

A Review of the Church's Latest Guidelines on Sex

A PARENT'S GUIDE: SEX EDUCATION OR EROTOPHOBIA?

By Terence L. Day

INTRODUCTION

QUESTIONS OF SEXUAL ETHICS HAVE ALWAYS seemed perplexing, especially for religious people and for religious institutions. Each generation believes that it discovered sex and, in a manner of speaking, each does. Today The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and its people are struggling with sexual questions, perhaps as never before. Church leaders have long emphasized the primary importance of sexual purity, and they continue to feel a grave responsibility to teach the law of chastity. For this clear, unfaltering voice the body of the Church can be grateful. Yet, too often, injunctions encouraging chastity are burdened by negative connotations and forebodings about the dark side of sex. Therefore, the warnings often instill in Latter-day Saints an inordinate fear of sex, or erotophobia, as psychiatrists know it.¹ Many LDS couples, therefore, approach the nuptial bed not only with a divinely sanctioned physical desire for each other, but with profound misgivings about the expressions of physical love.

Few of us in Western societies escape the influence of erotophobia, which can impose needless guilt, undermine self-esteem and even impair spiritual development.² Unwarranted guilt also jeopardizes wholesome sexual adjustment in marriage. Sexual maladjustment deprives both spouses of a measure of a loving and nurtured sexual fulfillment.³ This may be particularly true for women.⁴ In both sexes, diminished sexual desire is the most commonly reported sexual maladjustment; negative sex feelings are major contributors to this type of maladjustment.⁵ Consequently, these unresolved family stresses undoubtedly contribute to spouse and child abuse, and to divorce. For these reasons, it is important to recognize erotophobia so its impact may be reduced in the lives of its victims.

TERENCE L. DAY has been a journalist for 26 years and is currently a news writer for the College of Agriculture and Home Economics at Washington State University. A version of this paper was presented at the Sunstone Symposium IX in 1987.

My study on the origins and evolution of Christian sexual ethics reveals compelling evidence that many of the sexual attitudes that influence Latter-day Saints do not arise, as we have supposed, from the gospel, but from pagan philosophies that predate Christianity. They come neither from the scriptures nor from revelation, but have been traced by scholars at least to Pythagorean moral dualism. Pythagoras, who lived in the sixth century B.C., taught that the male is good and the female is bad. He also taught that the body is evil and that sexual activities pander to demeaning passions. This philosophy comes to us in an unbroken chain through the great philosophers Plato and Aristotle. Philo played a major role in melding moral dualism and Christianity. St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Augustine, and also St. Thomas Aquinas played vital roles in defining Christian sexual attitudes. St. Clement, who produced Christianity's first known text on sexual practice in married life, borrowed heavily from pagan philosophy. St. Clement associates sexual activity with evil and glorifies self-restraint for its own sake.⁶ Nearly eighteen centuries later, the LDS church's first sex education guide perpetuates some of the same pagan erotophobia.

Tracing the evolution of Christian sexual ethics from Aquinas in the thirteenth century to the present day has been both fascinating and deeply saddening. As recently as one hundred years ago, our ancestors lived through a veritable siege of sexual horror, an era of rampant erotophobia during which circumcision was introduced to prevent masturbation⁷ and when masturbators were even sent to insane asylums. In extreme cases, castration and clitoridectomy were inflicted on masturbators. Early in this century when many of our parents or grandparents were in their formative years, one could not speak publicly about sex, nor could one write about it. Doing so was not only impolite; it was illegal. Margaret Sanger was arrested eight times between 1914 and 1917 on obscenity charges. Her crime was that of speaking publicly on contraception.⁸

Although we may not personally remember these times, society is profoundly influenced by them, perhaps especially so in the patriarchal Mormon culture. Whatever level of erotophobia



Latter-day Saints may have experienced in the past, it was likely elevated in recent years when the Church formally interjected itself into the bedroom in an unprecedented degree.

A PARENT'S GUIDE

Amid growing and alarming reports of child, spousal, and sexual abuse, a series of important but little-known events began in 1981 when the Church Social Services Department sent a book on human sexuality to local Church leaders for use in counseling members. This book, *Human Intimacy: Illusion & Reality*, was written by Victor L. Brown, Jr., former director of LDS Church Social Services.⁹ Brown, or at least his book, evidently had great influence on *A Parent's Guide*.

Next, the First Presidency issued the first of two communications on temple recommend interviews that I have dubbed the "bedroom letters." On 5 January 1982, stake presidents and bishops were advised to ensure that candidates for temple recommends refrained from oral sex, which these communications interpreted as an "unnatural, impure, or unholy practice." Less

than a year later, the First Presidency sent a second letter cautioning local authorities not to pry into marital relations. However, new temple recommend interview instructions contained a new question on refraining from "unnatural, impure, or unholy practices." For the benefit of anyone who might ask for definitions of what constituted these practices, the First Presidency provided a one paragraph interpretation that was to be read verbatim to the inquiring person. It stated that the brethren had determined that both oral and anal sex were "unnatural, impure, or unholy practices." Normal rules and procedures for repentance were to be applied.

The latest development in this bedroom saga was removal of the "unnatural, impure, or unholy practices" question from the temple recommend interview book in early 1986. This would appear to cancel the Church's official concern with marital sexual practices.

It was in this environment that in 1985 the Church published *A Parent's Guide* in conjunction with admonitions to local priesthood leaders regarding child and spousal abuse. The Church announced education programs in these various areas.

The context of the guide's appearance is one permeated by negativism. It is important that *A Parent's Guide* be examined not only for the facts it presents, but for the attitudes revealed by its rhetoric. Erotophobic tendencies have been correlated with conservative values such as religious orientation, regular church attendance, and avoidance of sex as a topic of conversation—all descriptors that seem to define Latter-day Saints, among other peoples.¹⁰

METHODOLOGY

My definition, any evaluation is subjective and therefore risks being controversial and being criticized. Because of that danger, and in the spirit of fairness, I will briefly state the background and values that I bring to this task. I am a husband, father of six children, professional journalist, and an active high priest in the LDS church, to which I hold a profound allegiance. I wholeheartedly and joyously embrace the law of chastity as God's divine law.

My evaluation of *A Parent's Guide* relies primarily on analysis of the value burdens of the authors' words; I also have examined other rhetorical tactics. This has been done within the perspective of my studies concerning the origins and evolution of Christian sexual ethics. I make no claim of unerring objectivity in assigning positive or negative values to words and phrases. There may be some disagreement on interpretations. In instances of uncertainty, I've tried to err on the side of grace to the authors of *A Parent's Guide*.

Words and phrases are divided into three lists—positive, negative, and neutral—depending on definition or connotation. Positive words and phrases are those likely to give the reader a favorable impression of sex, conveying the idea that sex is good, that it is proper, and that it is healthy to enjoy it. Negative words and phrases are those likely to give the reader an unfavorable impression of sex, conveying the attitude that sex is dangerous, wrong, and evil. Neutral words and phrases are those likely to convey neither positive nor negative connotations. Tables 1, 2, and 3 list examples of sexual words and phrases that were included in the analysis.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

In undertaking any study of this nature, there is one overbearing problem: that words have different meanings to different people. Connotation, which can be even more important than definition, is even more highly subjective and greatly influenced by context. For example, narrowly defined, the word "sex" is neutral. But it may bear a positive or a negative connotation,

depending largely upon the values of the listener or reader. It also may receive good or bad connotations depending on the company it keeps. In the company of such modifiers as "abuse," "carnal," "defile," "devilish," "gratification," "indecent," and "lust," it takes on a bad connotation. However, modify it with adjectives such as "clean," "enjoyable," "good," "pleasurable," and "virtuous," and the word "sex" takes on a good connotation. Phrases such as "questions about sex" and "sex characteristics," I have classified as neutral, unless a value burden is implied. In this study, there

is no way to deal with connotations that the reader will apply to the words. For the true erotophobe, the word "sex" always has a negative connotation, and so does any word associated with the subject, no matter how clinical, or how positive a connotation others may place on it. At the other extreme, the erotophile may see good in almost every sexual association.

FINDINGS

The language of *A Parent's Guide* is overwhelmingly negative, displaying a profound distrust of sexuality. The *Guide* contains 456 words and phrases referring to sex and sexuality. This does not include the word "gender," which is used many times, nor does it include many uses of the word "intimacy" where the authors' intention was not clear. In some cases "intimacy" is clearly used in a nonsexual connotation and therefore was not counted. Even the authors caution that their use of the phrase "physical intimacy" doesn't necessarily imply a sexual relationship. In other cases the context is clearly a sexual one, and the use was counted.

Only 64 (14 percent) of 456 references convey a clearly positive image of sex. Clearly negative references accounted for 170 (37 percent) of the total, and 222 (49 percent) of the references were neutral (see Table 4). A large number of neutral references (98) appear in the sections on how to teach children up to the age of puberty. They deal fundamentally with biology and psychology. Whether one weighs positive statements against the sum of positive, negative, and neutral, or only against the sum of positive and negative, the *Guide* falls short of the sex-positive instruction needed by Latter-day Saints.

Sex-Positive References

Whatever the shortcomings of *A Parent's Guide*, there is much to applaud. It contains some of the most positive affirmations of the holiness of human sexuality that have ever been publicly made by the Church. Indeed, the very best thing about the *Guide* is that the Church has published it. Although the tone of *A Parent's Guide* is sex-negative, the manual puts the Church

Table 1

EXAMPLES OF POSITIVE EXPRESSIONS

- do not speak of awakening sexual interest as sinful or unclean
- enjoy
- expression of love
- joy in bodies virtuously used
- openly affectionate
- ordained of God
- remarkably heightened pleasures of touch and arousal
- rewarding

squarely on record for the first time as officially endorsing non-procreational aspects of human sexuality. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of this pronouncement for the development of healthy attitudes about marital sex.

The *Guide* speaks of the sexual relationship in marriage as one that is “uplifting”; it mentions “the feeling of joy of the physical senses”; it speaks of “righteous intimacy.” The *Guide* counsels that the physical changes of puberty are “clean, good, and divinely mandated.” We are counseled to teach our children that “our bodies are good,” that in creating them God declared that his creation was good and that “they will find joy in their bodies when they use them virtuously. . . .” (p. 9).

There is throughout the manual a positive tone about frank discussions of sex in the home, including the use of scientific terminology such as “penis” and “vagina.” There is wise counsel that parents shouldn’t overreact to their children’s use of vulgar sexual terms. The use of reliable reference books as sources for sexual information is recommended.

The *Guide* quotes President Spencer W. Kimball as saying that “the intimacy of sexual relations is right and divinely approved” (p. 46) in the context of lawful marriage and that God ordained sexual relations not just as a means of procreation but as “an expression of love” established to bring joy (p. 46).

In urging parents to teach their children proper sexual attitudes, the manual cautions, “Do not speak of their awakening sexual interest as sinful or unclean.” We are told to teach our children about the “deeply pleasing intimacies” that will be built in marriage. Genesis 2:24 and Matthew 19:5-6 are cited as evidence that “sexual expression is ordained of God.” Sexual congress is called “this sacred act.” In this section is the manual’s only use of the word “passion” in a positive sense.

The most sex-positive chapter is on courtship and marriage. Half of the 60 references to sex are positive, 47 percent are negative, and 5 percent are neutral (see table 5). For all of this, the authors should be applauded.

Neutral References

Of total sexual references in the *Guide*, 49 percent are used in a neutral connotation. Most of these references were used in a biological sense, describing human physiology without the burden of value judgments. To some degree, sex-positive values

can be found in such candid acceptance of human biology; however, the positive connotations are in part the result of comparing biological, bias-free terms to the sex-negativism of the Mormon culture. Since the context did not pertain to sexual activities, I determined that these references are fundamentally neutral.

Negative References

Negative connotations were found in 37 percent of total sexual references, and in 73 percent of the value-burdened usages in the *Guide*. Notwithstanding many positive statements, the authors begin the book with a strong note of negative imagery. Of the value-burdened references to sex in the introduction 80 percent are sex-negative. There are 12 negative words or phrases and only three positive ones. The negative words include “lust,” “unrighteous dominion,” and “adulterous acts.” The positive references are “righteous meaning and use of intimate physical relations,” “lawful relationships,” and “true intimacy.” Perhaps these positive examples illustrate the need for largess in assigning positive value, for all three may connote negative values at the same time they convey positive associations. For example, “lawful relationships” suggests

unlawful relationships and therefore a negative connotation. Similarly, “proper” actions suggest improper actions. However, the authors’ intent in such usages obviously is positive, and I so credited them. In doing so, I have eliminated an entire stratification of self-qualified “positive” statements. This was done to ensure a fair-minded and conservative.

In Chapter 1, which sets the stage for discussion of the proper role that human sexuality plays in our lives, references to undesirable aspects of sexuality outnumber positive ones 3 to 1. Here the words “abuse,” “defile,” “degrade,” “lust,” “misuse,” “immorality,” “appetites,” and “physical gratification” overpower the words “righteous intimacy,” “joy,” and “uplift.” In the chapter concerning principles for teaching children, negative words and phrases outnumber positive ones 16 to 1.

Negative connotations outnumber positive references 4 to 1 in the chapter on adolescence; 46 percent of the references in this chapter are neutral (see Table 6). The authors’ intention is to foster chastity. It is Latter-day Saint doctrine that adultery and fornication are second only to murder in seriousness of offenses

Table 2

EXAMPLES OF NEGATIVE EXPRESSIONS

– abuse	– passion
– carnal	– pornography
– defile	– Satanic substitute for happiness
– degrade	– selfish pleasure
– degradation	– sensual
– devilish	– sexual excess
– distress	– sexual
– ensnares	– sin
– entices	– sinful
– evil	– solely for pleasure
– gratification	– strictly physical
– immoral relationships	– unchaste
– incest	– unclean
– indecent	– wickedness
– lust	
– misuse	

against God. Unfortunately, this great caution against sexual sin exacts a heavy toll on the image of sex. Our young people develop in their formative years a negative image that comes back to haunt them in their marriages. The ghosts arise in the form of unhealthy inhibitions and of unwarranted guilt feelings because of their sex drives.¹¹

“Female breasts” is used in a negative context and the words “sex drive,” “masturbation,” “mate,” “arousal,” “sexual feelings in sinful ways,” “purveyors of evil,” “carnal,” “perversion,” “selfish,” “abuse,” “shame,” “wicked,” and “lustful boys” convey negative images. (I found no lustful girls in the *Guide*. This could be either an innocent happenstance or a residual Victorian misconception about female sexuality.)

The chapter on courtship and marriage is the only chapter in which positive connotations approach half of the valued words and phrases, yet even here more than half the images (27, or 53 percent) references are negative; 24 (47 percent) are positive and 3 are neutral. The section begins with two warnings; then, after some unqualified positive statements, it returns to negative values. Engaged couples must avoid talking about their coming sexual relationship and must not give undue attention to sexual information in their individual preparation, for it may “actually create problems.” They must avoid “morbid desire” and practice “self control.” Honeymooners must avoid “sexual excesses” and any “unnatural” conduct. We are reminded from earlier instruction in the manual that there is no such thing as a “sex drive.” We are admonished not to use our partners “merely for the gratification of . . . passion.” Self-control is the crowning glory of true manhood and we are warned that “sexual indulgence whets the passion and creates morbid desire.” At times, “complete abstinence” is in order for married couples. Almost every positive statement about human sexuality is offset by warnings. At times, the authors extol pagan notions of self control and abstinence while curiously ignoring Paul’s admonition (1 Corinthians 7:4-5) that both husbands and wives have a right to sexual fulfillment and an obligation to sexually satisfy their spouses.

Misinformation

For the most part, the biological information offered by *A Parent’s Guide* is sound, but in a few places the authors fail.

BREASTS. In Chapter 5, we are misinformed about the human body and its functions in Chapter 5 in which we are told that “the world” makes divinely created bodies the object of carnal lust by making “the female breasts primarily into sexual enticements, while the truth is that they were intended to nourish and comfort children” (p. 37). However, Proverbs 5:19 and The Song of

Solomon (which Joseph Smith said was uninspired) speak approvingly of breasts as sexual attractions for men, and of women yearning for this form of attention from men.

SEX DRIVE. The worst misinformation in the *Guide* comes as the authors attempt to refute the existence of the sex drive. The authors closely follow Brown’s book, which dismisses the sex drive as “another dogma of a carnal world.” Rather, Brown reasons, the “alleged sex drive is actually an appetite learned from culture and reinforced by biology, its satisfaction institutionalized by culture.” Brown notes that we can control when, where, how, and with whom we gratify our sexual urges; as if the ability to control the sex drive somehow blots out its biological imperative. Never mind that we also control when, where, how, and with whom we gratify our thirst and hunger, or that both society and the Church direct many conventions to control these appetites. There is no significant argument in the scientific world over the existence of a sex drive, although there are arguments aplenty over its nature and the mechanisms involved.¹²

MASTURBATION. The *Guide* also reiterates the Church’s long-standing injunction against masturbation. Treatment of this important subject is uneven. In one section parents are admonished not to overreact to genital self-exploration in young children. This, of course, is enlightened counsel. Parents who do so may cause great mischief for their children’s later enjoyment of sex. Unfortunately, the advice is based on the misinformation that small children do not masturbate. Scientific literature documents that systematic masturbation is common in children at 6-8 years of age, and masturbation, resulting in orgasm, has been reported in children less than one year old. Yet, elsewhere in the manual, masturbation is condemned for youth and adults. (It probably also would be condemned for children were it recognized as masturbation.) However, nowhere do the authors define masturbation, leaving open the possibility of confusion in discussing the topic. Without a definition of masturbation there is a possibility that some couples might understand the Church to condemn much foreplay and afterplay between husbands and wives—for this is, technically, masturbation.

OTHER RHETORICAL DEVICES

Other rhetorical devices are the literary mechanisms whereby the authors have woven the language of the *Guide*. The authors have repeatedly employed the device of qualifying, balancing, and countering sex-positive statements with sex-negative statements. Rarely is a positive statement turned loose without the fetters of caution. A good example is the treatment of sex in

Table 3

EXAMPLES OF NEUTRAL EXPRESSIONS

-breasts	-sex
-ejaculated	-sexual
-fidelity	-sex education
-genitals	-sexual union
-intimacy	-sexual virtue
-intimate relations	-sperm
-menstruate	-testes
-multiply and replenish	-this union
-nocturnal emission	-uterus
-ovary	-vagina
-pubic area	-wet dream

Table 4
TOTAL SEX-POSITIVE, -NEGATIVE, -NEUTRAL
REFERENCES

	Number	% Total	% Value Burdened
Positive	64	14	27
Negative	170	37	73
Neutral	222	49	n/a

Table 5
VALUE BURDENS OF MATERIAL OR
COURTSHIP & MARRIAGE

	Number	% Total	% Value Burdened
Positive	30	50	53
Negative	27	45	47
Neutral	3	5	n/a

Table 6
VALUE BURDENS OF MATERIAL FOR
ADOLESCENT EDUCATION

	Number	% Total	% Value Burdened
Positive	11	12	22
Negative	40	43	78
Neutral	43	46	n/a

marriage. Beginning on page 47, the authors give honeymooners license to learn about one another's bodies, but follow, in the next sentence, with the warning: "It is not a time for sexual excess." License for "private discovery" of physical bodies is given, then caution against "unnatural" sex follows. The *Guide* says that while sex is a sacred act, marriage is not ordained "merely to satisfy . . . passion." This whip-saw treatment of marital sex is followed by one completely positive paragraph advising that one of the purposes of sexual intercourse is "to bring joy" to the participants. But on the next page there is the assertion that the "sex drive" doesn't really exist and that there are "times within the marriage when complete abstinence is appropriate for extended periods of time" (p. 49).

Time and again, the authors employ this rhetorical device: approval followed by warning, if not preceded by caution. In some instances, approvals are sandwiched between warnings. On page 36, parents are counseled in teaching teenagers about sex. The section begins with a disparaging remark about our "so-called sex drive," promises "remarkably heightened pleasures of touch and arousal," and then cautions that we must control these urgings. The following 14 paragraphs are an almost unbroken litany of warnings and cautions abundantly laced with the most vivid sex-negative words imaginable: "selfishness," "perversion," "immorality," "carnality," "masturbation," "abuse," "wickedness," and "lustfulness."

CONCLUSIONS

The evidence from both my analysis of word and phrase connotation, and of rhetorical devices, argues strongly that the message of *A Parent's Guide* is erotophobic. Notwithstanding many positive statements about human sexuality, the reader is likely to come away from the manual suspicious of the propriety of sexual enjoyment, even in marriage.

The *Guide* clothes erotophobic Latter-day Saint attitudes and policies in the garments of sociology and psychology. This invites suspicion of pagan erotophobic influence, which may lead some to an ultimate rejection of the Church's position on morality. No scripture or revelation is cited for authority, except for 1 Corinthians 3:16-17 and Alma 41:10, neither of which is used in a sexual context in holy writ. If the reasons for eschewing masturbation, or any other sexual practice, are medical or are founded in psychology or sociology, surely Latter-day Saints are at liberty to judge for themselves the merits of these arguments. The Church seems not to realize that its position on masturbation may contribute to the incidence of fornication and adultery. This subject is overripe for investigation and critical analysis. Are the Church's teachings on masturbation gospel, or an autoerotophobic vestige of nineteenth-century Victorianism?¹³

In summary, *A Parent's Guide* should be welcomed for the many positive statements that it makes in support of human sexuality. So far, it is the most positive presentation of the Church's stand concerning sexuality. The challenge for both local leaders and parents is to glean many of the virtues it offers in support of the "enjoyment" of sex in marriage while winnowing

out the chaff of pagan sex-negativism. The challenge for the Church is to purge erotophobia from its educational materials and policies. I am optimistic that it eventually will. Marybeth Raynes, a licensed marriage and family therapist and a clinical social worker in Salt Lake City, has pointed the way in her call for a positive approach to sex education. "You cannot teach a positive concept using only 'don't' and 'never' and expect a person to have a positive understanding of that idea." She continues, "In my view, translating all of our injunctions about sexuality and the moral code into positive phrasing and meaning will result in more willing obedience with fewer negative effects."¹⁴ Perhaps the Church hasn't sufficiently taken into account the emotional and spiritual costs of teaching chastity by sex-negative denunciations. The burdens of a sex-negative approach warrant exploration of a more sex-positive approach.

NOTES

1. I first became interested in this topic while serving as an elders quorum president in a ward that encompassed many student families—particularly graduate student families—who were under severe stresses. During this time, I became aware of the sexual quotient in this family stress as many couples had urgent questions about their sexuality. Some went to priesthood leaders for counsel; but most sought illumination by visiting with friends and received a babble of answers. Questions ranged from the appropriateness of specific sexual practices to the propriety of LDS couples using birth control even when their emotional resources were near exhaustion. It became obvious that in many cases individuals were suffering from hyperactive guilt complexes. Others had questions such as we all probably have had at one time or another, which fall in the gray area between clearly good and clearly bad—a zone in which presumably personal goals, standards, and circumstances may dictate different answers for different Latter-day Saints. Ultimately, this experience led me to an exhaustive and continuing study of Christian sexual ethics.

2. Singer, Barry. "A Comparison of Evolutionary and Environmental Theories of Erotic Response. Part I: Structural Features." *The Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 21, No. 3, 1985, p. 245. LoPresto, C. T., Sherman, M. F., & Sherman, N. C. "Effects of a Masturbation Seminar on High School Males' Attitudes, False Beliefs, Guilt, and Behavior." *The Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 21, No. 2, p. 143.

3. For an expanded discussion of this topic, I recommend three companion articles by Harold T. Christensen ("The Persistence of Chastity: A Built-In Resistance Within Mormon Culture to Secular Trends"), Marvin and Ann Rytting ("Exhortations for Chastity: A Content Analysis of Church Literature"), and Marybeth Raynes ("A Wish List: Comments on Christensen and the Ryttings") all in SUNSTONE, Vol. 7, No. 2, March/April 1982. Together, they are an excellent examination of and commentary on the cultural forces that may be influencing the rhetoric of Church leaders on sexuality. Raynes provides a particularly valuable commentary on the need for a more positive teaching of sexual morality.

It is important to note that it is not religiosity, but sex-negativism such as was commonly associated with Victorian values that produces needless and pleasure-denying guilt. Some data indicate that regular church attenders receive more pleasure from sex than non-religious people. It is how chastity and fidelity are taught that influences how individuals feel about their sexuality.

4. Sack, A. R., Keller, J. F., and Hinkle, D. E. "Premarital Sexual Intercourse: A Test of the Effects of Peer Group, Religiosity, and Sexual Guilt." *The Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 20, No. 2, p. 173, citing Gunderson and McCary (1979); and Green, D. E., & Mosher, D. L. "A Causal Model of Sexual Arousal to Erotic Fantasies." *The Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 2-3, 5.

5. Hyde, Janet Shibley. *Understanding Human Sexuality*. 3rd Ed. (McGraw Hill Book Co. New York, 1986), p. 538.

6. Foucault, Michel. *The Use of Pleasure: Vol. 2 of The History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robert Hurley (Pantheon Books, New York, 1985), p. 15.

7. Meney, John. *The Destroying Angel: Sex, Fitness, and Food in the Legacy of Degeneracy Theory, Graham Crackers, Kellogg's Corn Flakes, & American Health History*, (Prometheus Books, Buffalo, New York, 1985), pp. 101-102.

8. Douglas, Emily Taft. *Margaret Sanger: Pioneer of the Future* (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1970), pp. 98-99. Money and Foucault are excellent books on the history of sexual attitudes.

9. Brown, Victor L., Jr. *Human Intimacy: Illusion & Reality* (Parliament Publishers, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1981).

10. Baron, Robert A., & Byrne, Donn. *Social Psychology: Understanding Human Interaction*, 5th Edition (Allyn & Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1987), p. 556.

11. Green & Mosher, 1985; Singer, 1985.

12. I sense that some authorities are beginning to shift the focus of their discussions from "sex drive" to "sexual desire." Apparently this is because of the difficulty of defining and measuring drive, which Freud called Libido. Desire, on the other hand, lends itself to quantification, which serves a primary function in research. This shift of focus of scholarly

inquiry, however, in no way negates the existence of the sex drive.

13. Autoerotophobia lingers yet today in the United States, and perhaps particularly in the LDS church. Circumcision of male babies is an almost universal practice in the United States, although most parents no longer understand why this operation was introduced. According to Money, it was advanced in American medicine as a prophylactic against masturbation. Boy Scout manuals perpetuated masturbation myths as late as the 1950s. Some authorities feel the main motivation for still submitting baby boys to this useless surgery, which is barbarically performed on the most sensitive tissue on the human body without anesthetic, is the discomfort that parents have in cleansing the infant penis—which frequently responds with an erection.

14. Raynes, *op. cit.*

THE NEXT WEIRD SISTER ATTEMPTS REPENTANCE

Thinking it had been a while
since she had felt god's grace
(one should feel sorry,
loving one's own end)—
she thought she felt sorry,
bowed her head, opened locks
for the air, made a hell-broth
(can done be undone?).
She thought she felt sorry,
for the seeds of all
things yet uncreated
(he knows thy thoughts),
for a child with a tree in his hands
(who can impress the forest),
for where she had never been
about, about—wayward
(show the grief his heart).
Thinking heaven is murky—
she thought she felt god's grace:
give me...give me...
then thought of killing swine.

—LAURA HAMBLIN