait of a man., and books written by women were separated on library shelves from those written by men so that nothing male would rest against something female. The private parts of classical nude paintings and statues were covered up. The practice is apparently still alive in America. I am told that George Bush Jr’s original united States attorney general, John Ashcroft, spent \$3000 covering up the exposed breast of the classic statue of Justice. The lunacy reached its apex

when not only human legs had to be covered up, but the legs of tables and chairs and pianos had to be skirted. In Victorian England it was a scandal for a woman to ride in a fox hunt or to groom her own horse, or to quote from the classics in conversation. Women were denied every form of status and achievement, save one. But newly industrialized society made housewife a job hard to hang onto. Would she be the unwed childless career woman or the subjugated, dependent housewife? Women were divided into two types: the bad ones who would, and the good ones who wouldn't. Pure women supposedly had no taste for sex or ability to feel sexually. "*Sexual instincts became something no nice girl would admit to possessing; her job was to make man ashamed of his*". [E. S. Turner, [A History of Courting.](#)]

Contemporary Moral and Religious Views

The history of Western sex-lore indicates that Sumerian formulated agricultural sex-lore was developed into a *morality of sex* by Greece and Rome. Christianity then divinized that Greco-Roman sex-lore, and the Romantics, as children of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, un-divinized it. The fact that so-called Christian moral sex doctrine is, in reality, *secular cultural doctrine* led to the fact that most contemporary Christian denominations have taken a second look at allegedly Divine marital sexual morality, and have concluded that it isn't Divine and it isn't immutable - and it isn't correct. Only ultra conservative Fundamentalist Christians, including the Roman Catholic Church and most Republicans, still think *statutory marital sex* [sex morality created by State laws] is the essence of the sex that God made. The Fathers of the Church notwithstanding; absolutely no one other than Ultra Conservative Christians and Republicans thinks that the romantic love and affection which accompanies most sex is immoral.

More than forty years ago the National Council of Churches accepted artificial birth control as a moral and legitimate way to reasonably limit family

size. There is a majority consensus among contemporary Christian Americans that every woman has the right to govern her own body and thus to decide whether or not she wishes to have children. Most accept as legitimate and moral non agricultural sexual practices such as artificial insemination and in-vitro fertilization. Artificial methods for overcoming natural infertility are commonly accepted. Additionally, pills for “erectile dysfunction” have never drawn any hysterical moral reactions from any religious body. But that is probably because these drugs pertain to males not females. Genetic engineering to remove susceptibility to disease and perhaps to increase reproductive ability are cautiously being accepted. Abortion is still a controversial matter, but rightly so. It is too important an issue to leave unconsidered and un-debated.

Today people get their notion of sex and its morality from newspapers, movies, television and the internet. Their sexual ideas come from what they read in newspapers and magazines, or from what they see in motion pictures or on the television screen. Commercial exploitation of what is called sex but isn't feeds the American people with pseudo romantic notions of love. The cumulative effect is a distorted, petty and shallow conception of sexuality and sexual relationships. There is no question that technology has produced new sexual realities and moralists must address them. It is equally clear that traditional notions of the nature of human sex and sexual morality were simply culturally based, highly relative, artificial and erroneous, subjective perceptions. The new social realities require new and more accurate definitions of the true Nature-given identity of sex so that moral and Biblical interpretations can be more objectively true and accurate, and less a matter of subjectively inaccurate fantasies. The realities of contemporary life within an impersonal technological culture also require dumping some of the pitifully inadequate and inaccurate old cultural sex doctrines of the Western world. The sexual teachings in the Bible need further exploration, particularly the deeper

implications of Paul's notion of **one flesh**. Unfortunately, the traditional sex-lore doctrine of finding *the one* who will forever make a person deliriously happy and satisfied is part of today's popular but unrealistic view of becoming "one flesh". Finding the one that God or Nature *supposedly has predestined* for a given person is part of the contemporary dating game. The lore says that when a person meets *the one*, they will automatically recognize them. The truth is that becoming "*one flesh*" as the Bible says, takes a lifetime of adapting self to the beloved. I once saw a movie in which a daughter asked her father: "How do you know when you have found *the one*"? The screenwriter who wrote the dialog came up with a surprisingly profound answer. Daddy said to his daughter: "You could happily live with many different men. But *the one* is the man you cannot live without".

In the case of humans, *conscious personality* sharpens and deepens the division between male and female. In consequence, we need to invest human sex with a realistic identity that includes the acquisition of self governing maturity but does not supersede or diminish or override the biological reality. It is within factual sex as a *personal and individually unique modality of the entire person*, rather than as a purely biological property or function of all living things, that we must look for the basis of successful [moral] sexual behavior. Making up definitions of sex that have little relation to objective factual human sexuality has got to stop. Victorian sentimental idealism demanded of a woman an artificial "angelic" and adolescent sexual identity which was impossible to sustain. On the other hand, males are caught in the cultural ideas of masculinity that includes aggressiveness and toughness. These are instances of bad sexual stereotypes that do not help in the attainment of maturity. Generally an individual is not conscious of sex as a personal quality. But an intimate encounter with another who is human in a radically different way from self does make human sex meaningful as a revealer of personal quality. Just as parent and child are co-relative realities, so also sex.

Neither maleness nor femaleness is an absolute. Male and female are co-relative entities. You cannot define a male except in relation to a female and vice versa. In fact: part of the erroneous antagonism to homosexuality is recognition of this co-relation. However, those who negatively react to homosexuality suppress the personal unity, the **one flesh**, that results from sex, As Thomas Mann put it “*No man is an island*”. No individual is an absolute and complete entity in and of self. Only God is. Each human individual is incomplete. We call that the *social nature* of humankind, and human social nature is more fundamental than the differentiation of sex. We are consciously co-relative to each other because we are human, not because we are sexual. Sexual co-relation is secondary to human co-relation. In view of that fact, homosexual relationships rest upon a more fundamental correlation between human individuals than sex. Homosex is definitely sexual; but the correlation is human. Likewise, heterosex is definitely sexual; but the basic correlation between male and female is still a conscious human to human union. It is not possible for humans to relate as one asexual “it” to another asexual “it”. We necessarily relate to each other as *human* sexual persons even when the expression of the relationship is not explicitly sexual. What is communicated by sex, whether hetero or homo, is the person. Irrespective of whether hetero or homo; sex is person to person, not sex to sex. Sex may be the hand holding, the tactile connection between two individuals; but what is connected are persons. In that respect, homosexuality is no different than two people of the same sex talking to each other. Consequently one of the questions that can be asked about the naturalness or unnaturalness of homo sex is the question of whether or not, by its very nature, it connects persons or disconnects them – as hate does. Among many other things that do so, sex express the consciously generated and consciously sustained *unity* which must be regarded as the primary object and achievement of sex.

The evolution of sex as love

Love relationships introduced tenderness and affection and a certain amount of equality into male female relations in contrast to Medieval Christian, male dominated subordination of women. It increased, within the common population, desires for love and affection that went unsatisfied due to the rigidity of feudal life and the frigidity of Medieval Christianity. Romanticism also provided a solution to adulterous courtly love. The solution was to move the male courting of a woman from a married woman to an unmarried women. Originally, romantic or loving and affectionate sex was still under the control of parents. Parents still chose mates; but this time, not just daughters are controlled in regard to the company they keep, so are sons. During the origins of Romanticism, casual dating did not yet really exist. Parents arranged and chaperoned meetings between girls and boys. Likewise class distinctions still held. No lower class man could ever court an upper class woman. Since parents decided whom their daughters could date and their dads still had power over their marriages; marriages effectively remained as “arranged marriages”, and “arrangement” overruled love between dating couples. There is a touching scene in the movie Fiddler on the Roof. Tevye is a father with three marriageable daughters who one by one try to convince Tevye to approve the men they love and not the men the village matchmaker sets up. Tevye gives in completely to 2 of his daughters, and after doing so he asks his arranged wife of 25 years: ”Do you love me”. She thinks about it for a moment and then says in effect; I have put up with you all those years. I have prepared your meals and washed your clothes, and have given you children. “I suppose I do”. The next step in dating was inevitable. Young people in love ceased asking their fathers for permission. They wanted to marry for love, not for money or status as arranged marriages were. But only within the last century did marriage for love become the basis of most marriages. The merging of love and sexual behavior by the Romantic movement,

also formed the basis for love to become the justification of non marital sex. People increasingly justify sexual behavior by claiming love. And it does not take a lot of thought to see that mutual love is a far superior form of creating **one flesh** than is planting seed.

Modern Studies

By the time of WW I, boy and girl did not have to meet in church and after 3 or 4 meetings announce a parentally approved engagement. They met in all sorts of unchaperoned places; schools, dances, drugstores, and they did not consider it necessary to become serious with each other. Picking one's mate on the basis of love became a *responsibility* to find the one best to love and live with. That cannot be done with 1 or 2 dates. Dating became searching the field. In the interim before finding the one and only, dating became an activity done for social pleasure as well as a device for discovering compatibility. . . . Outside of the Western world - among many other cultures – the notion of romantic love is today laughed at, scorned, and thought to be ludicrous and impractical. These people cannot conceive of picking a life-mate on the basis of an emotion. This is a clear example of the spread and integration of an idea to one part of the world, and its consequent appearance as a perfectly “natural” and right form of behavior, while another part of the world looks with amazement on such behavior.” **[Ira L. Reiss, Premarital Sex Standards in America (London: The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-Macmillan Limited) P.58]**

In the past, dating, courtship, and engagement were distinct stages in the selection of a marital partner. Each stage represented an

increasing level of commitment and intimacy. Although this remains true to some degree, since the 1960s these stages have tended to blend into one another. For example, modern dating and courtship often involve sexual relations. Studies indicate that more than three-quarters of young people in the United States have had sexual intercourse by the age of 19. Furthermore, the contemporary mate-selection process frequently includes the practice of cohabitation - living together in an unmarried sexual relationship. Cohabitation has a long history among poor people, but has become popular among young, middle class adults only since the 1960s. Cohabitation often precedes marriage, but in some cases, people continue to cohabit without marrying. In general, people tend to date and marry people with whom they have characteristics in common. Thus, mate selection typically results in homogamous marriage, in which the partners are similar in a variety of ways. Characteristics that couples tend to share include race, ethnicity, religion, economic status, age, and the level of prestige of their parents. In the United States, marital similarity has increased for some traits and decreased for others in recent years. People seek partners who are similar in attributes that result from individual achievement. For example, an individual is more likely to marry someone who has a similar amount of education. At the same time, Americans are less likely to require similarity of factors present at a person's birth, such as religion and social class. However, the tendency to marry someone of the same race persists. For instance, marriages between African Americans and whites make up less than 1 percent of all marriages in the United States. Until the Supreme Court of the United States ruled the practice unconstitutional in the late

1960s, laws in some states prohibited certain types of interracial marriage, also known as miscegenation. **[Microsoft ® Encarta ® Encyclopedia 2005 © 1993-2004 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.]**

Sexuality and lovemaking techniques have been studied in various cultures since ancient times. The *Kama Sutra*, written in India in the 2nd century BC, is one of the best-known ancient sex manuals. It discusses the spiritual aspects of sexuality and presents many sexual positions and techniques for enhancing enjoyment of intercourse. In Europe and the United States, the scientific study of human sexuality began in the late 19th century during the Victorian Age, a time of repressive sexual norms. German psychiatrist Richard von Krafft-Ebing focused on what he considered to be the psychopathological problems of sex. Viennese physician Sigmund Freud, founder of psychoanalysis, considered sexuality central to his psychoanalytic theory. Havelock Ellis, an English physician, collected a wealth of information on sexuality from case histories, medical research, and anthropological reports. The first work in his series Studies in the Psychology of Sex was published in 1896. His scientific objectivity foreshadowed modern sexology. Early in the 20th century, German physician Magnus Hirschfeld founded the first sex-research institute in Germany. He conducted the first large-scale sex survey, collecting data from 10,000 men and women. He also initiated the first journal for publishing the results of sex studies, and started a marriage-counseling service. Most of his materials were destroyed by the Nazis during World War II (1939-1945).

In the early 1930s, American anthropologist Margaret Mead and British anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski began collecting data on sexual behavior in other cultures. The most noted scientific studies of sexuality in the 20th century are those of American biologist Alfred Charles Kinsey and his colleagues and those of William H. Masters and Virginia Johnson. Kinsey began interviewing people about their sexual histories in 1938, and with his colleagues he published Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (1948) and Sexual Behavior in the Human Female (1953), based mostly on interviews with 5300 white men and 5940 white women. Masters and Johnson began their clinical studies of the physiology of sexual response and sexual dysfunctions in the 1950s. These observations were published in Human Sexual Response (1966) and Human Sexual Inadequacy (1970), among others. Smaller studies have confirmed many of the findings of these pioneering sex researchers and have challenged certain others. The AIDS crisis has prompted a number of contemporary surveys of sex, including the National Health and Social Life Survey, the results of which were published in the book Sex In America (1994). As in any area of science, particularly relatively new and sensitive areas such as sex research, these studies have been criticized, on the basis of their findings and methodologies, but each study brings us closer to a fuller understanding of human sexuality. **Human Sexuality," Microsoft® Encarta® Encyclopedia 99. © 1993-1998 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.]**

True Love

Everyone realizes that love is a matter of the heart, not the head. But not

everyone knows how the loving heart works. The first bit of knowledge necessary for making an *accurate judgment* about emotions and free-will is to be aware that the head supplies the information that free-will acts upon. The head produces consciousness of another person and it soaks up information about that other person. But then the mind stops and the emotions and free-will take over. The emotions and the free-will are *engines of action*. They are, in themselves, dumb as a rock and blind as a bat. When the mind tells the emotions and free-will that this or that object is a cookie, the emotions and free-will respond in 3 steps. The first step produced by the emotions and free-will is appreciation for the cookie as a cookie. In other words, the initial reaction of the emotions and free-will is like having your mouth automatically water over a piece of chocolate pie. The initial response to a goodie is a positive emotional and willing reaction consisting of: “I **like** what I am being shown”. The 2nd reactive step of the emotions and free-will occurs if the piece of pie is perceived by the intellect as available. If it is, the reaction of the emotions and the free-will is **desire**. “I want that piece of pie!” Aroused desire then puts a person into action to get the pie. If the pie is attained, then the 3rd stage of emotion and free-will occurs, consisting of the **pleasure or enjoyment or delight** that eating the pie brings. The 3 emotional and free-will reactive states are: liking, desiring and enjoying. But the free-will can produce these reactions in a manner that the emotions cannot. The emotions are physical and organic; and they are aimed at self survival. The emotions, by Nature are selfish, and no amount of asceticism or training will ever change that. Because it is by Nature selfish, the **emotion of desire** in regard to any and all goodies is called *concupiscence*. In regard to sex it is called *lust*. The free-will, in contrast, is capable of being unselfish. It is capable of transferring self service into pleasing a beloved. This is accomplished when a lover freely *decides* that he or she will transfer the center of their desires to a beloved. In that freely chosen situation, the

lover has decided that his or her only desire will be to satisfy the desires of the beloved. The result is an unselfish dedication to another that brings *delight and satisfaction to the lover*. The person in love becomes *pleased by being able to please a beloved*. The only pitfall in this situation is an immature ego or tenuous control of emotions in a person who wishes to love another. If a person does not have a mature self governance or self control, and instead has a fragile grip on their own ego and identity; they, of necessity, will treat others only as useful for satisfying their own selfish needs. A person without a well developed personality; i.e. without maturity, cannot love another as other, because they will have an underlying fear of losing their grip on themselves. Their *needy* emotions will force them to be self serving no matter what. The situation of the immature is like a starving person with a piece of pie. They desperately need to take care of self first. In that vein, one of the significant signs of the irresistible need to self serve is a desire to make an alleged beloved conform to self. Absolute *self service* is contained in the notion of some that once they marry they will change the other to fit what they think the other should be, instead of changing self to fit the other. However, art lovers don't love the Mona Lisa in order to repaint it in their own image, and a true lover does not love another in order to change the other to suit themselves. Since mature and self possessed individuals do not have any great needs to categorize, manipulate, dominate, or possess others; they are much more open to the appeal of pleasing those who are *not the self*, in place of always pleasing themselves. To allegedly love someone with the idea of changing them to suit self or changing the habits they have that the lover does not like, is not love. It is “**use**” of the other in the service of love for self. True lovers do not say to each other, “I will love you only if you become a copy of me”. Such self serving needy persons will necessarily eat the other person for breakfast, lunch and supper. The situation will be a love oriented to serving self rather than a love that is pleased to

fulfill the desires of a beloved. Among other things, *need* in one or both partners makes the “love” conditional. It makes self gratification a condition for the relationship. By deliberate choice, and only by deliberate choice, can we make another the ‘site’ or the seat of our own loves, wants and enjoyments. True love exists when the lover shifts the source of self gratification from self to beloved. Unselfish love for another requires that the beloved, not the lover, be the criterion of the lover’s actions. It requires loving the other *as they are*, not how they can be formed into an image of the lover that only then pleases the lover. And only by way of *a knowing and deliberate free choice* can we treat another as if they were us. Only by free choice can we make their likes, dislikes, desires, pleasures, choices and joys our own. If a desire is emotional only, it will be selfish. It will be a desire to possess the other as something to absorb. Only by deliberate choice can we be pleased when and because the one we love is pleased. Only by free choice can we be pleased to please another. Only by free choice can we love another instead of ourselves alone. A person cannot unselfishly love someone else unless that person *freely chooses* to do so. It is not possible to love someone else, as someone else, on the basis of emotion alone; but fortunately, our emotions are fair game for *control by our free-will*. Once an emotional response is under the direction of a freely made choice to please another; emotion will show up as affection for that other, and it will drive a lover to display that affection in a physical manner; for example, as a hug or a kiss. The emotions must be involved, because genuine love means transferring all of yourself to the other, not just part of self. The pleasure of affection as well as the joy of love are the satisfactions that derive from having another person accept a show of affection. True love exists and will produce **one flesh** only if both parties can honestly say to each other: “I am delighted with you for being who you are”. From this point of view, love is the sacrifice of self to another; but from the contrasting point of view, it is actually the

addition of another to ourselves. The only caveat in this free will scenario is the fact that self serving persons can easily fool themselves into thinking that what they want is what the other person wants.

There is one other consideration regarding true love; and that is the question of what generates the initial, and basically automatic, *liking* of one person for another. We all know that “likes” are triggered by things that look *good* to us or for us, things such as money. So what makes us perceive someone else as good for us? The answer: their perceived loveableness. The person who looks good to us is someone we perceive as lovable. Speaking as a man in regard to loving a woman, a “lovely” woman is a woman who is perceived as *worth loving*. She is someone of *objective value who thereby automatically triggers appreciation*. She is charming. She casts a spell of enchantment on those who meet her. She is a woman who values herself and has treated herself accordingly. She is a woman who is all the little things that make her elegant and able to love someone other than herself. In terms of **desire**; a *lovable person* is a valuable person perceived as being able, and possibly willing, to love in return. A *desired* lovable person is someone who is perceived as a possible friend, because we desire only what we rationally perceive as attainable. Within a truly unselfish mutual love, felt value is 2 way. No one gives a worthless gift to someone they wish to please; and if the ‘self’ is felt as worthless, the ‘self’ is never given as a gift. Self perception is such that no one unselfishly loves well unless he or she feels lovable; because a person without appropriate self esteem will most certainly feel they will be rejected.

While John Watson and B.F. Skinner were conditioning human behavior, a psychologist at the University of Wisconsin, by the name of Harry Harlow, was doing related research on behavior. Dr. Harlow was also interested in conditioned learning; but having produced some classical studies in that area, he turned his attention to animal motivation. He became a public figure when he told his

students that he had tried to condition frogs and it wouldn't work. Frogs could not be operantly conditioned. The wire services picked up on the story and touted it as a discovery by a scientist that frogs are the dumbest animals on earth. Newspaper editors, looking for wasted research funds, asked who was dumber, the frog or Harlow. Harlow focused his attention on natural behavior in contrast to artificially induced, operantly conditioned behavior. This approach oriented his research to the intrinsic motivations of animal behavior. In contrast to strict mechanical behaviorists such as Pavlov, and in contrast to Freudian explorers of the unconscious; Harlow showed that a psychologist could penetrate that invisible, non-measurable thing called the psyche. He showed that the psyche could be unlocked by examining the naturally given intrinsic sources of behavior rather than extrinsic, artificially induced behaviors. In consequence, Dr. Harlow was one of the first to show that *positive motives*, delineated by Maslow as belonging, esteem and creativity, were as necessary and potent as *deficiency motives* such as the survival and security motives profiled by Maslow. Harlow studied love, "scientifically". Using artificial wire mesh mothers for infant monkeys, he made some of the fake mothers the source of food, and others the source of comfort but no food. Then he filmed the resulting behaviors of the small monkeys. The infant monkeys would quickly suckle the fake mother that gave food and then run to the cloth mother for comfort. There they would remain as long as 18 hours at a time. He also isolated some of the infants from any form of mother or motherly comfort or stroking. Those without motherly warmth developed an extreme form of withdrawal. They would curl up into a ball and if not helped, would die. Dr. Harlow's studies indicated that love, or at least affection, was a necessary component of almost all human behavior at all stages of human development. Stroking and bonding became buzz words. In hospitals today, newborns are tightly wrapped, kept in warm comfortable cribs and on schedule are picked up and

stroked by nurses. Harlow's studies indicated that lack of love in childhood could be lethal. At best, such lack produced asocial adults who were incapable of proper group or social relationships. It produced adults who could not relate to others by way of friendship or intimacy.

Sex is similar to love and affection in its pervasive character. It is present from birth, and grows up along with the rest of the human being. It is also irremovably attached to love and affection. Trying to remove it or kill it along the way is deadly to both sex and affection and to ego. A suppressive approach to sex by outside forces in place of confident, deliberately chosen self control, will not only kill normal sex; it will destroy normal love, affection and the desire to belong. It may also crush self esteem and the desire for ebullient self expression. And one of the most pervasive and effective *suppressions* of freely chosen unselfish sex has been *plant lore* sex. Even though genuine human nature functions otherwise; deterministic, seed planting sex-lore says that sex is fixed at birth and does not grow up. Human sexual functions should not be allowed in any form along the way to adulthood. Agricultural sex-lore describes sex in the manner of preformation. At birth, we are implanted with a wrapped package of adult sex; but we can't unwrap it until we are adults. There is no doubt that full sexual functioning requires the mature judgment of an adult; but there is also no doubt that nature itself produces physiological and emotional changes long before that. To deny it is lunacy.

[Much of the preceding material can be found in the PBS television series called, Science Odyssey: In Search of Ourselves, narrated by Charles Osgood.]

The Romantics connected sex to love, but Ultra Conservative plant sex believers unconnected it; because young people and unmarried adults can't be allowed to engage in packaged adult plant sex. Of course this means it is immoral to fall in love outside of marriage as well as engaging in sex outside of marriage.

Several such studies as those of Harlow have shown that love is just as necessary to an infant as is food. Love can be a matter of survival to a child. Many psychogenic diseases of childhood are due to lack of love. Lack of love can be one of the factors producing in children a condition called '*marasmus*'. Marasmus is a form of apathy in children leading to emaciation and sometimes resulting in death. Lack of love produces an emotional disability or stunting of emotional growth. As the English parliamentarian Hillarie Belloc mentioned in one of his books; lack of food will cause the body to die, but a lack of love will cause the soul to die. **[Belloc, among his other works, wrote: The Bad Child's Book of Beasts; but he also wrote, The Servile State.]** The similarity between the effects of physiological deprivation and love deprivation give rise to the notions of '*stimulus hunger*' and '*stroking*' described by Eric Berne in his work, Games People Play. Stimulus hunger is a need for intimate physical contact and sensory stimulation. Stimulus hunger is fed by biological stroking. Biological stroking means physical handling, fondling, embracing and the like. Touch is the medium involved, and touch is common to love at any level. The need and desire to touch and be touched is the root form of union or contact between human beings. Touch is a matter of physical intimacy. Stroking by way of acknowledgement or praise tends toward the same situation. Mutual acknowledgment and stroking tend toward personal intimacy wherein people are totally open to each other and in full contact with each other. **Maternity**, however, requires not only warmth and hugs; it requires motion. Babies respond to motion by trying to deal with it. That is one of the ways in which they learn to adapt and live at ease within their environment. Babies try desperately to cling even to an offensive or rejecting mom. If that compulsion is not satisfied in infancy, it will return as a need for an abusive spouse; because the unloved person has been trained to feel that relationships are painful. All babies love their mothers, but not all mothers love their babies. Female monkeys raised in

isolation and then artificially impregnated, crushed the heads of their babies. Harlow's fake moms proved that most anyone will do as a mom. A father, a big sister, a brother, aunts, uncles, grandparents, as well as foster or adoptive parents will do; because infants will take what they can get.

Love begins with a felt pleased appreciation of someone else. If the reciprocal consciousness of two human beings is an appreciative type of consciousness, if it is a matter of mutual delight, awe, wonder and admiration of the other as other; then the relationship can be termed a matter of love. Two such people can, so to speak, mutually fuse into one conscious self. Since self-conscious capability is a species characteristic, inter-subjectivity is open to the entire species. Any human individual can do this with any other human individual. Between any 2 individuals there is the possibility of a composite self, or one flesh, containing mutual awareness of both within both. True love produces a conscious 'convivere' or fusion of two lives into a single consciousness and shared source of functioning. As appreciative, love is not primarily a matter of performance. True love does not of itself imply that we do anything to or for the one we love. Genuine love is not at root a matter of helping someone in need, although it may be a question of being *good for* someone. Love is basically a contemplative experience. Its actions consist of displaying love for the other, not in doing something for the other. Just as a person listening to 'lovely' music does not wish to rewrite the music; so also, if some other person evokes appreciation in us we should not feel any impulse to lay hands on them in order to change them. To do so would imply destroying precisely what we appreciate. In terms of genuine love, love is a *response*. Love is a *reaction* to something lovable outside of self. True love consists of a *reaction* to the loveliness of another *as they are*. True love says: "I love you, because you are you"! Responsive love is an unconditional response that preserves the other as other. Responsive love carries no parent/child undertones or overtones. It does not

give rise to superiority/inferiority relationships or to dominance/submission relationships. It produces a relationship of equals. Because it is not a response to performance; responsive love cannot be won by successful performance, nor is it lost by unsuccessful performance. True love is a response to a person. Responsive love is appreciation for the other simply because they are who they are. But the insecure will go at love as performance. The insecure will conceive of love as doing something in order to *win the approval* of another. But attainment of approval is not a loving response. It is the response of an inferior to a superior. Performance love operates as a dominance/submission relationship. It operates to make the inferior a clone of the superior. It operates as an eraser of self and self esteem. Responsive love is true love because it does not need to lose self in order to suit the other. If the beloved is a true lover in return, they will love the lover as the lover is.

There has been much recent controversy about what dire things will happen if the parental, safety level, normative moral and legal controls of Church and State are removed from sexuality so that pre-marital sexuality becomes socially acceptable. Some people, because of their acculturation to a safety type Weltanschauung, fear that non marital [non caged] sex; which from their point of view is immoral, will get out of hand. But in many cases, the fear felt by the insecure is fear of what they themselves might do if the marital caging of sex was removed. Undoubtedly sex unrestrained by the external 'parental' control systems of Church and State will get manipulative when used by the insecure; because the very nature of insecurity is lack of self governance. But this possibility is not due to the nature of sex, nor the character of true love. It is due to the nature of insecurity. Moral judgments regarding reasonable human behavior cannot be based upon neurotic fears. Morality must be based upon the true facts of healthy sex and of genuine love. As an acute response to the *reality of another person*, true love is

not held in check by a normative code or a list of values. It is held in check by the reality of the person loved. For the insecure or safety minded 'adult', unrestricted sex activity is a real possibility; and hence cause for concern. But in the hands of a mature person who does not need to feed on other persons, the possibility of deliberately harming the person loved due to runaway sexual desire is not there. What man who truly loves his wife could harm her; and what woman who truly loves her husband could harm him? What parent who truly loves his or her children could harm them? And what man or woman who truly loves another could, even without being enclosed within a contractual institution such as marriage, harm them? True love is not the result of obedience to a command or moral law. Neither is true love a response to imagination. True love is an affective, and consequently effective, reaction to another arising solely from the reality of the other. This is the suggestion that Aristotle makes in his Nicomachean Ethics. After he has delineated an entire code of human behavior, Aristotle remarks that the way to get anyone to follow the code is to present it in the form of a good person. It is a good person, not a bunch of moral demands, who *constitutes compelling moral standards*.

The secure person can surrender unconditionally and unreservedly to a beloved precisely because a mature person has a good 'hold on self'. At the same time, surrender of self to another is a fully conscious and deliberate captivation. Persons who truly love another, deliberately place themselves at the disposal of the person loved. In doing so, mature lovers do not lose their self identity to the other. Instead, additional identity results from being captivated. If someone 'lights up with delight' over someone else, this response brings them to peak experience of themselves. Identification with another, as a total orientation of lover to beloved, bestows additional human personality. Identification with another results in identification *from* the other being added to self identification. Loving another

causes the lover enjoyment. But if a person really wants to give self to another, it is necessary that the other person accept the gift, and that means they have to respond to being loved. The desire to give self to another must be mutual in order to work. If it is mutual, true love will result in a union. It will produce the “**one flesh**” spoken of in the Bible. Loneliness, for its part, is an indicator of the fact that the desire for *union* has natural origins. Sex is not a drive toward pure physical self gratification. Sex is part of the basic need of one human being for another human being. Although it is true that gifts can be used in an attempt to ‘buy’ the love of someone; gifts are, or at least are supposed to be, gratuitously given symbols of love. As a genuine symbol, a gift represents one’s self. A genuine gift does not necessarily have to be a material item. Hugs and kisses are also symbols of self. A simple smile could be a gift. When a gift of knowledge or of love and affection is given to someone else; the gift should tell them loudly and clearly that they are *worth* being recognized and being loved. One of the most potent of all gifts as a symbol of self is a meal. Eating with someone is, in and of itself, a sign of friendship; which is why eating is used as the ritual symbol of love between Christians. The meal is called ‘communion’ because eating a meal with someone, besides being a symbol of the giving of self to another, also involves a returned friendship along with communication and interaction. This is why men and women go on dinner dates. This is also why refusing the hospitality of someone is an insult to them. Refusing hospitality or refusing a gift is the same as saying you don’t wish to be friends with the giver. However, as the most potent gift of all; sex can have all the meaning of human love and all the meaning of human life, and be the means of communicating these things to another.

False love

The Latin word for ‘good’ is ‘*bene*’. The Latin word for ‘*choice or volition*’ is ‘*volare*’. The Latin word for ‘*making something*’ is ‘*facere*’. The English

language uses these Latin roots to form, among others, the following words. **Beneficence** and **benefactor** from “bene facere”; and **benevolence** [good will or good motive] from “bene volare”. All of these words carry a reference or a relation to free will. Human love is sometimes identified with one or other of these; but in fact, true human love encompasses all three. If there is to be any true love present, benevolence or good will must be there. If beneficence and benefaction are to be acts of love, benevolence must be the *motive* for both of these. A person, however, can be beneficent for motives other than benevolence. A politician, for example, can be beneficent in order to win an election. The same is true of benefaction. Being generous can be used to impress another, or even to con them. Sadly, beneficence and benefaction also can be bestowed on another only because they serve the needs of the gift giver. If they are motivated by the needs of the giver, they are not benevolence or acts of love for another. They are acts of love for the giver. Selfish benefaction that serves the purposes of the giver rather than the receiver is the most insidious and most harmful form of false love. To give something to someone or help someone in order to serve one’s own purposes alone rather than theirs is to use them. This is one of the reasons why the term ‘do gooder’ is pejorative. Doing something to the benefit of another generally represents at least care for another, if not love for them. But not always. Does anyone think that the philanthropy of a large corporation is an act of love? False benefaction can be insidious due to the fact that almost everyone gets taken in by it. If a person looks carefully at the nature of benefaction; it becomes apparent that “helping hand” benefaction puts the giver into a position that is superior to that of the needy receiver. That superiority, in turn, carries the widespread assumption that the giver knows better than the receiver what the receiver needs. Knowing better, and being able to fulfill the needs of another, causes the view that care giving includes directing another and steering another toward what is better for them than

they are able to do on their own. How many women go into marriage thinking I love the man, but I need to change his drinking habit, or the clothes he wears or the music he likes. I need to wean him from TV sports. In other words, I will make him conform to my outlook about what is good for him. It is for his own good. Sorry! This is a self serving parental outlook of the deadliest kind; and it is usually followed by what the man feels is intolerable nagging. Going into a marriage with the idea of changing the other is going into a marriage with the idea of causing a divorce before ever being married. Genuine unselfish love, means loving another as they are; without any selfish desire to change them into conformity with self. Genuine unselfish love means being delighted with someone for being who **they** are. Wanting to change someone to one's own ideals is conditional. The condition is: do what I want, and I will love you. That condition immediately puts a limit on the 'love', if it can be called love. I will love you only if you do what I say; and only to the extent that you do what I say. Conditional 'love' is also called performance love. I will 'love' you only if you perform. I will love you only if you clean the house every day. I will 'love' you only if you get a job that brings in \$200,000 a year. In fact, studies have shown that the primary communication within American marriages consists of telling the other spouse what is wrong with them. When fear of disapproval or rejection is stronger than the desire to be loved or to belong, the person will not act or show true self at all. Whence arise all the defenses and inhibitions with which we conceal ourselves from others making it impossible for them to love us or us to love them. Doing good to someone comes to mean making them, whether they like it or not, to be like one's self. This is the psychology of the 'head hunting' Evangelist who is forever trying to 'convert' others to his or her own personal point of view – which by the way is not "Christian" at all. It is also the psychology of the overly autocratic boss or manager. True benevolence does not per-se involve giving or doing something to

or for another. The term does not refer to an action on another. It refers to a state of mind, or more precisely, a state of will. In keeping with the manner in which all of our emotions and volitions are triggered, genuine benevolence is a response to the attractiveness of another; and as a response is basically passive. Benevolence does not cause or produce the loveliness of another, it presupposes the beloved is already lovable and attractive to the lover. Love for another does not consist of making them good by caring for them or by being good to them. A person does not fall in love with a beast while carrying the intention of turning them into a beauty. A person falls into true love with a beauty, and there is no intention of turning them into a beast.

A Summary of Belonging Sex

Since American society looks upon sex as part of love, American culture apparently has reached a belonging level. But belonging has 2 faces. In the young it produces conformity to the fads of a peer group. But in the more mature, belonging to a society is part of the development of individuality. It is necessary to belong to a group before being able to excel within that group. Conformist unions are based on conformity to a group perceived as significant by the person who desires to conform to the group norms. This need to identify tends toward elimination of differences. In this context, equality is sameness; and equality of the sexes is sameness of the sexes. Union through conformity is not too violent, nor is it a matter of total personal commitment; but conformity can be quite permanent. It can be seriously permanent when mixed with a heavy dose of insecurity. A long lasting need to belong by way of conformity, means that the personality growth of the individual has stalled out or run aground.

However, heightened individuality is the effect of belonging to a group once a person is an accepted member and has passed the initiation rites of conformity. This is due to the fact that friendships within a group are a matter of being treated

as *individually* of value. In consequence of Romanticism and belonging; one of the concerns of our current American belonging culture is authentic, interpersonal relationships. A shift from institutional guidance to personal autonomy is occurring. People are questioning the claim of persons in authority to that authority. They question whether the authority is being properly and intelligently used. Many people will no longer tolerate the role of poor dumb, lambs led to slaughter by a power elite. These facts, and many others, suggest that the cultural focus of the U.S. today is very much analogous to individual belonging levels of focus. Our culture seems to be concerned with love needs and personal identity and human dignity and human worth. Love needs and personal identity problems focus on people rather than on objects and products and organizations. Even the concept itself of 'culture', which is the personality of a society, is a move toward a more human point of view of human groups. Resistance to institutional meanings, and 'legalized' artificial forms of life represent the same movement toward personal meanings. Love needs imply equality between people. Hence the questioning of authority, when authority sets up parent-child relationships between governor and governed; and uses authority as a weapon for coercing citizens into an homogenous conglomerate. People no longer tolerate being wards of society and institutions. Adjustment to institutional demands is no longer the ideal of many people. Some people do not care to be 'well adjusted' to society insofar as the 'adjustment' means loss of personal identity to mass culture. Those who are mature deny that lack of slavish conformity to every social form is due to a maladjusted personality. These people do not want for themselves a totally standardized social identity. The standard elements of social environment are the cultural meanings of life prevailing in a given society. But beyond these standard or cultural meanings are personal meanings. Interpersonal relationships add idiosyncratic or personal meanings to life and to self identity. And invasive government intrusion into

personal and interpersonal matters has little other outcome than to smother the ability of citizens to attain adult maturity.

Under the impulse of Romantic thought, human life is interpreted as dynamic living of life; not as utilitarian production of future possessions and offspring. The future exists, but future goals are no longer seen as objects to be manufactured or prizes to be won. The goal of life is here and now fullness of life. As a fuller form of life than isolation, belonging implies intimate union between people, and union is created by communication. It appears to be no accident that communications sciences and the world wide web have been born within the last few years. It appears our own culture, and perhaps much of the world, is reaching toward belonging levels. Authority under our past cultural format was paternal and autocratic. Authority had a life of its own. Authority in and of itself had the flavor of the 'divine right of kings'. Victim cases are too bad; but some people must be sacrificed for the sake of universal categories. As cheap TV Westerns still insist in the words of honest sheriffs; " Sorry son. I know you are innocent; but you were convicted and it is my duty to hang you". Previous cultures imposed eternal verities and absolutes everywhere, and evolution could not be so. Life was to be lived as servile obedience to absolute moral codes. Utilitarian *performance* would 'win' God's love, and awards would be handed out accordingly. Salvation was not the fullness of life itself; but an object of some kind that one could acquire by performance and then keep in the same manner as owning a house. Successful life issued in possession of 'Heaven' as a payoff, rather than in using life in this world to becoming someone who would enjoy living in Heaven.

In order to serve in the revolution against plant sex, sex assumed the role of unmitigated eroticism. As an orientation to venereal pleasure, eroticism strikes at archaic tradition in several ways. Eroticness is first of all a rejection of simplistic, botanical interpretations which make human sexuality nothing more than plant

propagation. Eroticism implies personal pleasure as a dimension of sexuality over and above unconscious reproduction. But absolutely divorced from reproduction and commitment, sheer venery becomes so freely available and so over exposed that it is reduced to the commonplace. Total eroticism fails as a revolt against cultural plant botany because it causes sex to become trivial. Total dedication to the cultivation of sexual pleasure is, secondly, a vacation from technology and work. Sex has a dimension of play and leisure, but eroticism becomes a ritualistic technique for producing cheap diversion. Eroticism failed as a permanent tool of leisure and became erectile dysfunction. In struggling against modern alienation, sexual potency was no match for the emotional anemia afflicting so many persons in urban society. With their inability to love or hate, some people cannot generate erotic contact, let alone orgasm. Sexual solipsism failed as a form of communication and sex became speechless. Because of its infidelity, eroticism likewise failed as a revolt of private life against public intrusion. Rendered insignificant by the loss of biological and cultural meanings, sexuality made one last effort to attain significance. Eroticism attempted to find meaning in eroticism itself. Sex was not to derive meaning from life, life was to derive meaning from sex. But in order to be the crown of all effort, sex had to mix with all things. Sex had to become utterly promiscuous. However, as all things to all people, sex got divorced from its true relationships to humans and to the realities of life. It is no accident that approximately 90% of all contemporary video pornography consists of depictions of male defilement, degradation and dominance of females; and in consequence, about 75% of all pornographic content actually consists of males and male anatomy, rather than females. In contemporary American pornography, females are physically manhandled but seldom simply photographed *as whole and entire persons*. What is photographed is bits and pieces of female anatomy. Only about 1% or 2% of pornography shows females dominating males. Sex may be the

vehicle; but the unmistakable message is: human sex is male dominance of females.

The Characteristics of Modern Belonging Sex-love are:

1. Sex is a personal matter not a social matter. Sex is a matter of self governance not a matter of social institutional governance.
2. Sex is love itself - love meaning affection and passion
3. Sex is communication
4. Sex is freedom
5. Sex is humanness or the nature of humans
6. Sex is life itself
7. Sex is performance in bed rather than the ability to produce lots of male kids.

Self emergence implies that love is an interpersonal relationship, not an intersexual relationship. Sex is not the entire surrender of love, it is not the totality of love itself. But sex is a part of person to person surrender. Sex operating as part of belonging needs is a mutual attraction of persons leading to self transcendence. Sexual desire as part of belonging need is a desire for peak experience through mutual surrender and union. Sex at this level is not purely biological mating, nor is it a fully conceptual form of mutual expression. Yet sex is the symbol of total mutual personal surrender. The sex act is a sign and a medium through which personality is channeled. Belonging sex is a medium of communication. Human individuals, because sexually bifurcated, are incomplete beings. All agree, humans are social beings, and sexual bifurcation is the basic cause. We can't be full adults without others. Consequently, sex is first of all an urge to relate and associate, and only secondly an urge to reproduce. Sex is the source of the need to belong [the urge to merge]. It is part of our social nature. Without sex as our strongest orientation to unite and to socialize, whether as a family, or a clan, or as a club, or simply as friends, etc. there would be no human societies. Sex causes us to get

together and form societies. Because of separated sex halves, humans are not loners like some species. Society, as society, also has belonging needs. Simply from the point of view of cohesion, a society must have some degree of friendships among its people or the society will disintegrate. With a large and complex associational society such as contemporary America, the need is pressing. American society, like all other urban societies, is held together by political and utilitarian interaction in disregard of kinship. The need for community and face to face primary groups is considerable. Mutual attraction of the sexes, on the other hand, is a recognizable factor contributing to the formation of exogamous primary friendship groups. Nevertheless, some contemporary folks react even to personalist views of sex. They feel and have stated that personally managed sex not caged by marriage will ruin the family, and family ruination means social ruination. Free love in its true sense of no marriage was tried in communist Russia and it did not work. Russia quietly went back to formal marriages. Totally free sex has never happened in America, because sex is still ruled by current State civil laws and by current Religious moral precepts, aided and abetted by a culturally ingrained view from the past that sex is owned by the government. The fact is that the industrial revolution had more impact on the family than free sex ever had, and the State and the Church are still here. The actual truth is that the romantic myth does not ruin family. It actually mitigates what the Industrial Revolution did; because romance works for cities containing unconnected strangers. It creates belonging. Without friends you are not lonely, you are not there. You don't exist

CHAPTER SEVEN: STATUS SEX-LORE

The social structure and culture of a society have special significance with respect to sexual behavior. The position occupied by the

individual in the social group carries with it definitions of the sexual activities expected of him. Some of these definitions are taken so seriously that severe punishment awaits the person who fails to perform his role in the traditionally accepted manner. Other rules are regarded more lightly, and the individual who varies his behavior may run only the risk of ridicule. But in any case cultural pressure is constantly exerted on all members of any society to express their sexual impulses in socially accepted fashion. **[Patterns of Sexual Behavior](#) by Yale professors Clellan Ford and Frank Beach (New York: Harper and Brothers, and Paul B. Hoeber, Inc., Medical Books, 1951).]**

Rights and liberties

Inalienable rights refer to rights that come with being a participant in human nature. Webster's dictionary says that *civil rights*, as distinct from natural rights, are rights secured by the 13th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution; along with certain Acts of Congress that prevent involuntary servitude (slavery). *Civil rights* refer to laws that guarantee citizens equal status under the law along with equal opportunity to exercise those rights. Webster's dictionary says that *civil liberty* is exemption from arbitrary governmental interference with person, opinion or property. *Civil liberties* refer to rights that guarantee freedoms such as free speech and freedom of worship, along with due process of law; such that, as one Supreme Court Justice put it; your freedom [and the scope of the government] ends where my nose begins. **[See: the trial of John Peter Zenger. Microsoft ® Encarta ® Encyclopedia 2005 © 1993-2004 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.]**

Social Recognition of Sex in and by Civil Law

Since the day Western civilization turned human sex into marriage; sex, as the married state, has had social recognition by various States and by institutional religion. But single sexual status has not. Single status is automatically assumed to be “non married”; but non married does not mean non sexual. Being single and having a sexual identity are not the same thing. For example: being a woman with the rights of a citizen is not the same as being a wife with the rights of marriage; and the rights that come with being married do not erase or diminish the rights of being a citizen. Although unofficially accounted for in many ways by the people in a society; the gender of single people received little statutory recognition in America until recently. And this came about because physical structures in some did not match their psychological self identity. A few mean spirited Southern States came to the anti-medical conclusion that a gender self identity that did not match physical structures was a fake or a neurosis. They passed laws requiring that physical structure determine which public toilets a person could use. These States apparently never heard of biological hormones. But the reaction of people and even of large corporations to these laws, taught Southern legislators that gender identity is real.

Sex is one of the major components of a person's definition of self and others. As a conscious self definition it is called gender. Children learn very early to label themselves "girl" or "boy." In cultures that emphasize sex role identity, these self labels become an important part of a person's concept of self. There is some evidence that children actively seek out models and information about sex roles, apparently to maintain a stable self identity as girl or boy. Because sex roles carry with them prescriptions for behavior with others, individuals need to know the sex of the person or persons with whom they are interacting, if for no other reason than to feel comfortable. People use indicators such as hairstyle,

dress, facial appearance, and language styles as well as nonverbal cues such as demeanor and mannerisms, to determine another person's sex. The strength of the desire to know a person's sex is particularly evident when these cues are not available. For example, enthusiastic inquiries about an infant's sex by all who would interact with him or her. Because sex roles are learned through interactions with other people, especially parents, teachers, and peers, as well as through portrayals of people in the media, they vary from individual to individual and from society to society. Even within a given culture, individuals can vary in the degree to which they adopt sex roles. Thus one person, of either biological sex, may adopt the female sex role and internalize a feminine sex role identity, usually thought of in Western societies as warm, understanding, and gentle. Another person may adopt the male sex role and have a masculine sex role identity, again, usually thought of in Western societies as independent, competitive, and assertive. Other people may not restrict their behavior to one sex role type but may adopt behaviors socially associated with both female and male sex roles. The uninformed assumption that personal psychology and pre established social roles must always exactly match physicality, however, is not new. It has a long history. Hysteria, for example, was thought by the Greeks to be a female only syndrome. Hence, hysteria and shell shock or *post traumatic stress* was, and still is, thought by some to be a fake within a cowardly male. Victorian England and today's Ultra Conservative Christians think homosexuality is the same. One of the more recent persecutions of homosexuals is a monster called *Conversion Therapy*. Conversion therapy is a form of alleged retraining of homosexuals which assumes falsely that homosexuality is an acquired condition. Religious belief in this incredibly warped doctrine has spawned several Fundamentalist run schools that specialize in imposing this cruelty. In 2015, President Obama responded to a petition seeking to legally ban conversion therapy. He pledged to advocate for such a ban. Obama was motivated by the

suicide of an Ohio teenager named Leelah Alcorn who was a victim of conversion therapy. In her suicide note, she said that the only thing the therapy did was convince her that she was worthless. For its part, Victorian England statutorily forced over 19,000 homosexuals to take testosterone as a “conversion therapy” for their homosexuality. Alan Turing was a British genius who invented the first *programmable* computer. Turing was a code breaker working at Bletchley Park during WWII, and he was one of those assigned to crack the Nazi “Enigma” code machine used by the German military. He invented the programmable computer to help crack the German code which, day by day, had “zillions” of new possible solutions. His computer was designed to work the same way today’s hackers find passwords - each day, it went through all daily possible solutions one by one until it hit pay dirt. Turing, however, was gay. After the war, he was forced by the British government to take testosterone to “cure” his homosexuality. He became so distraught, he committed suicide - as did innumerable other gays. The ignorant British government rewarded Turing for shortening WWII by about two years and saving millions of lives by driving him to suicide. The other sexual, but single status, that still is oppressed and suppressed by various governments and by the Church is that of being a female. In America today, neither females nor homosexuals are given due legal status and Constitutional rights. Neither group is given proper recognition by American laws, whether it be State or Federal law. At this point, it is not possible to claim that either American sex law or American sex lore have attained the equivalent of Maslow’s 4th stage; namely, due recognition. But since these oppressed groups have been vociferously claiming their just rights with a certain amount of success, it is safe to say that American society and culture are opening up to legal recognition of due rights based upon sexuality. America is arriving at legal and public and moral levels of realization that sex should not disqualify unmarried individuals from their due American rights as citizens. Part of this change is due

to the fact that the Vietnam war and the flower people taught Americans that absolute conformity to culture and cultural norms and discriminatory laws from biased legislators is not always good for them.

Esteem or status is connected to incorporation into society; and sex, likewise, is a factor leading to incorporation into society. Status sex-lore implies two things. **1.** That a sexual social hierarchy exists and applies to sex in such fashion that gender and various types of sexual lifestyles are unequal in societal esteem. **2.** That the hierarchy is based upon the false and deadly agro-civic-romantic picture of sex held by Western societies. Sex in the context of traditional and appalling *botanical* definitions; includes both gender and sexual orientation, and its hierarchy comes primarily from public opinion. These social opinions of sex and sexual behavior are based, however, almost exclusively upon the institutional American anti sexual, false morality derived from the sexuality of plants. Immoral human flora must not get sexual or they won't reproduce. For example: **1.** Since plants have no emotions, it is immoral to desire or take pleasure in sex. **2.** In spite of the fact that plants do not marry and the further fact that reproduction does not produce married infants; human planting of seed is declared to be immoral by Nature if engaged in outside of wedlock. **3.** Since plants reproduce only with plants and not with animals or minerals; if the seed is not planted in the correct farmland, human sex is immoral. The incorrect, and thus "unnatural" and *immoral fields for planting seed* include; wasted seed, young children, non-humans, close blood relatives such as parents or siblings, self, and any orifice that is not reproductive. Additionally, if a given sexual behavior is artificially and wrongly declared illegal by law and not by botany, behavior such as misogyny [marrying someone of a different race]; then it is also socially disreputable to do it - until people discover such laws are garbage. In other words, the status of a given sexual behavior derives, not just from sex-lore, but also from

State and Federal laws which define some forms of sex as legal and honorable and moral, namely heterosexual marriage; and some as artificially illegal and therefore disreputable and immoral. Under either umbrella, law or botany; the form and condition of one's sex life is a major determinant of moral standing in the community. Social standing is likewise true for groups of people who form primary face to face *groups* on the basis of sexuality. Such groups are a medium through which the members react to society, and the gender of the group itself acquires social standing of good or bad based on gender. In the past, only marital sex groups have been recognized and incorporated usefully into society. But the family no longer has the same social import it once had. In view of overpopulation, a large family could be considered a social ill as in present day China. Additionally, response to social need has not been one of the virtues of American marital families. Many American families settle down into an enclosed, private life – which is also a need in a crowded, noisy nosy society such as ours. In other words, when restricted to marriage alone; sex does not today have a great deal of social significance other than being a channel through which the State can exercise control over its citizens and intrude into matters that, by nature, are private. When not recognized as a social unifying factor or functional organ of citizenship outside of marriage and family, sex becomes a social factor only in negative ways. The social import of sex becomes teenage pregnancies, venereal disease, HIV, and unwanted children. Those at the low end of a social hierarchy do not have the same dedication to that hierarchy as do those at the top. Little folk don't mix with, nor in any way identify themselves as bosom buddies, with the big shots in a society. In order to shine, such low level citizens do not commit to creativity; they commit to conformity. The big shots then fall into a trap. Good citizens are those who don't make any waves and don't blow any whistles; but if they do, punish them - and thus prevent any improvement in any social problem. In the absence of wealth, the

avenue for high social status is cultural conformity. This refers primarily to conformist sexual morality and marriage because culturally viewed sexual “morality” is the most honored source of social status. Win a Nobel prize, so what. But be a sexual conformist, a married heterosexual who practices reproductive plant sex, and you are the top of the line. However, *unmarried* mature people, operating personally at esteem levels, want their sexual activity to be useful not only to themselves, but also to society. A social conscience is not restricted to, nor limited to, married people. As a matter of fact, response to social needs has been more noticeable in the unmarried, than in the married. But in the U.S. today there is no social framework for utilizing the non marital groups that have in fact formed. Because of “fixed in stone” legal sex, whose morality and status consist of the requirement that married couples engage in farming sex only; these groups are not incorporated into the normal, everyday functioning of society. In fact, they are discouraged and destroyed by our current laws. Until recently, American society recognized only monogamous, contractual marital sex that is undertaken for reproduction only, as having legal social status.

Personal esteem needs, in the context of society, are a drive, not directly for fame; but for acknowledgment as a meaningful someone in society at large. The drive for esteem is a need by an individual to have the society, of which the individual is a member, be aware of them *as an individual* and not as a clone in a mass collective. In the U.S. one way we do this is by way of recognizing majority status versus status as a minor. For example: on the basis of age, we grant an individual the right to vote, to sign contracts, to drink alcohol; and at the same time we give recognition to a person’s career as being part of their individual identity. The sexual equivalent of majority status is a statutorily established age of sexual consent. However, people with an achieved personal identity want to be recognized by society for what and who they are, and not as a common sexual clone of

everyone else, and not as a statistic. The fact is that any person who accomplishes something of value within a society is able to do it because of being significant to others in the society. Without that significance, no one will listen. That is why some people run for President of the United States when they know they cannot win. What they do hope for, however, is to become nationally known so that in the next election they can win. Quite a few years ago Western Electric, in conjunction with the Harvard School of Business Administration, conducted some experiments in employee performance. Six women working on telephone relays were selected as the test group. The investigators were trying to determine how changes in hours, work conditions, and wages affected output. The investigators became known to, and became trusted by, the women. The women, in turn, made an apparent shambles of the experiment. To the amazement of the researchers, increased output promptly followed every conceivable change they could make in working conditions. Most surprising, when all work conditions were restored to their original state, the output of the women increased to a new high. In due time, the investigators discovered the reason. By working with the women, by consulting with them, and by giving the women a share in the decision making; the researchers had given the women a new sense of personal importance in relation to their work. As a result, the performance of the women increased no matter what the conditions. It would seem that persons who have a sense of self and of self worth do not like being reduced to the herd. They desire to have their person acknowledged and respected on an individual basis. If idiosyncratic or individualized identity is present it gives rise to a sense of outrage whenever self is treated as an indistinguishable part of the crowd.

Americans are offended by snobs; and because of the similarity between the need for recognition and snobbery, the need for esteem has been called all sorts of things, like pride and vanity. Pride and vanity do exist, but the need for recognition

is not these. One of the current and pejorative labels on a false version of the need for esteem is 'status seeking'. Status seeking is a pejorative because it implies assumption of all sorts of status symbols that are above and beyond one's genuine worth. It is pejorative because it refers to acquisition of shallow, hollow external substitutes for internal worth. The need for esteem, on the contrary, is felt in view of true self worth. But at the same time, love and friendship unite people into a 'we'. Hence, esteem needs, as following upon friendship or mutual love, can be viewed in terms of groups with shared interests. If a group is significant, being a member is significant. Society, by acknowledging constructive face to face primary or 'we' groups, can thereby incorporate individuals and "we" groups into its social structures as socially certified contributing contributors. In the absence of such incorporation, groups are not only denied due recognition; they are many times denied their due rights as American citizens. For example; the need for esteem by minorities is not simply a need to be treated justly. It is a need to have accessible social roles that allow them to contribute to American society. At esteem levels, the drives of social minorities for recognition and freedom from prejudice and stereotypes is a drive for the freedom to be a useful citizen. Minority groups and individuals wish to take their place in American society and want no more than due adult rights and duties *that allow them to be significant contributors to the greatness of America*. It is not possible to move America forward by stomping on minorities as the Trump administration constantly did.

Because social status is disreputable if the sex is not *legalized* marital farming sex; anti sexual laws that are not truly Nature based can ruin a person's reputation without any true misbehavior on the part of an individual. In some places sodomy was illegal even between legally married couples. Laws against sodomy, however, were basically aimed at gays. In 2003, the U.S. supreme court reversed itself regarding a Georgia ban on sodomy [i.e. a punitive law against

gays] and treated Georgia law as an invasion of privacy rather than as a wrongful condemnation of sodomy. This decision on the privacy of sodomy implied that adults are capable of managing their lives and their sex without the paternalistic dictates of ignorant legislation and the self righteous demands of moral Nazis. But in being sadistic killers of other people's due reputations, biased legislators and moral Nazis do not lose their own social position; because the only sin most people know is sex, and wrongful persecution is not sex. Fortunately, a more sophisticated sex law is passed once in a great while. For example: "alienation of affection". Alienation of affection refers to an outside party who manages to make a married person more devoted to them than to their spouse by undermining the spouse. The law makes some sense, but it can be misused. In 1868 a woman named Abigail McFarland divorce her husband Daniel on grounds of abuse. Around 2 years later she began seeing a reporter named Albert Richardson. This caused her ex of 2 years to walk into the newspaper office where Richardson worked and shoot Richardson point blank. The incident became sensational throughout America. Ex husband McFarland was put on trial, but was found not guilty. The basis of McFarland's acquittal was equivalent to treating Richardson as alienating the affection of Abigail. The jury decided Richardson deserved to be shot for stealing away McFarland's ex wife. In other words, the jury considered Abigail still bound to McFarland 2 years after their divorce in spite of the fact that Richardson was not around before or during the marriage of Abigail and Daniel.

In general, a single person must plan to marry or they are a misfit. A single person must be a heterosexual virgin planning to legally marry in order to reproduce without restraint and without pleasure when required to do so by their marital promise to respond to spousal request, or their social standing drops precipitously. Deliberately choosing to be single is a sin; and thus, single people have lowly status and are sometimes the victim of vicious laws. [Check out the

song “Night of My Nights” in the movie “Kismet”.

The status of women

The traditional role of women consisted of home maintenance, cooking and child rearing. Feminine adventures outside of the family were not part of the social view of women. When women began to achieve in professions outside the home, the “old boy” network was severely shaken. Currently, women, *on an individual basis*, have done extremely well in essentially all of the activities formerly considered strictly male domains. As a group, however, American women are still identified as less human than males. The traditional roles socially assigned to women have been presented as naturally linked to women's physiology. To assist Nature in maintaining woman as misbegotten males; American law, plus the major religions, have universally maintained male dominance.

Women’s rights

When the French revolution resulted in a “peoples” government, French women found out that the preamble to the new French Constitution, called a Declaration of the Rights of **Man** and of the Citizen, meant what it said; namely, the rights of French *males*. In 1845, Margaret Fuller, a friend of Ralph Waldo Emerson and cofounder of the newspaper called The Dial, wrote a book called Woman in the Nineteenth Century. The book was an argument for women’s rights in America. Fuller claimed that when the social roles of individuals are defined according to the sex of the individual, human development is severely limited. Toward the end of the 19th century; Elizabeth Cady Stanton, whose father was a congressman, along with Susan B. Anthony, fought to attain voting rights for American women. In 1895 and 1898, Stanton published a 2 volume work called the Woman’s Bible. In it she took aim at the male bias in the Bible - most of the heroes are male. She saw organized religion as a supporter of male dominance and

called for its abolishment. She and her Quaker friend, Lucretia Coffin Mott, an anti slavery reformer, fought against slavery and struggled for women's civil rights. These rights, over and above the right of women to vote, included the right of American women to own property under the same parameters as men, and equality of divorce laws which at that time made divorce easy for males and almost impossible for women. Stanton and Mott put together the first women's rights meeting, at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848. The meeting produced a Declaration of Sentiments. The declaration demanded equal rights for women in marriage, education, religion, employment, and political life. Charlotte Perkins Gilman characterized the home as inefficient. She contended, in books like Women and Economics (1898), that female economic dependence upon males was bad news, and she advocated for day care support and cooperative kitchens. A hitherto unknown book of hers called Unpunished, was published posthumously in 1997. Among other things it addresses domestic abuse. The Socialist Labor party, in 1892, was one of the first national political parties in the United States to include woman suffrage as a plank in its platform. However, women seeking equal rights for women did not restrict their activities to women alone. They participated in drives for prison reform, improved education and prohibition. Some social critics of women's rights feared that feminism, which they disingenuously claimed meant the end of the home and family, was destroying the family. "A woman's place is in the home". What most male anti feminists really feared, however, was that the women would surpass them and disclose how inadequate these males truly were. Dorothea Dix led the drives for prison reform and mental hospital care for the needy. The settlement-house, a place where the poor and immigrants could go for social services, was inspired by Jane Addams and by Lillian Wald. Women were also active in movements for labor reforms, agrarian reform, and for birth control. Mary Elizabeth Lease invented the slogan: "What the farmers need to do is raise

less corn and more hell." Ida Tarbell wrote a 2 volume exposé called the History of the Standard Oil Company. It was a detailed report on the monopolistic practices of the company. In the early 20th century, Margaret Sanger was one of the sources of the invention and availability of the birth control pill and of Planned Parenthood clinics..

In response to discrimination; John F. Kennedy, in 1961, established the President's Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW) - chaired by Eleanor Roosevelt. In 1963 the commission published a report of the appalling inequities suffered by women. These inequities involved employment discrimination, unequal pay and legal inequities. Most of the commission members, however, did not support the ERA, the equal rights amendment to the Constitution. They figured that all necessary specification and definition of all equal rights were already in the Constitution. Good thing the Supreme Court was not miffed by the notion of the commission members that the Supreme Court is not necessary, because all is settled. Kennedy was assassinated in 1963; but President Lyndon Johnson took up where Kennedy left off. Johnson managed to get a partially biased Congress to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964. [Congress passed the first Civil Rights Act in 1875. It barred segregation in public places.] One of the provisions of the 1964 Act was called Title VII. Title VII prohibited discrimination in employment *based on gender*, and it created the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to enforce it. Betty Friedan wrote The Feminine Mystique in 1963, the same year Kennedy was assassinated; and in 1966 she organized the National Organization for Women (NOW). Friedan and some of her followers formed NOW in order to pressure a lethargic EEOC to get to work. Many of the members of NOW were highly educated, politically savvy women. They knew how to lobby congress and file civil suits against sex discrimination. NOW also generated more radical offspring groups such as SALT (Sisters All Learning Together) and WITCH

(Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell). Some worked for more liberal abortion laws, as well as for the passage of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution. Some women's liberationists were openly hostile to men, viewing them as the oppressors of women and denouncing them for regarding women solely as sexual objects. But most wanted relationships between men and women that were based upon mutual respect. Interest in the women's liberation movement became widespread. Television talk shows and popular magazines featured discussions by articulate feminists on the need for deep reforms in American society. In 1970 a doctoral dissertation by Kate Millett became the best-selling book, Sexual Politics. Both 19th and 20th century feminists believed that women should be judged as individuals, as men are, and that personal rewards should be based on personal achievement. They wanted women to have roles separate from those of wife and mother just as men had roles separate from those of husband and father. For example, many worked for the ordination of women to be priests, pastors, and rabbis. New considerations entered into the feminist perspective of the 1960s and 1970s. Increased and more accurate knowledge of birth control, including the use of contraceptives and *the pill* gave women greater control over their own destinies.

SUFFRAGE

The right to vote is called *suffrage*. It is from the Latin word *suffragium*, which can mean both voting rights and actually voting. Suffrage is sometimes referred to as a *franchise* to exercise a civil right held by citizens *as citizens*. Suffrage began as a right of the privileged only. Those who fought against its expansion to others were usually those among the privileged who already had it and did not want to lose its exclusivity.

Women's suffrage refers specifically to the right of women to vote. It is not the same as the so called Equal Rights Amendment which refers to the complete

package of all American civil rights. In 1916, Alice Paul founded the National Woman's political party, the NWP. In 1923 the NWP proposed an *Equal Rights* amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The amendment said that it would be illegal to deny or abridge equal rights on the basis of sex. The import was that any law which treated the sexes differently would be unconstitutional. The Equal Rights amendment was far more universal than the right of women in America to vote. The amendment required a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority of both houses of congress to pass it onto the public for a public vote. Under this 2nd phase of adoption requiring public approval, the ERA amendment required ratification by 38 of the States. Neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate voted approval until 1972 under Nixon. The approval by congress, in large measure, was due to the support of Betty Friedan's organization called NOW. Its most vocal **opponent** was Fundamentalist Christian, Phyllis Schlafly who thought being a housewife was superior to being a full citizen. Congress set March of 1979 as the due date for the 38 State approval. But even after an extension from 7 years to 10 years, the ERA never acquired the necessary approval of the States. But in spite of this failure, women did succeed in getting a Constitutional amendment specifically for the right of women to vote. The 15th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which was ratified in 1870, gave voting rights to black *men*. But State laws gave women the right to vote only in Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, and Colorado. In 1917, women suffragists acquired the right to vote in New York State. The push for a Constitutional amendment specifically giving women in all States the right to vote began with Cady Stanton's introduction of a constitutional amendment for woman suffrage in 1878. The amendment was reintroduced until it became law as the 19th Amendment in 1920. This amendment not only gave women the right to vote, it gave universal right to all citizens to vote in *federal* elections along with the right to vote in State and local elections. Years later, in 1971, the 26th Amendment set the voting age for all

elections at 18. The exclusions are citizens under 18, the mentally incompetent, and convicted felons. This latter exception, however, is currently falling in regard to felons who have served their jail terms and have reentered society as full citizens.

In actual fact the right of anyone, male or female, to vote for or elect a public official was comparatively rare all over the Western world until the 19th century. In monarchical governments the people were subjects, not citizens. At one point, the Pope was elected by acclamation of the people of Rome, but since the 13th century he has been elected by the College of Cardinals. In colonial America, civil law treated women as inferior to men. The law was based upon the chauvinist belief that men, by nature, are smarter than women. Consequently, early American civil law denied women the right to vote - unless they were property owners. The qualification of owning property in order to vote also pertained to males. Property owners alone, like shareholders in a corporation; had the right to vote. When the American Revolution was over, the Constitution of the brand new United States gave decisions about who could vote to the individual states. By the time of the 15th amendment to the Constitution, most states had dropped the property qualification in favor of allowing all adult **male** citizens to vote. But relative to women, this chauvinist move simply killed the right of women with property to vote. So the women's suffrage movement trudged on until they finally won the right to vote by way of the 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. In many ways, the American right to vote was a child of the American revolution. Before the Declaration of Independence only certain property owners could vote, but the Declaration of Independence was a strong incentive for giving universality to all matters of citizen rights. No citizen should have more rights than another citizen. Gradually the property qualification was dropped - for men. In 1965, one of the last inhibitors of voting rights, namely a literacy test, was abolished by the Voting

Rights Act.

In 1985 about 53 percent of all college students were women, more than one quarter of whom were above age 29.

The first:

Woman astronaut to ride in space: Dr. Sally K. Ride, 1983.

Woman astronaut to walk in space: Dr. Kathryn D. Sullivan, 1984.

Woman cabinet member: Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, 1933.

Woman candidate for President: Victoria Claflin Woodhull, nominated by the National Woman's Suffrage Association, 1872.

Woman candidate for Vice-President: Geraldine A. Ferraro, nominated by the Democratic Party, 1984.

Woman doctor of medicine: Elizabeth Blackwell; M.D. from Geneva Medical College of Western New York, 1849.

Woman elected governor of a state: Nellie Tayloe Ross, Wyoming, 1925.

Woman member of U.S. Senate: Rebecca Latimer Felton of Georgia; *appointed* Oct. 3, 1922.

Woman *elected* to U.S. Senate: Hattie Caraway, Arkansas; elected 1932.

Woman graduate of law school: Ada H. Kepley, Union College of Law, Chicago, 1870.

Woman member of U.S. House of Representatives: Jeannette Rankin, elected 1916.

Woman member of U.S. Supreme Court: Sandra Day O'Connor; appointed July 1981.

First women suffrage granted: Wyoming Territory, 1869.

This material is from the 1994 Information Please Almanac Series; *Feminism 1960 To the Present*. CD ROM edition by Parson's Technology: [One Parsons Drive, PO Box 100; Hiawatha, Iowa 52233-0100.]

Homosexual Status

The Christian Bible indicates homosexuality is immoral because it is not reproductive. Sigmund Freud thought homosexuality was psychologically abnormal. The Christian Church calls it sodomy. Even as recently as 1952, the American Psychiatric Association was classifying homosexuality as a mental disorder. Webster's American Dictionary includes *bugger*, *buggery*, *sodomy*, and *sodomite*, (all meaning anal or oral sex); *pederast*, *pederastic*, *pederasty*, (all meaning child lover); and *pathic*, (meaning pathological). All the above are assumed to be perverted and pathological.

The gay movement in the U.S.

One of the motivating factors behind the complaints of homosexuals in our society is the fact that their friendships and commitments and responsibilities and their contributions to society are not recognized nor utilized by society. This is one of the motivating factors behind the complaints of homosexuals. Although they do not want to be persecuted for their sexual orientation, they do want status in terms of sex. There is a real drive, not for freedom to engage in open physical gratification, but a drive for recognition of their citizen status and their contributions to society. Our society is far from this in terms of our mentality. Our society is nowhere near happily recognizing homosexual groups. Hidden from view because of social hostility, an urban gay subculture had formed in the United States by the early 1900s. Given the orientation of the Federal Government, local police felt free to molest and harass gays. They constantly raided gay hangouts and arrested many of those found. The harassment and disregard of gays as citizens ultimately caused gays to unite for political purposes. Their efforts caused gay behavior to be removed from many State laws that had treated it as criminal behavior. Some States put sexual orientation into their civil rights laws as protected

behavior. In 1975 the Federal Civil Service Commission removed Eisenhower's ban forbidding employment of homosexuals in most federal jobs. In a number of places, openly gay candidates ran for elective office and won. The Catholic bishops and a few Ultra Conservative Fundamentalist denominations reacted violently against the changes; but some denominations such as Unitarians and Reformed Judaism, allowed gay and lesbian ministers and rabbis. The Fundamentalist believer, singer Anita Bryant, led a campaign to repeal a gay rights ordinance in Dade County, Florida. She was joined by Fundamentalist ministers, such as Jerry Falwell of Lynchburg, Virginia, who formed what he called the Moral Majority, Inc. Falwell was joined by bigoted politicians, such as Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina. **[See: The Reader's Companion to American History. Copyright © 1991 by Houghton Mifflin Company.]**

In 1924 a veteran of WWI, Henry Gerber, founded a gay movement called the Society For Human Rights. But a year later the movement was crushed by the Chicago police. In 1948, Alfred Kinsey's study of the Sexual Behavior in the Human Male indicated that male sexuality ranged on a continuum from homosex to heterosex, sometimes in the same male. That fact pointed to the truth that homosexuality is innate, not acquired. Kinsey's book ultimately resulted in the removal of homosexuality from the American Psychiatric Association list of mental disorders. [But the Association did not drop homosexuality from its medical reference book the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders until 1980.] Around 1955, the first transgender surgery occurred. William Jorgensen became Christine Jorgensen. In the meantime persecution of gays continued as it always had been. In 1950, Harry Hay founded a homosexual rights group called the Mattachine Foundation. One of the members of this group formed another group called ONE, Inc. This group published a pro gay magazine called, ONE Inc. In 1954, the U.S. Postal Service refused to deliver the magazine because

fanatical Comstock censorship still reigned in the Postal Service. They called the magazine obscene. But in 1958, ONE, Inc. won a lawsuit against the U.S. Postal Service. Nevertheless, in 1953, president Eisenhower signed an executive order forbidding gays to hold Federal jobs. Many state and local governments and private corporations followed suit. The FBI began a surveillance program against homosexuals. What the jump from homosexuality to ‘dangerous to the United States’ is based upon beats me. Are homosexuals by nature domestic terrorists? Does this include children? In spite of this rubbish, Illinois in 1961, became the first State to kill its anti sodomy statutes. However, the really strong gay resistance to persecution and denial of civil rights began with Stonewall.

Stonewall Inn was a gay bar in New York that was cheap and open to all. It regularly hosted numbers of gays along with the homeless. On June 28, 1969, the New York police raided Stonewall Inn with their usual gusto for abusing gays. The gay patrons ran out of patience. They rioted. The riots lasted for 5 days. A short time later part of the Mattachine Society split off and became the Gay Liberation Front. It generated public protests, demonstrations and confrontations with police. Other such groups followed. A year after the Stonewall riots, the first gay pride parade took place in New York. Other progress in the matter of gay civil rights also began to occur. In 1977, the New York Supreme Court ruled that former male tennis star Renee Richards could play in the United States Open tennis tournament as a woman. Harvey Milk, on an openly gay campaign, won a seat as a San Francisco city supervisor in 1978. A year later over 100, 000 people marched on Washington for gay and lesbian civil rights. Although HIV was originally identified as a gay disease, and preached as such by self styled Fundamentalist Christians as a Divine punishment on gays; HIV hit the heterosexual Ultra-Conservative Fundamentalists as well . The U.S. Supreme Court ruled against Texas in a 2003 decision that killed a Texas anti sodomy law. As coming from the

U.S. Supreme Court, the ruling, in effect, killed all such anti sodomy laws in all the States. But the ruling did not affect the military. Bill Clinton made a campaign promise that he would abolish the prohibition against gays in the military. But once elected, he could not get enough support; so in 1993 he created the “Don’t ask, don’t tell” policy. In 2011, president Barack Obama repealed “Don’t ask, don’t tell”, because more than 12,000 highly skilled and patriotic officers who refused to hide their homosexuality, had been discharged from the military. The effect was like Stalin’s purge of the Russian military. Stalin’s purge left-behind a huge number of unskilled Russian military officers who showed their lack of ability when the German Wehrmacht invaded Russia. The basics of “Don’t ask, don’t tell” are:

- Sexual orientation is no bar to service unless openly shown.
- There will be no investigations directly about sexual orientation.
- Bodily contact with homosexual intent is a cause for separation.
- Mere allegations are not a cause for separation.
- Hostile treatment or violence will not to be tolerated.

In 2016, the ban on open homosexual orientation in the military was lifted because the new Secretary of the Army, Eric Fanning, was openly gay. But white supremacist Donald Trump, who thinks only white heterosexual Aryan males should enjoy American rights, restored the ban in 2018.

Hate Crimes statistics regarding homosexuals

A hate crime, also called a bias crime, is a criminal offense committed against a person, property, or society that is motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias against a race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity or national origin. By definition, the term “victim”

in the statistics may refer to a person, business, institution, or society as a whole. The term “known offender” does not necessarily mean the identity of the offender is known; it indicates that enough attributes are identified to distinguish from an unknown offender. **[See: [Hate Crime](#). Microsoft ® Encarta ® Encyclopedia 2005 © 1993-2004 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.]**

The first such law was passed in 1994. President Barack Obama signed an updated more inclusive Act in 2003. It was called the Matthew Shepard law. In 1998, Matthew Shepard was pistol whipped, tortured, tied to a tree and left to die; because he was thought to be gay.

For 2002, FBI Statistics show:

<u>Orientation</u>	<u>Incidents</u>	<u>Offenses</u>	<u>Victims</u>	<u>Offenders</u>
Anti male	825	957	984	1022
Anti female	172	207	221	172
Anti homosexual	222	259	267	225
Anti bisexual	15	15	15	13

In the late 2000s and early 2010s, attention was also paid to the rise of suicides and the lack of self-esteem by LGBT children and teenagers due to homophobic bullying. On July 21, 2014, President Obama signed an executive order adding "gender identity" to the categories protected against discrimination in hiring in the federal civilian workforce and both "sexual orientation" and “gender identity” to the categories protected against discrimination in hiring and employment on the part of federal government contractors and sub-contractors. On January 7, 2013, the Pentagon agreed to pay full separation pay to service members discharged under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell”.

Gay Marriages

Since valid marriages in one State are recognized as valid in all States, if one State recognizes as valid a homosexual union, the effect hits all the States. Hence, when the Hawaiian State Supreme Court ruled in 1953 that a statutory ban on homosexual marriages might violate the Constitution of the State of Hawaii, the marriages of gays became a national topic.

In most of the United States, marriage between partners of the same sex is not legally recognized. Homosexual marriage provokes controversy. In the United States, religious conservatives who believe that the Bible forbids same-sex relationships constitute the most outspoken opponents of gay marriage. These critics, who fear that the recognition of gay partnerships threatens the institution of marriage, have spearheaded legislative efforts to explicitly restrict the definition of marriage to heterosexual couples. In 1996 the Congress of the United States adopted the Defense of Marriage Act, which allows states to enact laws that *deny recognition of same-sex marriages* obtained in other states. More than half of the states have adopted such legislation. However, gay-rights activists continue to work toward legal recognition of same-sex marriage. In 2000 Vermont became the first state to allow gay partners to join in a civil union that grants them the same legal rights that married heterosexual couples have. In 2003 the Supreme Judicial Court, the highest court in the state of Massachusetts, ruled that same-sex marriages are permitted under the state's constitution. The court clarified its ruling in February 2004 by saying that *civil unions* were not a permissible substitute for marriage, opening the way for the first legal gay marriages to be performed in the United States in May 2004. Although same-sex

marriages faced considerable political and religious opposition in the United States, an increasing number of local governments and private corporations recognize domestic partnerships for both homosexual and heterosexual unmarried couples. This recognition allows members of a committed but unmarried couple to enjoy some of the practical benefits enjoyed by married couples, such as insurance, hospital visitation privileges, and inheritance rights. Despite increasing acceptance, domestic partnerships have not been accorded the broad social and legal approval that marriage generally receives. **Domestic Partnership. Microsoft ® Encarta ® Encyclopedia 2005 © 1993-2004 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.]**

On September 30, 2011, the Defense Department ruled that military chaplains could officiate at same-sex weddings, on or off military installations, in states where such weddings are allowed. On November 13, 2016, during an interview with Lesley Stahl on *60 Minutes*, Trump said that he was fine with the *Obergefell v. Hodges* Supreme Court decision and that it was irrelevant whether he [Trump] supported same-sex marriage or not because the law was settled. However, Trump's decisions as president have put into question the sincerity of his comments. On October 13, 2017, Trump became the first sitting president to address the Values Voter Summit, an annual conference sponsored by the Family Research Council, which is known for its anti-LGBT civil rights advocacy.

Summary: Esteem levels of sexual status in America

Contemporary cultures have managed to desanctify or secularize sex quite thoroughly as well as make it a visual spectacle. Monogamous marriage is still a *legal* entity, not a religious entity, in the US and in Europe. Because of the very specific separation of Church and State in the United States; marital contracts in

America are, in fact, *secular contracts which the uniformed think are Christian*. They are not; because, like the fiction that the United States is a Christian Country, the Constitution does not allow for any U.S. law to have a religious nature. The legal marital contract in America *is a civil contract* whereby the State knows whose kids belong to whom and whose material goods belong to whom and, in case of death, to whom these goods should go. Illegitimacy has lost much of its ‘monstrous’ character and is acceptable to most of the populace. It is not penalized as such by law, although claim to the material goods of a parent on the part of an illegitimate child might be challenged. Some forms of sex are legally prohibited in many States. For example; sodomy remains illegal in a lot of places, and in some States pre marital sex, called fornication, is forbidden. Serial bigamy is okay, but simultaneous bigamy is not. On the other hand most States have adopted no fault divorce. Adultery in those States need not be used as cause for divorce. It seems that at the moment, the most esteemed status of sex and of sex-love is still farming sex and males who have a reproductive family. Male seed remains as dictating the morality of sex within a loving, civil contractual marriage and family. Only the emphasis of marriage has changed. The focus is not so much on having children, especially male children, but on raising them properly and effectively for a much longer period than agricultural families and Medieval families needed to do. It does not take as long to teach a child how to help on the family farm in the Fertile Crescent as it does to teach a child how to be an astrophysicist.

Esteem for America in other countries

The *external* esteem level of American culture involves the American search for a place and a role on the world stage. At this point America simply buys ‘esteem’ from other Countries by giving or loaning them money. But America reacts to world opinion as a toady and it does not get much respect even from Countries whose economies are supported by freely given American money. The

Europeans, especially Western Europeans, having a longer history than America, also have a more ‘regal’ attitude toward other countries. America is just the *novo riche* uncultured kid on the block. From this point of view, there is no ‘esteemed’ culture of the US even though America works hard at shoving Democracy down every throat that will open up. We have a well deserved national pride in ourselves; but the rest of the world is not too impressed. America is a ‘technician’ who tries to repair problems on the world stage; but America is not an elegant personage to be admired and copied. The respect given America and Western Europe by other Countries is for what we have made, not for who we are. Nevertheless, human rights throughout the world would not be where and what they are without the existence of America.

Chapter Eight: Creative level sexual law and culture in America

The creativity of self actualizing people is not exactly a matter of products or works of art; but of life itself. Self actualizing creativity shows itself in the ordinary affairs of human life. It is a tendency to do anything and everything creatively. Self actualizing creativity is a ‘way’ of doing things rather than creation of a special product. Since fully mature people perceive reality in its raw concreteness; they are everywhere perceptive of the ‘raw materials’ for creative living. Self actualizing people do not categorize or rubricize reality. They can appreciate reality as it is. They do not have prior expectations in regard to what ‘ought to be there’; but enjoy, contemplate and appreciate raw reality. In line with this is the fact that such people are not afraid of the unknown. They enjoy dealing with the strange, the unorganized, the puzzling. Creativity involves putting ‘design’ into raw materials; and self actualizing persons put themselves, their own personality, or their own stamp on what they do. Self actualizing creativity is like

improvisation in jazz. Professor Maslow compares self-actualizing behavior to the behavior of children who function for the sheer joy of experiencing themselves and the repeating of their experiences. This type of activity in children is known as *'funktionlust'*. Peak self experience seems to be akin to being full of life, so full that life bursts out spontaneously. When life does erupt from the self-actualized person, the life is the expression of the idiosyncratic identity of the self actualized person. The life of the self actualizing person is not so much response to the world around as it is an outpouring of self. The result is a highly self expressive, spontaneous behavior not tied to custom, or erroneous right and wrong, or mediocre manners, or mediocre rules. Creative need is consequently a need for freedom to express one's unique self. Self actualized people are less inhibited by the customary, and do not fear ridicule or embarrassment; because they have a rather sturdy self acceptance. Again, self actualizing people do not categorize or rubricize reality. They can appreciate reality as it is. Because they do not have prior expectations in regard to what 'ought to be there'; they are able to enjoy, contemplate and appreciate raw reality. Such people can see and deal with fresh concrete reality as well as abstract, classified reality. In line with this is the fact that such people are not afraid of the unknown. They enjoy dealing with the new and thus the strange and uncaged.

Because this analysis of sex, unlike a deterministic theory such as Marxism, is not a theory claiming to be a set of laws that predict the future legal and cultural views of sex in America; there is little to be described regarding creative sex at a cultural level. Creative level legal and cultural sex notions in America do not yet exist. American lawmakers and governments still impose boundaries on sex in areas that belong to the sphere of individual self governance. These laws and lawmakers lay hands on private matters in spite of the nature of the American Constitution and Bill of Rights. Nevertheless, it is true that the Western world did

reach a civil level that allowed for individualized living and the creation of the American democracy. American democracy allows each and every American individual to be himself or herself - to a degree. America allows individual citizens to live and grow as somewhat unique independent individuals. And never before have individual citizens been allowed to seek their own destiny to the degree that America provides. Historically governments viewed citizens as State possessions to be formed into a herd and used by the State for State purposes only. Serving the State was the sole destiny individual citizens were allowed. Only in America is individual destiny viewed as hands-off unique and private, and under the untouchable command and control of individuals themselves. It's called liberty. It means freedom to be your own unique self instead of a State clone among clones. Even though all too many petty and biased and ignorant lawmakers and enforcers want to play dictator or God; American Federal and State and local governments are, by Constitution, designed to serve American citizens, not the other way around.

One of the mistakes many laws and lawmakers make consists of viewing sex as an accouterment or an appendage. But sex is not simply an organ. Sex is an intrinsic modality of the entire individual. Sex is the individual. Individuals are incarnate sexuality. Consequently, true creative sex is not a set of specifically sexual activities such as reproduction. [Reproduction, by the way, does not generate new sexual organs. It generates new whole and entire individuals who are sexual through and through.] Sexual creativity, instead, is the creativity of the individual flowing through the individual's sexual makeup. Creative sex, for example, is a teacher's creativity *as a teacher*, flowing through the teacher's sex as male or female. Human sex is sex that has a personality. Accordingly, sex is not good or evil in and of itself; because it doesn't exist in and of itself. Sexuality has the same character as its owner. If the owner is crude, that person's sexuality will

be crude. If the possessor is elegant, the sexuality of that person will be elegant. If the owner is immoral, the sex will probably be immoral. If the owner is moral, the sex will be moral. The fact is sex as persons rather than organs is the true criterion of what is and is not moral sex. If the sexual behaviors of given individuals help turn them into mature and happy self governing adults, their sexuality should be accepted as one of the genuine roads to a successful physically and psychologically healthy individual. The suppression of sexual behaviors that effectively, by Nature, work to produce mature individuals is the only immoral and unnatural dimension in regard to unnatural sexuality. Such fascist suppression is no different than suppressing eyesight or the ability to move arms and legs. Plant sexuality is not the height of human sexual morality. It is the nadir of human sexual morality. Nature did not design human sex to produce plants. Nature designed human sex to produce humans.

Another dimension that should be present in a sexually creative culture is recognition of the fact that human reproduction is not the primary purpose of human sex, because human sex is not reproductive most of the time. Human sex, before anything else, produces intimate coupling or, as the Bible calls it, “**one flesh**”. Recognition of this outcome has been present from the very beginnings of civil societies; but until the industrial revolution, union as the outcome of sex has been viewed as secondary to reproduction. Early civilizations had only two major components, farms and armies. The family farms produced the goods that kept the State in existence, and the militaries protected the farmers. Sex produced the farmers and the soldiers, but this required record keeping. Keeping track of citizens and ownership of goods is one of the reasons civil governments, from the beginning, politically recognized reproductive marital units as a necessary state and status of citizens. The marital unit, the family farm, literally provided the economic structure of a society. However, once the economic structures included

industrial giants and big business; governments took notice of, and gave legal status to, corporations as persons and units; but they failed to properly recognize non-marital couples that were not part of a family farm or a giant corporation. This was a mistake. Although public education keeps track of individuals and provides an avenue of State control over the individual, many non marital couples function as units the same as families, in spite of no legal recognition. They are thereby handicapped in regard to what they have to offer society. Such couples could consist of anything from scientists to engineers to ditch diggers. Unitive identity includes the sexual morality and practices of the various American racial and ethnic groups that form the life-giving heterogeneity of the U.S. Even the 50 States as differing are part of that heterogeneity. It is interesting to note that a non married couple can go to the bank and get a stable *joint* bank account; but the American government does not want to allow them stable status as *joint* citizens.