

## THE SEXUAL (IE, GENITAL) & THE SPIRITUAL SPECTRUMS

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

I need a running start before I get to your statement, to which this Think-sheet is a first response. As I begin, all you need to know is that I'm using "sexuality" in its narrowest sense, viz "sex," which I'm using in its narrowest sense, viz intergenitality (which, viewed from one side, is the contact of one's genitals with another human being [excluding, here, bestiality]).

Why this severe delimitation? It's implied in your statement. The phrase "out of the closet" means that a gay/lesbian [ie, homosexual] has gone public with the personal fact of homophilia, ie same-sex attraction, active or passive, whether exclusive or bisexual. (As you know, the verb "to out" is a derivative, meaning that somebody else has done the job, ie gone public about your psychogenital orientation, without your permission. I'm assuming you're against "outing" heterophilia cases, public blabbing as to particular straights' genital proclivities/activities.)

One further assumption: Doubtless we agree that spirituality-sexuality is a continuum. This advaitistic (nondual) perspective has many implicates, of which two are of special relevance here: (1) What one does with one's genitals affects one's spirit, & (2) the obverse: what one does with one's spirit affects one's genital non/activity....No ontological conclusion is to be drawn from the thisworldly fact of psychophysical unity. In particular, the materialistic conclusion that any survival of the human individual after physical death is irrational. In other words, bodymind or mindbody is only a working assumption, not to be overread as a metaphysical fact.

1 I've always been fascinated by what people do / don't do with their spirits & I'm forever prying with the intent of recommending Jesus. Call it "personal witnessing," or "evangelism." People are the big show, & what's deepest in them (a rough definition, here, of "spirit") is, for me, the big circle in the circus.

Viewed as a spectrum, the lines look like this, reading from min to max:  
(1) No spiritual awareness. A half-century of prying has made me skillful in curing this pathology ("pathology" in the sense that spiritual awareness is normal, & spiritual maturation is the process of the increase of spiritual awareness, including awareness of the touch of one's spirit on other spirits & the Great Spirit). (2) Stages within awareness (Quaker-called "openings," Buddhist-called "awakenings"). (3) Sainthood--not just mind over matter, but the condition in which spirit invades--pervades--uses mindmatter--mattermind in the interest of a Higher Order).

2 I've comparatively little interest in what people do / don't do with their genitals. Not no interest, but low interest in comparison with my fascination with what they do / don't do with their spirits (I'd say, as synonym, "souls" if the term didn't connote body-soul dualism). But since my fascination is with the spirit-circle, I'm highly interested in the points where that circle is/becomes tangential to sex (as defined in this Thinksheet's first ¶ [not first §]).

In §1 I laid out the spiritual spectrum. Here's the genital:

(1) No sexual feeling. Once I had a counselee who lived with this deficiency till age 17, when he got his wiring surgically completed "and [as he put it] the girls began to look interesting." (2) The second form of deficiency, not quite so pitiable, is sexual feeling only, or mainly, for one's own sex. An early aim in the cognitive counseling of gays & bi-s is the admission that their condition is a deficiency. (Whether or not the deficiency is "biological" is, here, irrelevant.) Every human being is deficient in light of the human ideal of perfection, & "perfectionism" is living in a state of denial vis-a-vis this fact. The gay ideology (that being gay is nothing more or other than living "an alternative lifestyle," etc.) is the intellectualization of the denial of deficiency ("deficiency" in the sense of [RHD2] "incompleteness" of sexual development in a specimen of a sexual species). (3) The dead virgin, ie the person who lives the whole of life without any genital contact with another human being. (4) The dead raped virgin, ie the person who lives the whole of life with no genital contact with another human being except forced contact. (5)

The marital virgin: no genital contact before or outside of marriage. (6) The faithful spouse: no genital contact outside of marriage. (7) Marriage + one sexual playmate, a.k.a. & f.k.a. (formerly known as) "the mistress system." (8) Marriage + two sexual playmates, one for each spouse. (9) Ménage à trois, sex among three (a highly unstable compound). (10) "Open marriage," no commitment against spouses' having multiple sexual partners serially (ie, one at a time). (11) Marital promiscuity (multiple sexual partners simultaneously). (12) Nonmarital promiscuity or "open sexuality," such as I saw in the early days of Esalen Institute--at dinner, participants choosing sexual partners for the night as a second form of dessert.

3 Everybody's somewhere along that dozen-line genital spectrum. I'm at (5). That's my "out of the closet" sexual history....REPRISE: "Genitality" is the condition of a specimen of a sexual species. "Sex" is intergenitality, hetero- or homo-. One's "sexual story [or "history"]" is how one's used / not used one's genitals vis-a-vis other human beings.

4 I think (5) is best. For the almost-half-century since I first laid eyes on her, I have never looked upon Loree without joy. And I have never looked upon another woman with intentional lust, ie with the intention to "make out" with her. (Primal lust--one's eyeballs occasionally bulging out--is another matter; it's natural & normal & to be enjoyed without any sense of guilt.) Other women have been / are to me persons, not "sexual objects" in the common sense of the term (ie, possible lays)....Yes, (5) is the sexual lifestyle I recommend as having (1) the least pain, (2) the most pleasure, & (3) the highest potential for spiritual tangency (though I'm more sure of the first two than of this).

5 What bearing has all this on **your statement** (the second line of this Thinksheet)? (I'm speculating because--I repeat--I've nothing from you on it in addition to the bare statement. I hope this Thinksheet will lead you to enlighten me further, both as to your statement & as to my speculations/ruminations on it.)

1 Literally, "Straights should come out of the closet" should mean that straights living among homos & pretending to be one of them should admit that they are not gay. That is the literal transposition of factors. But it's highly improbable that that was the burden of your statement, which was made to a largely hetero audience. The number in that audience, or in the general population, who are living as in-the-closet heteros in gay communities is statistically infinitesimal. You must have meant something twisted off from the parallel transposition, something less easy to grasp than the parallel, something with a torque. I'm curious as to why the torque.

2 In §2, I did what you said to do: I a hetero came out of the closet as to my sexual history. So what? What do you want to make of that? It's a puzzle to me. I can't imagine anyone's being interested. It has hermeneutic value (in helping to understand who/what I am), but just about zero erotic-titilative value. Where's the beef? What's the deal? In my case, your statement seems worthless.

3 If your aim is to create fellow-feeling sympathy for homos, my case could have the opposite effect. The mere mention of (2, "the second form of deficiency") could tempt me to pride, to thanking God that "I am not like" those others (L.18.11). Just think how good I could get to feeling about myself! I am not, & never have been, a homosexual, a fornicator, an adulterer, a convicted or official celibate ("official celibate": one who's celibate without believing in it but by submission to institutional policy).

4 If your aim is to crack heteros open to sexual experimentation toward (as you said) "new forms of living together in a radically changed world," then putting personal sexual histories on the table would be a precondition. (In that context, you a hetero came out of the closet in stating you'd been a (7), egalitarian style: each female equally related to you.)

5 The "pericope adulteratis" (Jn.7.52b-8.11), of dubious authenticity, warns all us sinners against throwing "the first stone." I'm for that. Humility & penitence all 'round. Surely your statement includes that.