

70,000,000 is a lot of people reading Ann Landers, who on sex is straight-laced biblical--the two "mono"s (the Greek for "only"): MONOTHEISM (only one God) and MONOGAMY (sex only in marriage, and only one sexual partner). How can she get away with it when "the media," in which she makes her living, are hush-hush on monotheism and treat monogamy as an antique? Must be a swelling public hunger for Jewish-mama no-nonsense plain talk....Take, eg, 3 Jan 85: A divorced man in his "early 60s" "sleeps" twice a week with his widowed sister, who's in her "late 50s," and he wants to know what's wrong with this incest, since it's not hurting anybody and is "good sex" though it's "not a love match." AL's reply: "Sick, sick, sick. If I had your address, I would send you a get-well card....you are denying yourselves the opportunity to have normal relations with others. I am talking about marriage. The fact that neither of you sees anything wrong with such behavior suggests a moral dead-spot that is unnatural and revolting.".... There you have it, folks: sex as a means of loving within marriage is healthy, all other interpersonal sex is sick, unnormal, unnatural, and disgusting. Besides, (ALL4Jan85), 72% of 90,000 women writing her say "the act" is optional, disposable, in comparison with tender affection: penetration and orgasm are grossly overrated, commercially overheated and overtouted.

1. The Bible "cools" sex by making it only the secondary mode of identity: I am only relatively male-myself in relation to female; I am absolutely-primarily human-myself in comparison with the divine--as the great Brunner put it (p.92, MAN IN REVOLT, Westm./47), Man (humanity) is to "understand himself in *God alone*." With this orientation as key, one can unlock almost all the doors of what the Bible has to say about sexuality. Contrariwise, works handling the subject anthropo-, socio-, psycho-logically, and *not theologically*, are not just partial (in both senses) but also perverted, (in this sense) written by sexual perverts, anthropolaters. Some of the best stuff you can find and read on sexuality is written by (in this sense) perverts. A "per-vert" is somebody who "turns aside from" the true use of something in the interest of something else, and "leads" others "astray" in the process; and since the true use of sex(uality) is the glory of God, any other glory, any other purpose, is perversion. I'm rubbing this in for any reader who may not feel the Bible's revulsions against genitals that wander away from (1) God and (2) the only God-sanctioned, God-sanctified, God-blessed sexual relationship, viz., death-do-us-part male/female marriage.

2. Sentimentalists pervert Jesus to the sanctioning of "love"-sex--that since sex (like the Sabbath) is made for "man," and not "man" for sex-strictures, the rule is not "What are the sex limits?" but rather "What, here and now, best ministers to love, the truly loving relationship?" Almost no other religious founder in history is as sex-rigorist as Jesus (e.g., Mt. 5:31f, 19.4-6 and parallels), yet so he gets (pardon the expression) screwed into supporting latitudinarianism!

3. The "out" some of these Jesus-screwdrivers use is the ancients' ignorance in comparison with our knowledge. E.g., when those ancient Jews (including Jesus) condemned homosexuality, they did not know of our scientific (?) distinction between constitutional ("nature") homosex. and cultural ("nurture") homosex. Yet Mt.19.12* says some "can't marry" because they were "born that way"--and to argue that Jesus permits, or even may permit, homosex. because he does not specifically condemn it is a pathetic hermeneutic perversion (*argumentum e silentio*, the argument from silence). But just say that Jesus, like everybody else not being perfect, wasn't always kind: better in the sense of not being a hermeneutic perversion, though a moralistic travesty on the pseudo-syllogism (1) kindness (including approving homosex.) is good, (2) Jesus was good, (3) so Jesus approved of homosex.! (*The wording does not distinguish between impotence and homophilia, constitutional homosex.; I take it to apply to both, though among the Jews all forms of homosex. were severely in the closet--an opinion the context strengthens.)

4. Much of the current sex-discussion, in and beyond the UCC, fails to dis-

OVER

tinguish between rights (legal dimension) and morals (ethical dimension), obscuring the fact, important to democracy, that the citizenry MUST agree on laws and CAN-NOT agree on morals (e.g., abortion: I hope we can keep the law that says it's OK--to use the opponents' terms--to "murder" "babies"). But over-attention to rights skews debate: in an Orthodox/Roman/Protestant/Jewish forum I participated in a few days ago, a "mixed marriage" was defined as one between a man and a woman! Further, this over-attention confuses rights and what is "good" and "helpful" (1Cor.10.23-31): say I, homosex. rights, yes; homosex. promo (as in the Okla. case now before the Supreme Court: a teacher's right, in public school, to preach homosex. as equally good in comparison with heterosex.), no--children should have held up before them the idea of (see #1915) total sexuality, and that not on the same level as (Barth) "semi-sex." Whether or not a particular case of homosex. is a moral perversion, every case of homosex. is a defect vis-a-vis total sexuality--a defect that has no right to be paraded as equal to wholeness.

5. Humans aren't defectless, and denying one's defects is pathetic and self-contradictory. Biologically, heterosex is the NORM for our species--so clearly that without this norm-reality, our species would cease to exist. On the hyper-/norm-/hypo- pattern, homosex is hypo- or sub- normal; other words are excess/norm/defect, homosex being thus "defect"ive (biologically: no moral or personal-valuational overtones implied). Theologically, the situation is the same: heterosex is the creational NORM, *imago dei* (Gn.1-3, for Jews and Christians the *locus classicus* and center-point for all discussions of sex (e.g., Jesus, above reff.)). Anything other than the full (body/mind/psyche/spirit) man/woman relationship is "out": (1) self-arousal (autoeroticism) is nowhere condemned in the Bible, and offends the biblical norm only if it neurotically substitutes for interpersonal sex; (2) monasticism ("spiritual" celibacy) tinged with the notion that marriage is metaphysically inferior is out, though Jesus' "for the Kingdom of God's sake" was a window through which this Eastern perversion crept into the Church; (3) bestiality (human/animal coitus) is out; (4) same-sex coitus (homosexuality) is loudly condemned in both Testaments: Lev.18.22:"God hates that";20.13: capital punishment for this "disgusting thing"; Judg.19.22-24:"sexual perverts...evil, immoral...awful"; Mt.5.27f:*a fortiori*, how much worse the lustful eye same-sex; 19.4-8:rigorism against divorce as violating God's creation plan of "one flesh" male/female, *a fortiori* how much worse a violation is homosex; 19.12: celibacy, marriage's only alternative; Ro.1.26-32:only antihomo biblical ref. including lesbians, both m/f under God's "wrath"; 1Cor.7:no place for homos (antihomosex being, by Jesus and Paul, as assumed as was the existence of God); 11.3-16:here, as everywhere, the assumption of sexual diversity, m/f, all else ruled out as illicit perversion--so the assumed diversity in the Christ/Church analogy in Eph. 5.21-33; 1Tim.1.10:*arsenokoites*, "male homosexual, pederast, sodomite"--a word used elsewhere, in early Christian literature, only in 1Cor.6.9 (qtd. by Polycarp, 5.3), the act specifically described only in Ro.1.27; Jude 7:"other flesh" than heterosex. ; (5) fornication (nonmarital hetero- or homo- sex; root of Gk. *porn-os* in 1Cor.6.9-13, as in "The Lord hates temple prostitutes," Deut.23.17f, and 1Tim.1.10; the terms on the root *able*, expansively, to mean any sexual immorality vis-a-vis the Jewish and early Christian moral sense; e.g., Jude 7 and a parallel handful of terms--*aselg.*, *ekporn.*, *epithum.*, *mism.*, *moichalid.*--in 2P.2.6-22); (6) adultery (strictly, genitals wandering out of marriage--reff. too numerous to require mention; loosely, in both Hellenistic-Jewish and early-Christian parenesis, "sexual vice in all its forms" (JND Kelly, A COMMENTARY ON THE PASTORAL EPISTLES, Harper/63, p.50)); self-castration (e.g., Origen; not explicitly condemned in Scripture, but obviously a violation of the goodness of creation).

6. The phrase "the law of love" points to the interincorporation of law and love, as in the Law written on our hearts (Jer.31.31-34, the Law not to be foregone--for it is, Ro.7.12, "holy, just, and good"--but transcended--Mt.5.17-19). Justice is the social side of truth as love is the social side of Law (Torah)....Jesus was a rigorist, but not a legalist.