

Readers of this essay may also like to see

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

A short account of its history, beliefs and practices:

By Horace B. Pointing 9d.

CHRISTIANS AND SEX—A QUAKER COMMENT:

By Harold Loukes 1s. 9d.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND MORALS IN AN

AFFLUENT SOCIETY: By Eric Baker 3s. 0d.

**A SCIENTIST TRIES TO ANSWER SOME OF
HER OWN QUESTIONS ABOUT RELIGION:**

By Kathleen Lonsdale 6d.

SCIENCE, POETRY AND THE INCARNATION:

By Kenneth Barnes 1s. 6d.

TO SAVE FROM FEAR:

By John Macmurray 9d.

YE ARE MY FRIENDS:

By John Macmurray 3d.

QUAKERISM AND ITS OBJECTIVES:

By J. Ormerod Greenwood 9d.

POVERTY IN BRITAIN TODAY:

By Harriett Wilson 1s. 0d.

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF WORK:

Edited by A. Leslie Laycock and James Brennan 1s. 6d.

FRIENDS HOME SERVICE COMMITTEE
FRIENDS HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.1

**Towards
a
Quaker view
of sex**

An essay by a group of Friends

Revised Edition

PRICE: THREE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE

TOWARDS
A
QUAKER VIEW
OF SEX

An essay by a group of Friends

Revised Edition

Published for the Group by
FRIENDS HOME SERVICE COMMITTEE
FRIENDS HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.1

First Published February 1963
Sixth impression November 1963
Revised Edition 1964

The Literature Committee of the Friends Home Service Committee has been glad to publish *Towards a Quaker View of Sex* for the group of Friends which prepared it, as a contribution to thought on an important subject.

The views expressed are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the attitude of the Friends Home Service Committee, or of the Religious Society of Friends.

EDITOR'S NOTE TO FIRST EDITION

The material for this essay has been prepared by individual members of the group, considered and amended by the group as a whole several times, and finally cast into its present form by the Editor.* No apology is made for the evident variety of styles that has survived his pruning and re-arrangement: to have sought complete literary unity would have robbed the matter itself of life and vigour.

A word must be added, for non-Quaker readers, about the use of the word *concern*. In Quaker experience a concern is: "a gift from God, a leading of his Spirit which may not be denied. Its sanction is not that on investigation it proves an intelligent thing to do—though it usually is; it is that the individual, and if his concern is shared and adopted by the Meeting, then the Meeting knows as a matter of inward experience, that here is something which the Lord would have done, however obscure the way, however uncertain the means to human observation." (Roger C. Wilson: *Authority, leadership and concern*. Swarthmore Lecture 1949.)†

Grateful acknowledgement is made of generous financial assistance from the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust (made available through the Friends Temperance and Moral Welfare Union) and of the practical help afforded by the staff of the Friends Home Service Committee. We are particularly indebted to Jean James, who cheerfully and efficiently reduced our complicated drafts to excellent typescript on several occasions.

* Alastair Heron, who edited the first edition, has been prevented from helping in the revision by his appointment to the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, Lusaka.

† Allen & Unwin.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

In preparing this second edition the authors have sought to do two things. We want first to make clear beyond doubt the unofficial basis of our work. The Society of Friends is not responsible for the essay nor is it committed to any of the views herein expressed; but the authors met as a concerned group of Friends under the discipline of Quaker worship to write primarily for Friends but hoped that the essay might be of help to others. The second thing that we have tried to do is to respond to our critics by attempting to remove certain ambiguities and repair certain omissions. We have re-written the paragraphs that refer to the so-called "triangular situation". It was open to any reader of the original passages to interpret them in terms of an adulterous relationship being good and beneficial to all three persons concerned. This was not our intention for we do *not* advocate a light-hearted attitude to extra-marital intercourse. In other parts of the essay we have extended the discussion of both marriage and the problems of adolescence.

A great many men and women in personal distress have written to say how much the essay has helped them, but others inside and outside the Society of Friends have been hurt by what we have written and for this we are sorry. Some people have said that what we have written is confused and confusing. Much newspaper publicity was objective but some, by selective quotation, made it seem that we condoned sexual freedom irrespective of circumstance. From other quarters came a vehement condemnation arising from the belief that a rigid moral pattern of conduct is an inherent part of Christianity. If such a pattern were adequate to help bewildered men and women through the agonizing complexity of relationships in the modern world, our group need never have met. Further, it must be made clear that to hold that an external pattern of morality is inapplicable in some instances does not imply that we condone fornication and adultery: wayward sexuality is often appallingly destructive. Those who read this essay with care will realize that we are asking for an approach that starts from something deeper than a conventional moral judgment: rather it is from a concern for full responsibility in personal relationships.

The essentials of Christianity are simple but demanding; their implications in conduct have to be sought afresh in every phase of our rapidly changing society. Christianity is not a book of rules, the application of which has to be worked out in a pattern. It springs from a living relationship with each other and with God; and its fulfilment is in relationship. Its implications can, therefore, be reached only through an understanding which is personal and intimate; without compassion there can be no understanding at all. The compassion of Jesus was his point of entry into each human situation. We must accept and begin from the truth about each human being in his own predicament, here and now in the modern world.

The essay does not pretend to be a set of ultimate conclusions; it invites the help of those who read it in carrying forward the exercise of thought and prayer in which the authors have engaged.

The subjects are controversial but the writers believe that differences of view, when sincerely held, are not in themselves to be regretted. Unanimity may be achieved at the expense of truth. Finally, we would remind our readers of the concern with which this work was begun, a concern to understand and to help the homosexual. That concern abides.

* * * *

Our original obligations have been deepened while preparing this second edition, and we are especially grateful to George H. Gorman and to some members of the Friends Home Service Committee for advice during the work of revision, and to Ann Wright for typing help.

CONTENTS

I Introduction and Basic Assumptions	7
II Normal Sexual Development	15
III Homosexuality	26
IV A New Morality Needed	43
V Conclusion	49
Appendix A Origins of Sexual Behaviour	57
Appendix B Deviations Considered	69
Appendix C Sources of Help	75
Glossary	79
Book list	83

THE GROUP

Kenneth C. Barnes, B.Sc., Headmaster of Wennington School, Wetherby.

Anna M. Bidder, M.A., Ph.D., Research Worker and Teacher in Zoology, Cambridge University.

Richard Fox, M.B., B.S., M.R.C.P., D.P.M., Consultant Psychiatrist, Severalls Hospital, Colchester.

Alastair Heron, M.Sc., Ph.D., Fellow of the British Psychological Society; Director of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, Lusaka.

G. Joyce James, Housewife, one-time Marriage Guidance Counsellor.

Kenneth Nicholson, M.A., Headmaster, Friends' School, Saffron Walden.

Mervyn Parry, Teacher of educationally subnormal children. One-time assistant housemaster in a borstal.

Lotte Rosenberg, M.D., D.P.M., Consultant Psychiatrist and Child Psychiatrist.

Alfred Torrie, M.A., M.B., Ch.B., D.P.M., Fellow of the British Psychological Society; Consultant Psychiatrist.

Keith Wedmore, M.A., LL.B., Barrister at Law.

And one member who for professional reasons must remain anonymous.

I. INTRODUCTION AND BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The origins of this essay lay in problems brought by young Quaker students, faced with homosexual difficulties, who came to older Friends for help and guidance. It appeared that the Society of Friends as such had little to say to people troubled sexually, and that at the same time many Friends were in serious doubt whether the Church's traditional view spoke to this condition. The need was clear for research into sexual problems and morals, and for Friends to ask themselves where their responsibility lay. Accordingly a group of concerned members of the Society gathered in 1957 to re-examine through thought and prayer this most difficult of problems. It has met regularly ever since and includes those with experience in teaching, penology, marriage guidance, psychiatry, biology, psychology and the law.

At some of our sessions we have had representatives of the following Quaker bodies: Young Friends; Headmasters of Quaker Schools; Marriage and Parenthood Committee; Temperance and Moral Welfare Union; Penal Reform Committee; the Guild of Social Workers, and some individual Friends. It was clear that many had thought deeply about these problems and welcomed a chance to discuss them. The reception accorded to our article in *The Friend* of 20th May 1960, setting out our concern, and to a report of a later one-day conference (with subsequent correspondence) has further convinced us that even where Friends know little of these problems, most are ready and anxious to examine them with care and sympathy.

Primarily the task of the group was to consider what Quakers could say to homosexuals and to others who found that society strongly condemned their sexual feelings and who found, too, that the expression of those feelings could lead to victimization, blackmail, and imprisonment, whereas "normal" heterosexual conduct, however irresponsible, went virtually unchallenged. The group soon found that the study of homosexuality and its moral problems could not be divorced from a survey of the whole field of sexual activity: a few pieces of the jigsaw-puzzle could not be identified without a picture of the whole.

In the course of its meetings the group has asked what is known about sexual behaviour and its patterns, and whether any pattern can be defined in accord with both Christian thought and scientific discipline. The questions are sweeping and time has not been unlimited; consequently our answers are tentative and incomplete. With the help and encouragement of Friends and others it is our hope that further study of the moral and scientific questions will become possible.

We were aware that there is much needless suffering and human failure which Friends, in their own way, would wish to relieve; and that in subscribing to a moral code, some of which it no longer

accepts, society merits the charge of hypocrisy and its authority is weakened. The insincerity of the sexual moral code may well be a cause of the widespread contempt of the younger generation for society's rules and prohibitions.

It is not possible to be certain how the present situation compares with the situation as it was a few generations ago, but these appear to be the developments we are faced with today:

(a) A great increase in adolescent and pre-marital sexual intimacy. It is fairly common in both young men and women with high standards of general conduct and integrity to have one or two love affairs, involving intercourse, before they find the person they will ultimately marry.

(b) It is even more common for those who intend to marry to have sexual intercourse before the ceremony. This is true, probably, of a very large number of young people in all classes of society, including often those who have a deep sense of responsibility.

(c) The incidence of extra-marital intercourse is great, but it is not possible to estimate whether there is an increase. There must be very many instances which do not lead to divorce or obvious harm and which are kept secret.

(d) A wider recognition, and probably acceptance, of the "homosexual way of life", and a greater awareness of sexual deviations of all kinds.

The Integrity of the Family

The central concept of sexual morality in Christian countries is the integrity of the family. Most people—religious or otherwise—in our own and other countries would agree that the family as a social unit should be safeguarded and sexual practices that threaten its stability vigorously discouraged. The Christian family is a monogamous one, held together by an understanding love and responsibility and by an acceptance of a faith and purpose in life.

This concept of the family is esteemed both by religious and secular interests. The secular interest sees in marriage and the family an institution that preserves the structure of society, that maintains responsibility for children and provides them with security. The religious interest sees the institution as one ordained by God, and thus dignifies what is socially necessary. This might seem an ideal and permanent conjunction of interests, but it is not. The very fact that we think of marriage as an "institution" or a pattern will explain why many people have been led into a distorted idea of what is Christian. A Christian pattern can involve cruelty to those born outside that pattern. Over long periods of history, illegitimate children in Christian countries have been shockingly treated compared with their counterparts in a polygamous African community. Parents urgently seeking to establish what they think to be a Christian pattern of family life have in the past subjected their own children to barbarous punishments; or they have created conditions that are defensive, restricted, inhibited—and not in any way a source of the "abundant life". It is evident that we must sort out a confusion if we are to understand the components of what we call morality.

A distinction can be made between a social code and an ethical or religious code. A social code will express a norm that seems to be necessary to maintain the existing structure of society and community life. It cannot be fixed for ever, for the pattern of society has often changed (see page 12), and will continue to change. The social code changes in this process, not because society changes it deliberately, but because an increasing number of people break away from it. The ethical or religious code, however, is simpler but far more demanding and long-lasting. If it is truly religious it is, in its essentials, changeless and eternal.

During a period in which the social code is changing rapidly while at the same time ethical and religious codes are being widely questioned, it is inevitable that a great deal of distress will be encountered by many, both young and old, who do not "know where they are" in matters of sexual behaviour. Fear of misunderstanding and rejection discourage many from bringing forward their distress, yet the sexual instinct is common to all, and it is our duty to be informed and sympathetic. Particularly does this apply to all those called upon to listen and help, including elders and overseers in the Society of Friends. This essay may help to show that though each individual is unique, specific problems are not. Sexual difficulties are infinitely more common than is realized and the isolation of the individual, arising as it does from society's repressive outlook towards the sexually troubled, is more felt than it need be. Moreover, some difficulties are more apparent than real.

A still repressive and inhibited outlook towards sex, whether heterosexual or homosexual, has produced problems for the serious student of human behaviour. It has invested a normal function with guilt, mystery and ignorance; it has hindered the gathering of facts, and, what is worse, it has devalued the sexual currency to the levels of sensation and pornography. When we consider the universality of the sexual drive, understanding of its origins and manifestations is surprisingly small: nevertheless a body of knowledge has been built up and in what follows we draw freely on published works (see book list). Sexual behaviour and moral outlook are much more conditioned by upbringing and by prevailing cultural beliefs than most people realize. It is important, therefore, to examine other human communities, and even the animal kingdom, in order to understand the society in which we live (see Appendix A). What we shall not attempt here is an ABC of sex: basic knowledge of the elementary physical facts is well provided elsewhere. Instead we hope through this essay to share our concern and findings in greater detail, to assist those facing these problems in their own lives or in the lives of others.

The Society of Friends is often spoken of as "a peculiar people", but exemption from human frailty in general or from sexual difficulties in particular is no part of their peculiarity. In what follows we have drawn frequently on our personal experiences of Friends' needs. If Friends are at all peculiar it perhaps lies in their rejection of a professional priesthood and their acceptance of the total equality of men and women in the life of their religious Society. In a priesthood of all believers there must be a democratic sharing of

pastoral duties; we are bidden to watch over one another for good.

Christianity is concerned with relationships: the relationship of man with man and of man with God. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength, and . . . thy neighbour as thyself . . . On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.* In the course of our discussions we have several times recalled St. Augustine's statement: *Love God and do as you like.* As often quoted, this is a statement of the greatest freedom, but also of the deepest obligation. In so far as we love the good and know the mind of God we do not need rules and moral codes to guide our conduct. These statements offer, however, a freedom of action and judgment that we might grasp at too easily, assuming that we know our own minds and the mind of God. In fact they demand a disciplined search.

All attitudes to sexuality are conditioned by the individual's own upbringing, experience and desires, and it is difficult to be objective. The attitudes of professed Christians tend to have a definite bias—not necessarily good—that is to be explained in the light of Church history. (See pp 32 ff and 43). The group was therefore obliged to impose on itself a discipline that would enable each member to examine himself and to discriminate between habits of feeling and thought acquired from church and society and those that sprang from experience that was sincerely examined and assimilated. We have sought to act on our faith that the light of God is at work within us all and will, if quietly but energetically sought for, make this discrimination possible and lead to a unity of awareness.

Those who have written or spoken about sexual matters as professed Christians have too often given the impression that their sexual path has been smooth; that, apart from a hint of solitary difficulties in adolescence, it has fallen into line with Christian principles. This is a false impression. What may outwardly fall in line with principle may not inwardly be good. Distinguished members of the churches sometimes have to seek humbly for advice in sexual matters. A devotion to high ideals may co-exist with sexual incapacity and marital frustration: idealism can be accompanied by a startling insensitiveness to immediate human need.

All this applies to Quakers as to others, but there are certain historical characteristics of the Society of Friends that ought specially to lead us to a clear and wholesome understanding of the significance of the sex relationship. The Society has upheld throughout the three hundred years of its history the personal and spiritual equality of the sexes. It has an attitude to authority that enables it to say in the words of John Robinson's farewell to pilgrims setting off for the New World in 1620: "The Lord has yet more light and truth to show forth"—and on every conceivable question. For friends, God's will for man can never be circumscribed by any statement, however inspired; the last word has never yet been spoken on the implications of Christianity, and every religious expression is open to critical examination. Quakerism involves a continuous search; and, because it is a genuine and not a formal search, it may lead to surprises and unexpected demands. Lastly, Quakerism has never accepted a distinction between the sacred and the secular. Sometimes

the Society may have failed to achieve this synthesis. When this has happened, it has been through human weakness and not through any departure from the conviction that such a distinction is wrong. In sexual matters the unity of the sacred and the secular involves this implication: that the sacramental quality of a sexual relationship depends upon the spirit and intention of the persons concerned, not upon any atmosphere or circumstance provided from outside.

Quakerism is not a puritan movement, though it did pass through a phase in which many activities that we associate with the gayer side of life were rejected. For us today, to say that every experience can be sacramental does not mean that it is equally serious and joyless, and the members of the group have not approached their work in this spirit. The nature of our investigations has often been sobering; we have had to hear of tragic case-histories, squalid conditions, outrageous miscarriages of justice; and much of what we have thought and written has therefore been deeply serious in content and feeling. But at the same time we have recognized that sexual experience does not need to be solemn in order to be deep; on the contrary depth and commitment are precisely the conditions for freedom, for humour and for gaiety.

We do not claim that our views represent the views of the Society of Friends as a whole. But it can be said that the Society has recognized recently that love cannot be confined to a rigid pattern:

"Marriage is to be taken seriously, but not always in grim earnest; its problems take perspective from fun, adventure and fulfilment, and joy and sorrow are mingled together. We rejoice in success, but we must also be glad that we can console each other in failure . . . For some, there is a monogamy so entire that no other love ever touches it; but others 'fall in love' time and time again, and must learn to make riches of their affection without destroying their marriage or their friends. Let us thank God for what we share, which enables us to understand; and for the infinite variety in which each marriage stands alone." (Christian Faith and Practice, 1960, Extract 493).

Some Friends were disturbed by this statement, fearing that it condoned extra-marital relationships, but one of those primarily responsible for the drafting made it clear that the reference to falling in love was intended to be "a statement of observed fact" and that the statement about "making riches of their affection" recognizes that "there is a problem; that it involves responsibilities to others beyond themselves; and that there may be various ways of tackling it—not the same way for everybody".*

Sex: a Gift of God

It has been the tradition of the greater part of the Christian Church to lay down firm rules as to conduct, to fix a definite pattern as to what is "moral" or "sinful" but to be humanely tolerant of the waywardness and sinfulness of the ordinary man, offering him a ready opportunity for contrition and atonement. It might be claimed that there is practical wisdom in this. The group, however, felt

* Wilfrid E. Littleboy, *The Friend*, 23.2.62, p. 219.

compelled to question the whole basis of judgment as to what is right and what is wrong. Sexuality, looked at dispassionately, is neither good nor evil—it is a fact of nature and a force of immeasurable power. But looking at it as Christians we have felt impelled to state without reservation that it is a glorious gift of God. Throughout the whole of living nature it makes possible an endless and fascinating variety of creatures, a lavishness, a beauty of form and colour surpassing all that could be imagined as necessary to survival.

But, like every gift of God, it can be misused, and when it is misused the degradation to which men and women can be lowered reflects the heights to which they might be raised by its proper enjoyment. It seemed to us that morals, like the Sabbath, were made for man, not man for morals, and that, as society changes and modes of conduct with it, we must always be searching below the surface of human behaviour—to discover what is in fact happening to people, what they are seeking to express, what motives and intentions they are satisfying, what fruits, good or bad, they are harvesting. Again, as Quakers, we put our faith not in traditional judgments but in the accessibility of the Grace and Will of God in every situation in our own world.

There will be many reading this essay who will be disturbed at what may appear to be an acceptance of the present weakening of the moral code, and we should therefore state with emphasis and conviction what are our positive hopes for men and women and society. A moral code, even when accepted for the best of reasons, necessarily tends to be negative rather than positive, to be concerned with "Thou shalt not" rather than with what an individual should give to his fellows. We are much concerned about the whole content of human relationship, about the meaning of "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" in the full range and depth of its implications. Loving does not merely mean doing good works; it goes further than feeding the hungry and clothing the naked. It means warmth and intimacy, open-heartedness and overwhelming generosity of hand and spirit. It means a desire to know and a courageous willingness to be known. Loving implies commitment to the other person, involvement in that person's life, whatever it may cost in suffering, whether that suffering comes through being repudiated or through identification and sharing.

The life of society desperately needs this warmth of giving and receiving. Everywhere we see sociability without commitment or intimacy, and, especially in our towns, intense isolation and loneliness. We see human energy that should be creative and loving deflected into activities that are coldly power-seeking; we see love inhibited, frustrated or denied, turning into its opposite—into ruthlessness and aggression.

We have had to ask ourselves insistent questions and we want to record these questions whether we can answer them or not. Christianity for us is concerned primarily with what is true, not with approved patterns of conduct. We believe therefore that it is right for a Christian to ask every kind of question fearlessly in the search for truth. If Christianity is a true faith, there can be no ultimate contradiction between what it demands of us and what in practice

works towards complete human fulfilment. This necessarily rules out irresponsible promiscuity. We have no hesitation, however, in taking every now and then an empirical approach: we ask, for instance, whether homosexual contacts are really "unnatural" or repulsive, whether pre-marital intercourse is necessarily always a bad preparation for marriage, whether to have a variety of sexual partners does in fact weaken intimate relations and destroy a community.

To many such questions we have as yet no answer, or only a tentative one; and a small group, however long it continues its work, cannot provide all the answers. Some members of our group have found themselves compelled to surrender assumptions that they had long accepted as good and right, because the emphasis on morality has so often gone with a cold and inhibitive attitude.

A much wider research is necessary on the part of those concerned with modern sexual conduct, and a more open willingness on the part of men and women to assess their own experience honestly. Those who live by traditional standards should be more ready to include among their friends, without condemnation or prejudice, those who may have no use for these standards.

Many other groups have already recognized that the kind of morality that includes a vehement and categorical condemnation of the homosexual is not Christian, for it lacks compassion for the individual person and it lacks understanding of the human problem. Is it equally recognized that heterosexual morality—the morality of marriage and family life—though believed in with conviction, may be defensive and insensitive? The state of mind that ensures loyalty to the marriage partner may in fact shut other people out from the warmth and friendship they need. Morality may involve fear and rejection. Among the married, faithfulness may be achieved by "working to rule", but at the cost of depth and understanding; among the unmarried chastity may be upheld at the cost of charity: at the cost of an unwillingness to give or to understand (see pp. 55-56).

There can be no truly abundant life, no really open heart, without risk. Here is what the distinguished modern theologian, Paul Tillich, has to say about this, stimulated by the thought of the woman of questionable morals who broke the costly jar of ointment over Jesus and was criticized by the bystanders for her wastefulness:

Jesus . . . knew that without the abundance of the heart nothing great can happen . . . [A] religion within the limits of reasonableness is a mutilated religion. Calculating love is not love at all. Jesus did not raise the question how much *eros* and how much *agape*, how much human passion and how much understanding was motivating the woman; He saw the abundant heart and He accepted it without analysing . . .

The history of mankind is the history of men and women who wasted themselves and were not afraid to do so. They did not fear the waste of themselves, of other men, of things in the service of a new creation. They were justified, for they wasted all this out of the fulness of their hearts. They wasted as God does in nature and history, in creation and salvation . . . There is no

creativity, divine or human, without the holy waste which comes out of the creative abundance of the heart and does not ask, 'What use is this?'

We know that lack of love in our early years is mentally destructive. But do we know that the lack of occasions to waste ourselves is equally dangerous? In many people there has been an abundance of heart. But laws, conventions, and a rigid self-control have repressed it and it has died. People are sick not only because they have not received love but also because they are not allowed to give love, to waste themselves." (Tillich, 1956).

We shall start by tracing the course of normal sexual development from infancy through adolescence and the adult lifespan, only then turning our attention to homosexuality in men and in women. With this essentially factual basis we can then consider the need for a new morality, and finally its implications for those seeking to help others experiencing sexual difficulties.

II. NORMAL SEXUAL DEVELOPMENT

Most people are attracted towards, and make love to, the opposite sex. To this extent, therefore, our civilization is right to label such behaviour as "normal" and, securing as it obviously does the future of the race, it is right to encourage heterosexuality and to ensure where possible that our children grow up to enjoy full and healthy partnerships with members of the opposite sex. Social pressures are exerted to ensure conformity to heterosexual ideals; but these vary greatly between cultures, with differing consequences upon adult sexual behaviour.

Infancy

Though often thought of as a time of innocence, infancy possesses much erotic pleasure of its own kind. Erections, common in boys of any age, can be seen even in the newly born; and some form of masturbation (see pp. 18-26) in infancy is virtually universal in both sexes. All but the blindest of parents must realize that at times even their under-fives find the stimulation of the sexual organs a source of interest, comfort and pleasure. Too often the automatic censure which these explorations call forth helps to create sexual inhibitions, or worse, in adult life. Parents should not be disturbed by their children's sexual curiosity or infantile practices.

The experiences of the earliest years are buried deeply—lost beyond our conscious recall—but echoes of those experiences enter into our adult relationships and mould in part the way in which we react to life situations, to authority figures, and to our sexual drives.

Latency

The stormy years of infancy pass and, as the child learns to please his parents with improved table manners, a dry bed and reasonably clean ears, so, in general, he or she enters the calmer period of sexual latency. Though friendships are primarily with children of the same sex, insatiable curiosity is the keynote here—a curiosity made the more irritating to parents by the usual inability to concentrate for long upon the answers. Parents should deal with questions as and when they arise, and they should answer the question, the whole question, and nothing but the question. There is no need, and it is highly undesirable, to withhold all instruction and then unleash it in one overwhelmingly embarrassing torrent, far too late, in the early teens. At the same time there is no need to offer over-sophisticated or elaborate answers at a time when simple ones are just as acceptable. When the child asks where he came from he may only wish to know whether it was from Birmingham or Birkenhead.

No child can be wholly protected from such basic anxieties as those which surround life and death and any parent who gives

misleading replies—especially to sexual queries—stands to lose the respect of his child. Indeed, mistaken ideas about procreation may make it hard for the child, later on, to accept things as they are. We cannot emphasize too strongly that education in sexual matters should be a gradual and continuous process from the time that parents and child are first able to communicate, and should begin well before the onset of adolescence.

Adolescence

With the approach of the teens the growing body faces the crisis of puberty. The endocrine system (ductless glands), increasing in activity, pours out sexual hormones leading to the well-known changes in appearance, distribution of fat, deepening of the voice and hair growth. The organs of reproduction enlarge: the onset of menstruation in the girl and seminal emissions in the boy herald full reproductive capacity. Just as the infant boy may be seen to have spontaneous erections, so these may also happen to him in adolescence and in maturity. Often such erections occur on waking in the morning, and if occurring during sleep may be followed by orgasm and emission. They are quite normal and should cause no concern, though in very rare cases they may be prolonged and painful, and call for medical treatment.

It is at this stage that the parents' ignorance of the facts of life becomes most dangerous. Most parents do not know that, owing perhaps to better food, children mature at progressively earlier ages, nor can parents recall accurately their own period of puberty. The result is that if they attempt sex instruction at all they tend to leave it until the child is 14 or 15. Some mothers are taken by surprise at the onset of their daughter's menstruation, and others still think boys are impotent until 18. In fact, boys commonly acquire sexual potency about the age of 12 or 13 and, if masturbation to the point of emission has not already taken place, it very soon may. It seems well established that nearly all 14-16 year-olds carry out this practice over a variable period. It is not commonly realized that most girls masturbate as well, though with greater variability. Girls mature even earlier, usually a year or so ahead of boys—menstruation is common at 12 and may begin at 10. Most girls take an active interest in boys from an early age, whereas most boys develop their sexual emotions, and certainly their heterosexual emotions, rather later.

Thus information about sex should begin very early. While some parents give their children honest replies and even introduce the subject at an early age, often when a brother or sister is expected, many parents are still unable to give adequate instruction or to give it at the right time. There is still a notion that small children or children before puberty are unaware, or should be unaware, of the existence of sexual drives; but we now know that adequate instruction about the biology of sex is not enough and does not prepare the adolescent for the problems which need to be faced.

Although no reliable modern British statistics are available, it appears that the sexual feelings of most boys in the early teens tend

to be homosexual; though this stage is less clearly defined in girls. It may well be that in most boys such feelings find physical expression at some time, but it only takes a glance at the marriage registers to see that such conduct seldom prevents future heterosexual adjustment. Obviously the emotional maturity of normal 14 year-olds does not match their physical capacity. The present pattern of civilization equips young people with an earlier functioning body but, through the need for training and specialization, postpones economic independence. Sexual tension is increased through the open stimulation of films, advertisements and other commercial exploitations of the sex drive, and by increased opportunities for meeting outside the home without adult supervision. To many, the prospect of late marriage makes the impact of sexual problems all the greater.

The attempt to adjust to a complex world, to a rapidly changing body and, conscious of parental anxiety, to an increasingly competitive educational system imposes a heavy burden upon the growing person. Adolescence, a time of exploration and uncertainty with its extremes of emotion, its passing passions and changeability, mirrors to some extent the turbulent times of ten years earlier. Half child and half adult, the adolescent is characteristically in a state of rebellion—idealistic or otherwise—against society and imposed codes of conduct. Particularly has this become the case with sexual taboos, and in very many teen-age communities not even lip service is paid to the traditional ideals of chastity, partly because they see only lip service paid by so many of their elders. When they meet the taboo against pre-marital intercourse they will often be given as reasons for this that the girl may have a baby, that they are in danger of venereal disease and that it is contrary to Christian morals. It does not take them long to discover that intelligent use of contraceptives, with which most adolescents are familiar anyway, usually (but certainly not always) avoids the first result, *and minimizes the second*; and that most forms of VD can now receive adequate treatment. It must be noted that VD is nevertheless a very serious problem among teen-agers and that strains of infecting organisms have now emerged that are resistant to treatment. On the third point most young men and women are not professing Christians and do not accept that Christian morality has any claims upon them. Moreover, many professing Christians are themselves no longer certain what are the true implications of Christianity for sexual relationships.

Thus the adolescent is given no adequate image, either by the Church or by society, of the nature of adult man- and woman-hood. The public image of the young adult is one of strong sexuality. A feeling of inferiority is experienced when the adolescent cannot conform to this image, a feeling which many will try to combat by sexual experiment. In our largely urban society the individual often lacks significance; he has few opportunities to take responsibility or to show his growing strength, such as come naturally to his rural contemporary. Young people starting work in towns become caught up in the anonymity of modern working conditions; to escape from the feeling of rootlessness they often seek personal significance through sex experience. They are frequently ill-prepared

for the selection of a mate, yet they are expected to take this step on their own responsibility, often with little guidance from adults. No wonder that boys and girls become anxious, afraid to be "left on the shelf" and seek reassurance in sex experimentation. Moreover, with the "taboo on tenderness" between parents and all but little children, and between adolescents of the same sex, especially boys, which is such a conspicuous feature of this country's social code, the adolescent is driven to satisfy with sex-play what is, in fact, a very different need.

It would be tedious to go over the other taboos in the same way: youngsters may be told that masturbation is physically harmful, and they can see that it is not; and when their natural bent takes them to homosexual adventure, they can hardly be expected to pause long if the first argument they encounter is that what they are doing is unnatural. Something better, then, must be found, and that something must be sincere and soundly based on facts.

Masturbation

Masturbation can occur throughout life, and is practised by both men and women. It is one of the three chief sexual anxieties of adolescence, the others being homosexuality and casual intercourse. Since the Wolfenden Report (1957), and as a result of the contemporary frank discussion of sexual matters, the last two are talked of more openly nowadays. Masturbation is still avoided as a subject, both by adolescents and by those whom they might consult. Often the only literature available is that which unfortunately discusses the subject under the name of "self-abuse". It is difficult to exaggerate the suffering induced by the sense of guilt and disgrace, the mental conflict and remorse, that so commonly invest this intimate matter. How rarely is it ever dealt with by parent or teacher, priest or doctor, except in ways destined only to increase the suffering. Much would be saved even by the simple acknowledgement that masturbation is the common experience of the great majority of men at some time, and of a large proportion of women.

The list of myths and old wives' tales of the consequences falsely attributed to masturbation is astonishing. These mistaken but popular beliefs have ranged from stooping shoulders to damage to the genitals, and have included insanity, paralysis, acne, excess growth of hair, loss of hair, epilepsy, fatigue, impotence, stomach ulcers, insomnia, weak eyes, skin rashes and loss of weight. An article in the *Journal of Mental Science* for January 1962 justly includes these words: "A hundred years ago it was generally believed by the medical profession and particularly alienists (psychiatrists) that masturbation was an important and frequent cause of mental disorder. Today no-one believes this . . . For practical purposes the whole history of the masturbatory hypothesis is contained within the last 250 years. This history is not one in which the present day psychiatrist is apt to feel much pride."

This subject will be repugnant to many, for reasons of which they are probably little aware, even perhaps to those whose vocation it is to counsel troubled people, and they may consequently be hampered in their work by lack of accurate knowledge. If what is written here

awakens the conviction that such knowledge is necessary and that the rough and ready method of dealing with the question is not only futile but may be harmful, it will have served its purpose.

It can firmly be said that autoeroticism (the name given by psychologists to masturbation) is a normal phase of human development, whether it occurs in early childhood, adolescence or adult life. It is not, as used to be thought, an abnormal perversion of the sexual instinct. Masturbation is usually taken to mean manual stimulation of the sexual organs to produce relief of sexual tension, but this definition is too narrow. More accurately it is "the self-production of erotically tinged and voluptuous sensations" which includes a much wider series of phenomena. Masturbation is usually intended to produce an orgasm but it is possible to have masturbation without orgasm and orgasm without masturbation. Indeed, sexual stimulation may result from incidental experiences not in themselves sexual.

The child discovers early that thumb-sucking is a pleasurable sensation. Some dentists say that in excess it deforms the palate but nobody would maintain that it is wicked or sinful. In adult life smoking can be a substitute for thumb-sucking. It is a socially acceptable habit despite its association with cancer of the lung. Many are victims of the habit, but they are not considered wicked or sinful unless of course their excess deprives others of needful things, when it would appear to be compulsive selfishness.

As with thumb-sucking a child also finds it can produce pleasurable sensations from other parts of the body, and eventually, by a natural process of discovery, reaches the genitals. The child is not aware of the nature and significance of the pleasure it seeks and obtains. If a "thing" is "nice" the child will seek it. There is no inherent morality at this age; pleasure and self-exploration are regarded as pure and innocent until an adult teaches the reverse. Pleasure may be obtained at this stage not only manually but from contacts with furniture or other objects and rhythmical rocking movements may take place. During the latency period between early childhood and puberty genital pleasure may only be occasional; it becomes definite with the onset of puberty. It is at this stage that nocturnal emissions, or "wet dreams" as they are often called, are frequently the first clear sign of sexual maturity in the boy.

The remorse and guilt which often follow acts of masturbation are linked with an area of the body which is thought of from infancy as unclean. In the child's mind, intensely receptive in its attitude to parental injunctions and prohibitions, the idea of unlawfulness becomes definitely associated with interest in the genital and adjoining areas. Another potent factor in causing guilt is the practice on the part of parents, nursemaids and others, of threatening amputation of the child's genitals or hands if it is detected persistently playing with itself. Such threatenings cannot be too strongly condemned, for it is from them and from predictions of gross physical injury or incapacity that castration fantasies may take their origin. These, although repressed, may bring anxieties of different kinds in later years. Griesinger* has said that "the constant struggle against

* Quoted in *Autoerotic Phenomena in Adolescence* by K. Menzies, 2nd edition. H. K. Lewis, 1921 (now out of print).

a desire which is overpowering and to which the individual always in the end succumbs, that hidden strife between shame and repentance, good intentions and the irritation that impels the act—this we consider to be far more important than the primary physical effect.” “It must not be imagined”, added Brill,* “that robbing masturbation of its terrors encourages the practice. On the contrary, I have found that as long as the patients dread it and struggle against it, they masturbate twice as often as when they become convinced that it has none of its supposed terrors.”

As has been stated already, there is no evidence that the act of masturbation in itself causes any damage, physical or mental. Many masturbate throughout life, especially those who never marry. It is true that masturbation may be in one sense harmful if, for example, it replaces the normal marriage commitment: it might indicate lack of sexual harmony, an immature sexual approach in either partner or latent homosexuality. There may be occasions in marriage when full intercourse is either impossible or undesirable, as in prolonged absence or during some pregnancies, when masturbation may be a help. It might indeed be a natural and reasonable relief, in so far as it might help one partner, with a very strong sexual urge, to avoid making undue demands on the other. But it must be stated that for great numbers of people these reliefs are neither necessary nor desired, and abstinence from intercourse for shorter or longer periods comes naturally in a relationship of understanding love.

From the biological standpoint, masturbation is not normal if preferred throughout adult life to the reproduction of the species in marriage or mating. Solitary indulgence in sexual pleasure leaves a certain amount of erotic longing unsatisfied; even where there are pictures in the mind of a fantasied partner in a heterosexual act, these leave undischarged impulses, and often result in a state of tension. Masturbation can become a habit, and thus comparable to any habit—such as smoking, drinking or drug-taking—which takes over control from the person concerned. The resulting loss of self-respect may constitute a serious problem, and clearly prevention is preferable to the more difficult cure.

The Young Adult

The conventions of behaviour between young men and women differ in time and place. In this country there has been, in recent decades, a steady increase in the degree of physical familiarity casually allowed, and in the public demonstration of deeper affections. It is not clear that this freedom necessarily imposes a greater strain upon the young unmarried adult than that imposed by earlier conventions. Undeniably, however, this freedom results in many quite casual relationships reaching a point of stimulation where intercourse is probable. Men and women are now, more than ever before, associated in the work of the world. This brings them into close personal relationships which may sometimes become “involved” and genuinely loving, though either or both of those

* Quoted by K. Menzies: *op cit.*

concerned may have loyalties elsewhere. As a result, a responsibility is laid upon each individual in a relationship to decide where intimacy should stop; a difficulty which arises in this situation is that, owing to the very different levels of stimulation necessary to arouse individuals, what is hardly affecting one partner may be strongly stimulating to the other. Among young unmarried people in this country today there is a very wide range of behaviour; from those who accept promiscuity to those who, guided sometimes by principles, sometimes by convention, keep themselves chaste for marriage. Between these two extremes, there are young people who treat seriously more or less temporary partnerships. Many of these young people would repudiate indignantly the idea that they did not intend faithfulness in married life. It has also to be accepted that loss of virginity before marriage is not now necessarily regarded, either by a girl or by her future husband, as a stigma. With this major change, restraint when it is exercised is as often from choice and principle as from fear.

It is often stated that loss of virginity has a far deeper significance for a woman than for a man. We believe that this statement needs careful examination. This point of view probably underestimates what must often be a deeply significant experience for a young man, whether the partner in his first sexual intercourse be casual or personally important to him. Again, emotional disturbance in the girl may be due to factors not inherent in intercourse itself; not only to the fear of pregnancy, but to inhibitions and guilt-feelings laid on her by her upbringing. It is often maintained that, for a girl, intercourse is indissolubly associated with the desire for children and a permanent home. This is often true in her long-term picture of sexual relationships, but we do not believe that it need enter at all into the moment of passion, when the desire to give and to receive may be as overmastering in the girl as in the boy. Without the fear of pregnancy, which is being steadily reduced by modern contraceptives, and without the special guilt-feelings which her upbringing has so often laid on the girl, man and maid are in this situation on equal terms. Either can be frightened, hurt, and damaged by what is for them the wrong kind of sexual experience. It must, however, be accepted as fact that light-hearted and loving casual contacts can be known without profound damage or “moral degeneracy” being the result in either partner.

This is not to say that sexual experience is the same for a man as for a woman. For many a man, the experience once finished is complete and leaves him with a sense of release and freedom with which he can turn easily to other things. For the woman, there is also release, but the experience remains with her, and she goes on dwelling in it. This difference is largely biological in origin: for the man, it is release of a localized urge, for a woman the whole system is involved.

This chapter is one of analysis, not evaluation; the problem of freedoms and restraints is discussed elsewhere. Few would advocate total sexual permissiveness in our society; and most men and women must, for at least part of their lives, live in adult singleness without direct outlet for their sexual drives.

The Single Man and Woman

The problems of the single state are not the same for men as for women, yet there are similarities, greater than is often realized. The urgent drive of physical desire in a man is often thought to have no equivalent in a woman, whose desires are sometimes said to be emotional rather than physical. It should, however, be recognized that, while some women feel no physical desire till roused by love-play, others can be roused in body as well as mind by outward or inward stimuli other than a man's words or caresses.

The single man or woman accepting the conventional restraints is without two features of married life: the release of sexual tension and of the parental urge. In the man, however, the second of these is often latent, at least until marriage and parenthood, and the recognized deprivation is purely sexual in its narrower sense. For many women the two deprivations are equal, but their maternal drive can find outlet in a score of ways not necessarily associated with children. Home-making is a satisfying outlet for many women: sterile when it stops at polished furniture and spotless curtains, fruitful when it results in a place of welcome. There are, indeed, many single men to whom satisfaction of their parental urge brings a more balanced life. Teachers, religious leaders, good employers and commanding officers, all these and many others, whether married or not, are expressing the parental side of their nature in their daily work, and the way in which this satisfies some needs of the unmarried passes unnoticed. A small minority are compensated homosexuals, and the homosexual in each one of us helps us in handling our own sex. When, as does indeed often happen, a homosexual, consciously or unconsciously, uses his or her nature successfully in service and care, parental feelings are often also finding expression. The majority of single men and women lead happy lives of great fullness. Some accept their state, others have chosen it. There is no more vivid testimony in our time to the riches that can come from chosen celibacy than that of the life of the late Pope John XXIII.

Marriage and Later Life

Most men and women look forward to marriage and to making of it a faithful and lasting commitment which will draw out all their capacities for companionship, caring and delight in one another. An attempt was made a few years ago by the Marriage and Parenthood Committee of the Society of Friends to describe Christian marriage, and we would like to quote from their pamphlet.

Marriage is not the goal but the starting point of a great adventure. Like other adventures it promises experiences of infinite variety, dangers from unexpected quarters, periods of doubt and uncertainty, moments of illuminating vision, and more than all other adventures, it holds the possibility of undreamed-of happiness spreading into and affecting the whole of life . . . In a happy marriage, perhaps the most striking discovery made by husband and wife as the years pass on is concerned with the infinite variety of their married life. Each partner is constantly changing and developing, and the closest

unity should still leave room for the free play of two independent personalities. But broadly speaking there are three main aspects of marriage in which harmony must be achieved if happiness is to result—the spiritual, the intellectual and the physical. And although these three aspects are closely interdependent, each has its own special problems of adjustment (p. 6).

Much unhappiness is caused by the ignorance and guilt that false attitudes to sex bring to marriage. It is also the case that at a deep unconscious level both men and women are polygamous and promiscuous as a result of drives usually kept in check by a restraint which may itself be weakened by many factors of which the person concerned is unaware. Sexual difficulties in marriage are of many kinds: some arise from lack of factual knowledge, but most stem from the immaturity of the individual, who is still partly caught up with fixations to one or other parent, with consequent guilt in the marital situation. Human sexual behaviour is to a great extent learned behaviour (see Appendix A). The honeymoon experience is commonly a great disappointment to the unenlightened who discover only later that sexual fulfilment grows through the years with other aspects of their relationship. Occasionally ignorance of the mechanics, so to speak, of sex can lead a newly-married couple into a vicious circle of impotence, frigidity or general maladjustment culminating in divorce or the mental breakdown of either partner. Particularly common is the failure of the man to bring the woman to orgasm. Lack of honesty in the sharing of feelings is another factor in marital disharmony. Sex, in addition to being a mystery, is also an appetite; people can talk quite freely about the foods they like and dislike, and similar frankness in matters of their physical relationships could promote mutual understanding. Each may need the help of the other in learning together the ways of adjustment. The sexual drive differs in strength and frequency in different individuals, and what is customary and normal in one marriage may not be so in another. Similarly, it may differ as between the partners of a marriage, from time to time, within each of them. In all such differences great patience, sympathy and encouragement born of love are required to overcome disharmonies, both temporary and of long duration.

The sexual drive continues active until quite late in life; in fact, many women find their physical married life more satisfying after the menopause. Their health often improves and they can take up new interests with enjoyment; mature husbands can share in the new beginning. On the other hand, some women who have never been fully adjusted to the physical aspect of their marriage use the change of life to turn away from it altogether, thus creating a problem for their more normal husbands. Similarly, in middle life many men realize that they are unlikely to reach the heights which they had hoped to reach, and may then go through a stage calling for special love and understanding on the part of their wives. These experiences are often difficult and painful and may come as a shock to the husband or the wife. Strengths and weaknesses, once thought to be known, have to be re-learned. Despite the difficulties, which it would be irresponsible to minimize, we know it is possible for the

couple to come through and to rejoice in giving themselves afresh to one another, renewing their confidence in themselves by so doing. In marriage the possibilities of the mental and spiritual growth of husband and wife separately and together are infinite. Every kind of loving—physical delight, the exercise of common courtesy, the stimulation of intellectual argument—and the fullest self-giving and forgiving are needed and can be enjoyed. Without being self-consciously religious, a married pair may feel that they come close to God and that their marriage receives a grace particular to its needs, a grace distinct from that which each partner receives separately. The potential of such giving and receiving can only be realized through life-long commitment. Each marriage develops an individuality of its own and there is no one general pattern.

Each marriage, therefore, can be threatened in a different way, and what would destroy one may strengthen another. The sexual energy that may be disastrous to the one may, in the other, unite the partners in a relationship which is intensely creative and from which the whole community benefits.

The gravest threat is always that which endangers the central unity of a marriage by dividing one partner from the other. The most obvious and recognized danger arises from an overtly sexual relationship between one partner and a third person. We do not condone such a relationship, but we recognize that it does not in all cases touch the central security of a marriage. The causes of physical infidelity are far too many to be enumerated here, but one partner may be caught unawares and swept into a situation bitterly regretted as soon as it is ended.

Unfaithfulness is not necessarily physical. There is a kind of mental or spiritual adultery which can damage all three people concerned. Hard as it is to forgive physical unfaithfulness, it is equally hard, and sometimes harder, to forgive an apparently innocent friendship between one partner and a third person if it creates a sense of exclusion and deprivation, and destroys the confidence, respect and affection promised in marriage. It is indeed possible for one partner, by passing through the experience of a different love, to develop a maturity which may benefit the marriage; but, because loving means being fully responsible for the one loved, situations which might become causes of insecurity should never consciously be allowed to arise.

Most marriages are strengthened when husband and wife have varied interests, and are not weakened if not all of these are shared; but if one partner be drawn into an intimate friendship through such an interest, at work or in recreation, the union may be undermined and divided. The threat is most dangerous when the extra-marital relationship grows, as it so readily does, from the personal into the sexual sphere, sometimes taking the two people concerned by surprise. An outside friendship may be a stabilizing factor when it gives an outlet to one partner for an interest which the other cannot share, but neither the friendship nor the interest should become so exclusive as to cause the other partner insecurity or jealousy.

Sometimes the very happiness and security of a marriage may attract a young man or young woman from outside, especially if the

maturity and sensitiveness of the wife or husband is seen in contrast to the dangers—already feared or experienced—of falling into the hands of an inconsiderate or merely sex-hungry woman or man. This situation is not necessarily a matter for shame; no one is to blame for seeking security. If wisely handled, it can be educative and can indeed prepare a young man or woman for falling in love with a contemporary in due time. Even when the partner to the marriage concerned is stirred by the experience, the resolution of the problem can leave a marriage enriched.

All these situations can, but need not, destroy the marriage. For, more often than is recognized, the three people concerned behave responsibly, are deeply conscious of difficulties and are equally anxious to avoid injury to others. Since this type of situation attracts no publicity and does not end in the divorce court, it is assumed not to exist. In some cases, even when the third party has withdrawn, the marriage moves only into distrust or uneasy tolerance, but it is possible for a solution to be reached which leaves the third person alone but unembittered, and the partnership strengthened. Sometimes, though rarely, the third person can be incorporated into a rich and equal friendship with both husband and wife—not, as is sometimes suggested, a *ménage-à-trois*. At all times the belief of the husband and wife that they are fully committed to responsibility for each other's good, and to a joint creative family enterprise, will bring them through their difficulties and enrich their marriage.

III. HOMOSEXUALITY

The task of taking a fresh look at homosexuality is not one which is undertaken with alacrity. That is because homosexuality conjures up more passion and prejudice than possibly any other subject except that of colour. The two attitudes have much in common; it is the fear and ignorance behind them that give them their venom.

The word "homosexuality" does not denote a course of conduct, but a state of affairs, the state of loving one's own, not the opposite, sex; it is a state of affairs in nature. One should no more deplore "homosexuality" than left-handedness. One can condemn or prohibit *acts* of course; that is another matter. But one cannot condemn or prohibit homosexuality, as such.

Secondly, the label of "homosexuality" is misleading. People are not either homosexual or heterosexual. Most people are *predominantly* one or the other; most in fact are predominantly heterosexual; many are predominantly homosexual; many are attracted to both sexes fairly equally and may be pushed one way or the other by circumstances, convenience, and social pressure. Before we assume that homosexuality is bad and heterosexuality is good, we should recognize that homosexuals are no more necessarily promiscuous than heterosexuals are necessarily chaste. They may be similar people (or even, it will be realized, *the same person*) and have similar moral values. But of course, where a heterosexual finds blessing in marriage, a homosexual cannot; and many of the pressures designed to hold lovers of the opposite sex together have the effect of tearing lovers of the same sex apart; it is hardly surprising then that most homosexual affairs (at least amongst men) are less durable than most heterosexual affairs.

Male Homosexuality

A homosexual orientation, as has been said previously, is usual among boys in the 11-17 year-old group, and may frequently find physical expression in such acts as mutual masturbation, more especially in all-male institutions. Many boys have countless rather casual contacts. At the same time, in dealing with adolescents, one should remember that their involvements, whether they have physical expression or not, can be far from casual: "A boy's first love is a love apart, and never again may he hope to recapture the glory and the anguish of it. It is heavy with portent and fearful with beauty, terrible as an army with banners; yet withal so tender and selfless a thing as to touch the very hem of the garment of God. Only once in a life comes such loving as this . . ." (Radcliffe Hall, 1957, p. 134). That first love will often be for another boy. The shock and bitterness of a boy who is denounced for having such feelings may well make it harder for him to reach a satisfactory

sexual adjustment later. And the denunciation will not remove the feelings.

A factor in this adolescent homosexuality is that it may be and commonly is extremely promiscuous, even in the most respectable boarding schools. These very physical "affairs" usually seem to leave little behind them; often a mere sharing of physical experience, they may have little connection with any real homosexuality. It is not uncommon to observe that a boy who has been the terror of the Lower Fourth becomes a respectable married man with a large family; whereas a class-mate who may have lived chastely, horrified by so-called indecent activities, and conscious of not even the faintest interest in joining them, later turns out to be the seemingly permanent homosexual. "The lack of psychological contact with woman-kind may well be a more important contributing factor than the experience of sexual play in dormitories." (West, 1960, p. 127.) While we may say that in general the adolescent phase of homosexuality is usual and does no harm, we must not forget that it may be associated with activities causing acute suffering to sensitive boys. Mutual masturbation can become a gang activity at puberty, or even before, with severe cruelty shown on occasions towards the reluctant boy who through fear or distaste tries to stand out. Something like initiation rites may be established—again a source of terror to a sensitive boy. We cannot say that practices of this kind do no harm, however harmless the homosexuality itself may be; and it is clear that a continuing responsibility rests upon parents and teachers to be on the alert for all forms of bullying.

Seduction is probably a small or insignificant factor in forming homosexual inclination, and early promiscuity (especially with a much older person, which is what shocks society most) probably affects the boy concerned less than experiences at say 20 or 30, let alone 60. A man of 60 does not commonly have a new sexual relationship without a considerable involvement and crisis. A boy of 13 may hardly even remember it, especially if there was no emotional involvement. Society has inverted the significance of these matters: worse, the discovery by a parent of homosexual behaviour in a son is still often attended by a major uproar in the home and even attempts, involving a great deal of publicity, to prosecute the partner. What would have been forgotten then becomes a vivid experience. Since in relation to homosexuality people tend either to know everything or to know nothing (and it must be assumed that many readers of this chapter fall in the latter category) it is necessary to stress how *common* homosexual experiences are in the young. Kinsey thought that about a third of all males have some homosexual experience at some point. This may well be an underestimate. What one can say definitely is that (on the physical side) a great many boys at school are involved at some time in sexual play with others; sometimes frequently, sometimes not; sometimes with only one boy, sometimes with many—or even with several at one time. Males are very phallus-centred and particularly in early adolescence the experiment and relief offered by homosexual interchanges are pursued, usually, without harm or emotional upset.

These affairs will most often be with boys of the same age, and

mainly physical. Less often but still commonly there may be an age gap of a few years, as between a 17 year-old and a 14 year-old boy. In the second case, these relationships may be far more emotionally charged, and physical satisfaction less routine, *but*, because in general more tense and deeper, they are more lasting. A genuine protectiveness and caring may be felt by the older boy, a real admiration by the younger; these emotions are not readily damped-down or forgotten. The romantic homosexual school literature—even the occasional poems which seek entry in the columns of the school magazine—relates to this latter type of affair.

But both these sorts of homosexuality, that which is mainly physical and shared with contemporaries, and that (marked by passion more than lust) linking those of different ages, flow naturally into heterosexuality and even marriage. The process may not be rapid: there are many affairs among young men of university age, and a really intense homosexual involvement may not occur until the early twenties; but all this may still be and often is but a natural precursor to the heterosexual life that is to come. One reader of *The Spectator* wrote to say that at school he had written sonnets to a younger boy; later he wrote them to his girl friend; the former was good practice for the latter. Even the mainly physical affairs explore, for the boys involved, their personalities and power, and make them sexually unafraid of later, heterosexual experience.

The Early Twenties

Passing on now to the early twenties, we may find that a tenth to a twentieth of the young men of our acquaintance are still mainly homosexual in outlook. Some may still be working out the entanglements of adolescence: their path through earlier sexual experience was perhaps not smooth or uninterrupted. They will have affairs with other young men, usually not boys, though there may well be an age difference. These affairs may still be very promiscuous—"one night stands"—or mainly emotional. But they are becoming more self-conscious: in the society of today those involved may be thinking of themselves as "homosexual"; and it is this age which knows real despair and may assume nothing else is ever to come. This is wrong; there is in society a small "hard core", but this is by no means necessarily the same group that had homosexual experiences at school or later. Many or most of the youths still predominantly homosexual in the twenties become normally heterosexual. Of those now becoming permanent homosexuals, many would not do so did not the pressures of law and of public opinion drive them into the only society where they can find acceptance, sympathy and apparent security.

On the other hand, many men come to discover strong homosexual feelings only late in life. But whatever the situation—and this, again, must be stressed—there are very large numbers of happily married men who could still regard themselves as "homosexual" and very many more who have occasional homosexual impulses and feelings. In neither situation is the marriage likely to be much prejudiced unless there has been a failure of complete candour between husband and wife; on this as on so many other

subjects, a failure of mutual understanding may lead to disaster. A wife who knows that her husband has homosexual tendencies knows where she is; and it is quite remarkable how a problem of this kind can be carried. A wife who is ignorant is helpless to cope; she is likely to become suspicious and fearful, and disaster is always just round the corner. A husband in such a marriage is an easy prey to blackmailers; and when disaster comes it is not easily dealt with, since all involved assume the damage irreparable. The wife feels deceived and humiliated; the husband, that the only thing left is to abandon attempts at heterosexual interest, and if necessary wife and family as well. Many girls know nothing about homosexuality at the time of marriage; and for these it may be difficult to make useful and necessary explanations.

Later Years

In later years the picture becomes more set as people become (on the whole) more set in their habits. Most males with some degree of homosexual inclination have nevertheless achieved a successful marriage, but a substantial minority now think of themselves as definitely homosexual. These attempt long-term homosexual "marriages", some with success; they settle down, for years or for ever, with some compatible spirit, and given the right qualities of temperament and character achieve a viable relationship.

But then of course there are the others: those men for whom a happy sexual relationship with a woman is not possible. To these, homosexuality is natural; persecution will make them inhibited, mad, or suicidal, but it will not make heterosexuality any more natural for them, or increase the attractiveness of those who try to force them into it.

Those men are chiefly thought of by the public as "homosexuals", who are likely to attract public and police attention. For a number of reasons, not excluding natural promiscuity, they do not settle down with one another, but endure a lifetime of fragmented relationships and are always on the search for a partner. They may form the "queer" society; they will frequent "gay" bars, street corners, beaches and public lavatories. They tend to have an especially strong sense of persecution and, with it, they avoid being too responsible. By and large, they are not happy; although some, by demanding little of the emotions, are not dissatisfied.

This last group may include the men who are effeminate; but it cannot be too strongly urged that not all effeminate men are homosexual, and few homosexual men can really be described as effeminate. But there are some who quite obviously can; and they come particularly to the notice of the public when they are in this last promiscuous category. That is why the conventional image of the homosexual is that of an effeminate, promiscuous man, especially likely to be interested in boys. Men of this kind are likely, one day, to get publicity; the rest are unnoticed and pass—to acquaintances, friends and even relations—as heterosexual. Small wonder that most people are surprised at the extent of homosexuality; they do not know which of the people known to them are homosexual.

This necessarily dispassionate account may still fail to convey any

particular problem. The reader is told that this happens and that happens; there seems nothing for him to *do* about it. But no account of homosexuality would be complete without reminding the normal reader that his own sexual emotion is welcomed by society, is encouraged by commerce, and features in films. What would it be like if every time he fell in love with a girl, he found he could not share or announce his love, and that if his affection were detected he would probably be written off as depraved by his fellows and expelled, if still at school? The homosexual learns guilt, secrecy and shame, which may follow him all the days of his life. The odd thing is that the greater his love, the greater the fear and shame. A boy may masturbate while at school with other boys for whom he feels nothing; his similarly uninhibited and perhaps contemporaneous heterosexual career will however distract attention from this; it will be said with truth, "Oh, that didn't mean anything to him", and an inglorious, unfeeling career of conventional seductions will attract nothing but mild admiration. But another will fall passionately in love, and stay in love for years, with another boy; his lack of girl friends will be noticed, and his affection deplored or, more likely, disbelieved. If and when his interest is noticed, he will probably find that many of his comrades credit him with nothing but a desire to commit sodomy. This may not even have entered his mind and his mortification and disgust may know no bounds.

Later in life it may be much the same; the promiscuous but discreet cannot expect acceptance, but if skilful they may avoid persecution. The chaste lover can expect no gratitude from society, which will only suppose, since he is chaste, that he is not homosexual. And, of course, two lovers, if both are male, can hardly expect to be urged together by the welcome pressure from society that a heterosexual engagement attracts. If they manage to set up house and stay together, they will not be favoured by praise in the local press on the silver anniversary of their union. This will seem absurd to most: but it is surprising how much the unrelenting hatred of society may eat into the soul; and man is a social animal.

Male Homosexuality in Britain

What is the present position concerning male homosexuality in Britain? Is it for example on the increase?

It is widely believed that the prevalence of homosexuality in this country has greatly increased during the past fifty years and that homosexual behaviour is much more frequent than used to be the case. It is certainly true that the whole subject of homosexuality is much more freely discussed today than it was formerly; but this is not in itself evidence that homosexuality is today more prevalent, or homosexual behaviour more widespread, than it was when mention of it was less common. (*Wolfenden Report*, 1957, p. 19).

Yet, although homosexuality is discussed more freely, it is seldom that a public figure feels he can afford to disclose that he is in fact homosexually inclined. Consequently people do not realize that they know intimately men who are predominantly homosexual, and who go to some trouble to conceal it.

"Oh, a deal of pains he's taken and a pretty price he's paid
To hide his poll or dye it of a mentionable shade;
But they've pulled the beggar's hat off for the world to see and
stare,
And they're taking him to justice for the colour of his hair."
(Housman, 1962).

It is commonly thought that homosexuals are found only, or mostly, in certain occupations. They in fact exist in every rank and activity of society. Homosexuals are by no means unknown even in those places where, above all, society makes efforts to keep its figures impeccable and personally unassailable. "It would never do for the British public to hear the 'Weather Report' from the lips of a co-respondent." (Herbert, 1949.) Similarly, it is thought even less tolerable that nations should be administered by those, however able, who love their own sex; a series of broken marriages is considered preferable by the arbiters of public morals.

Because of all this, homosexuals are at a loss to know how to meet each other; and consequently pubs and bars, even street corners or particular beaches, become homosexual meeting places until the police decide to have a purge. When people hear that a particular lavatory is a meeting place for homosexuals, they shudder, and wonder at the lack of taste. But who has driven them there? If homosexuals could meet more openly and with less persecution, they would no doubt choose more aesthetic surroundings. One of the ironies of the last Wolfenden debate in the House of Commons, 29th June 1960, was Mr. Shepherd (M.P. for Cheadle) deploring homosexual contacts in public conveniences,* while Mr. Gardner (M.P. for Billericay) asked whether we were to be confronted with the spectacle of two males living together as lovers†. But surely from the point of view of public decency, the latter arrangement is preferable, and is indeed the alternative that those who urge reform of the law would candidly prefer to see.

Many people fear that a more permissive attitude to homosexuality would "open the floodgates" and result in unbridled licence. "It is true that a change of this sort would amount to a limited degree of such toleration, but we do not share the fears of our witnesses that the change would have the effect they expect. This expectation seems to us to exaggerate the effect of the law on human behaviour..." (*Wolfenden Report*, 1957, p. 23).

The Wolfenden Committee also rejected another common belief. Some people, they find, hold that "conduct of this kind is a cause of the demoralisation and decay of civilisations, and that therefore, unless we wish to see our nation degenerate and decay, such conduct must be stopped, by every possible means. We have no evidence to support this view, and we cannot feel it right to frame the laws which should govern this country in the present age by reference to hypothetical explanations of the history of other peoples in ages distant in time and different in circumstances from our own. In so far as the basis of this argument can be precisely formulated, it is often no more than the expression of revulsion against what is

* *Hansard*, Volume 625, Column 1484.

† *Hansard*, Volume 625, Column 1504.

regarded as unnatural, sinful or disgusting. Many people feel this revulsion, for one or more of these reasons. But moral conviction or instinctive feeling, however strong, is not a valid basis for overriding the individual's privacy and for bringing within the ambit of the criminal law private sexual behaviour of this kind . . ." (*ibid.*, p. 22). We should go further, and question whether a feeling of revulsion, however strongly felt, is an adequate ground for moral censure. The situation is well painted by A. E. Housman in the poem from which we have quoted already:

"Tis a shame to human nature, such a head of hair as his;
In the good old time 'twas hanging for the colour that it is;
Though hanging isn't bad enough and flaying would be fair
For the nameless and abominable colour of his hair."

It has been left to professional writers to reveal as much as they dare in literature. Among the best fictional accounts of these matters are *The Heart in Exile* by Rodney Garland, which does a Baedeker's tour of homosexual society, *The City and the Pillar* by Gore Vidal, *Finistère* by Fritz Peters, and *The Charioteer* by Mary Renault.

In non-fiction, Donald West's *Homosexuality* must be one of the best and most thorough books on this topic ever written; others are Gordon Westwood's *Society and the Homosexual*, Peter Wildeblood's *Against the Law*, Anomaly's *The Invert* (an impressive 1929 Catholic viewpoint), and *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* by D. Sherwin Bailey.

Male Homosexuality and the Law

There has never been, anywhere, so far as is known, a law against homosexuality as such in any secular legal code. A man's feelings, emotions or orientations have never been the subject of this kind of attack. It is only with what he *does* that the law is concerned. Hence it is misleading to say "homosexuality is illegal". It is not, and one might say it cannot be. It has been said, "One cannot try the mind of man, for the devil himself knoweth not the mind of man."

Canon and Ecclesiastical Law. The Church has always frowned on homosexual practices. The ancient Jews distrusted them—apparently because they cannot lead to the procreation of children. The Mosaic law, embodied in the Old Testament and inherited by the Christian Church, was clear (*Leviticus* 18, v. 22; and 20, v. 13). St. Paul seems to have regarded homosexual behaviour itself with abhorrence, apparently because he was afraid women would be sexually neglected; and because such acts were "unnatural" (see Appendix A). "And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another" (*Romans* 1, v. 27), suggests that St. Paul shared what has been called "the prairie fire" view of homosexual conduct—that it is naturally more attractive than heterosexual satisfaction, and if it were allowed legally and morally everyone would turn to it. This is plainly contrary to experience, although there may have been some historical reasons for this fear in St. Paul's day. It is to him, principally, that those wishing to attack homosexuals turn, for there can be no doubt as to his recorded views (*I Cor.* 6, v. 9). His opinions may have been personal ones, however, or part of the accepted Jewish thought of his day.

Equally strong prohibitions, for example, that women should not pray with their hats off (*I Cor.* 11, v. 5), nor speak in church (*I Cor.* 14, v. 34), tend to be disregarded by most modern Christians, so that St. Paul's views are not, in themselves, final.

Gibbon, in his *Decline and Fall*, gives some account of these matters: "I touch with reluctance, and despatch with impatience, a more odious vice, of which modesty rejects the name and nature abominates the idea"; after discussing the laxities which abounded before Constantine, he goes on: "A new spirit of legislation, respectable even in its error, arose in the Empire with the religion of Constantine. The laws of Moses were revered as the divine original of justice . . . The lovers of their own sex were pursued by general and pious indignation." Justinian, after relaxing legislation concerning heterosexual matters, "declared himself the implacable enemy of unmanly lust, and the cruelty of his persecutions can scarcely be excused by the purity of his motives."

Justinian viewed homosexuality with abhorrence, believing that homosexual practices caused the earthquakes which were especially troublesome in his reign. Painful death, preceded by mutilation and castration, was the punishment for homosexual intercourse and two bishops, among many others, suffered this fate, and their dying bodies were dragged through the streets. "Perhaps these prelates were innocent," Gibbon adds dispassionately.

The Christian Church later also incorporated the ancient Jewish sex codes into Roman and Canon Law which formed the basis of the domestic law of medieval Europe. In medieval times, when clerical preoccupation with the sins of the flesh was at its height, and sexual pleasure was almost damnable in the strict meaning of that word, many men and also a few women were sent to their deaths for homosexual offences. The Church in general still regards homosexual practices as unnatural and gravely sinful, e.g. "Let it be understood that homosexual indulgence is a shameful vice and a grievous sin from which deliverance is to be sought by every means." (Archbishop of Canterbury, *Diocesan Notes*, November 1953).

Sodomy. Sodomy in England signifies sexual intercourse between two individuals involving penetration *per anum* by the penis. Nothing short of that is sodomy. (American State Legislatures sometimes give the word a wider meaning). The two individuals concerned need not both be male although obviously one must be. Sodomy is punishable under the statutes concerning *buggery*: buggery denotes both sodomy and anal intercourse between an individual and an animal, commonly called bestiality. We are here concerned only with sodomy.

Sodomy has been punishable since a statute of Henry VIII passed in 1533 (25 Henry VIII c. 6) by which it was punishable by death. It remained so punishable until Peel's reforms. The Offences against the Person Act 1861 provided, by Section 61: "Sodomy and Bestiality. Whosoever shall be convicted of the abominable crime of buggery, committed either with mankind or with an animal, shall be liable to be kept in penal servitude for life . . ." and Section 62 punished attempt, or assault with intent to commit buggery, with ten years imprisonment. These clauses were repealed by the Sexual Offences

Act 1956 (Section 51, 4th Schedule) and replaced by Section 12 of that Act. "Buggery . . . (1) It is a felony for a person to commit buggery with another person or with an animal." The Second Schedule repeats the punishments of life imprisonment for the offence, and of ten years imprisonment for the attempt. It should be emphasized that no matter what the age of the parties, consent is no defence. Also that a boy under 14 cannot be charged with sodomy, and a passive adult partner might under this provision be imprisoned for life for an offence suggested by the boy.

It is not widely understood, even among some lawyers, that sodomy, although widely thought not only to be a homosexual, but *the only* homosexual act, may be either heterosexual or homosexual; that is, it may be committed between persons of opposite sexes. It may well be in fact more common among married people than between homosexual partners; and there is no evidence that homosexuals are drawn to sodomy more than others. Needless to say there are very few prosecutions against married couples for so undetectable an offence, which usually only comes to light in divorce proceedings, but they do occur. (Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin, 1953, p. 370).

Homosexuals as such, therefore, are little more concerned with reform (which may well be needed) of the sodomy laws than others are; the chief legislation which affects them is that against "gross indecency between male persons". Ignorance about the nature and effect of this latter legislation is so widespread that, for instance, in the House of Commons debate on 29th June, 1960, the Conservative Member for Cheadle, in attacking the changes in the law proposed by the Wolfenden Committee, said in passing that he would be happy to see the total repeal of the "Gross Indecency" section—which meant going further than was suggested by the Wolfenden Committee.

Gross Indecency. Gross Indecency means, in this part of English Law, any sexual acts between male persons (including between boys) other than sodomy. Any sexual conduct involving the genitals is consequently prohibited, and consent is no defence. The law against "gross indecency" is relatively new, and arose in an unusual way in 1885 when Parliament appears to have created an entirely new offence unwittingly. It is thought desirable to give some account of the process of enactment as recorded in *Hansard*, to demonstrate this.

On 6th August 1885, the Criminal Law Amendment Bill was going through the Commons on its third reading, when Mr. Labouchère rose to move a fresh clause of which he had given notice on the Order Paper. Before he could say anything Mr. Walton rose on a point of order. He asked whether the clause about to be moved, which dealt with a class of offence totally different from that against which the bill was directed (protection of women and girls, and suppression of brothels) was within the scope of the bill. The Speaker ruled that anything could be introduced at this stage by leave of the House. Mr. Labouchère then proposed his clause:

"Any male person who, in public or private, commits or is a party to the commission of, or procures or attempts to procure the

commission by any male person of any act of gross indecency with another male person shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and being convicted thereof, shall be liable at the discretion of the Court to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding one year, with or without hard labour." *Hansard* continues, "That was his Amendment, and the meaning of it was that at present any person *on whom an assault* of this kind here dealt with *was committed* must be under the age of 13, and the object with which he had brought forward this clause was to make the law applicable to *any* person, whether under the age of 13 or over that age. He did not think it necessary to discuss the proposal at any length, as he understood Her Majesty's Government were willing to accept it. He therefore left it for the House and the Government to deal with as might be thought best." (Italics not in *Hansard*). Mr. Hopwood pointed out that under the existing law "the kind of offence indicated could not be an offence in the case of any person above the age of 13", but "he did not wish to say anything against the clause." Sir Henry James suggested two instead of one year's imprisonment. Mr. Labouchère had no objection. "Clause, as amended, agreed to." This clause was repealed and re-enacted in Clause 13 of the Sexual Offences Act 1956 which provides as follows: Clause 13: "Indecency between men—It is an offence for a man to commit an act of gross indecency with another man, whether in public or private, or to be a party to the commission by a man of an act of gross indecency with another man, or to procure the commission by a man of an act of gross indecency with another man."

Firstly, it should be observed that consent and privacy are immaterial. Secondly, the Victorian legislature was so sure that *indecent meant sexual behaviour* that it was induced to prohibit gross indecency as such, without troubling to define it. So reluctant also have lawyers been to disturb this attitude that there is no recorded case of a defendant admitting acts as charged but denying their indecency. (It is hoped that it will not be thought frivolous if it is observed that Lord Curzon thought eating soup before lunch grossly indecent; it would have startled him if two men doing it together violated this Act). It is not the least remarkable factor of this legislation that it is supremely vague. This has led to difficulties in its application: actual contact between the parties involved, for example, has been held unnecessary. And although the originators of this legislation must have had something analagous in mind to sexual intercourse, a mutual love-making in some form, the interpretation by the courts is still getting wider and vaguer. Indeed in 1963 (*R. v. Hall*, Cr. App. R 253), it was held that the offence may be committed "with" another man without the consent of that other man, or his being a party to it.

Accordingly, under the law as it now stands, gross indecency may be used to signify any sexual behaviour involving the presence of two males, more usually such acts as mutual masturbation, but mutual, or even presumably unilateral, exposure of the genitals will suffice if the circumstances are those of sexual excitement.

It was under the 1885 clause we have been discussing that Oscar Wilde was tried in 1894, and under which most of the celebrated

homosexual convictions in the early 1950s were obtained. It will be noticed that when Mr. Labouchère explained his clause, he seemed to be thinking in terms of *assaults*. The Rt. Hon. Sir Travers Humphreys, P.C., said in his preface to *The Trials of Oscar Wilde* edited by H. Montgomery Hyde: "It is doubtful whether the House fully appreciated that the words 'in public or private' in the new clause had completely altered the law . . . The reluctance of juries to convict in such cases is notorious, while no-one having experience in such matters would deny that the words 'in private' have naturally assisted the blackmailer in his loathsome trade."

Most men prosecuted under this clause are convicted on their own confession, or that of an accomplice turning Queen's evidence, and it has been suggested that no less than 90 per cent of cases of successful blackmail involve a threat to disclose such an offence.* There are even cases where a man has come forward to disclose blackmail by criminals, yet prosecution has followed against him for gross indecency. Thus a man has not been able to expose a blackmailer without the possibility of incurring prosecution, perhaps for an entirely private act with the blackmailer himself.

Recent Developments. In the House of Commons on 24th October 1963, Mr. Shepherd (M.P. for Cheadle) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department what steps he was taking to ensure that persons complaining to the police about alleged blackmail in respect of homosexual practices receive adequate protection against prosecution in respect of those practices. Mr. Brooke, replying for the Government, said "This is a matter for the discretion of the chief officers of police; but my information is that it has for some time now been the usual practice that the Director of Public Prosecutions is first consulted, and that proceedings are taken only in grave or exceptional circumstances or where the complaint is not made *bona fide*". Persons who are blackmailed in respect of homosexual practices can therefore report the blackmail to the police without fear generally that they will themselves be prosecuted.†

The Government has so far declined to introduce legislation to bring the law on homosexual conduct into line with that on heterosexual conduct, preferring to await a clear gathering of public opinion in favour of this move. The reasons given in one debate (1960) for resisting legislation were:

1. (as was the case) the majority of M.P.s were not in favour of early legislation, and
2. the present Act is on the statute book (even if it would not now be passed in its present form) and to remove it might seem to give moral approval to the acts prohibited.

A private Member's bill to reform the law was introduced in March 1962 by Mr. Leo Abse, M.P. for Pontypool. It was talked out, but public comment was far more sympathetic than that which followed the 1960 debate. This favourable trend continues.

Most English-speaking countries have followed England in having

* Rt. Hon. The Lord Jowitt. *Medicine and the Law: Journal of Mental Science*, 100, 35: 1954.

† *Hansard*, 24th October, 1963, Column 242.

legislation similar to this "gross indecency" section. Continental and other countries, except West Germany, have never had similar legislation. Austria has recently provided by statute for an age of consent of 18 years. The Wolfenden Committee, appointed by the Home Secretary, reported in 1957 as its principal recommendation on homosexuality that acts between consenting adults in private should no longer be a criminal offence. It also recommended *inter alia* that questions relating to "consent" and "in private" be decided by the same criteria as apply in the case of heterosexual acts between adults; that except for some grave reason proceedings be not instituted in respect of homosexual offences incidentally revealed in the course of investigating allegations of blackmail; that the age of "adulthood" for the purposes of the proposed change be 21; and, finally, that "research be instituted into the aetiology of homosexuality and the effects of various forms of treatment". (*Wolfenden Report*, 1957, Para. 355).

On 15th July 1964 it was announced that the new Director of Public Prosecutions had circularized Chief Constables suggesting that his consent should be obtained for all prosecutions of consenting males in future. This might well achieve uniformity of prosecution, but it appears doubtful whether it will see the end of this kind of prosecution altogether in the light of the statement of the Attorney General in the House of Commons on 28th July 1964 that no change in the enforcement of the law was intended. We hope that it will, nevertheless, result.

The offence of gross indecency finds no place in the common classification of crimes in text books, namely (1) offences against the State, (2) offences against property, and (3) offences against persons. It is perhaps the office of a logical system of criminal jurisprudence to exclude it, and leave private conduct to private morals and to pastoral and medical advice. All these are hindered by the present law, which also embarrasses frank consideration of moral standards, the examination of public welfare and much-needed research. Masturbation is not a crime, nor, in England, are fornication, adultery or sexual acts between women. Gross indecency with children of either sex under the age of 14 is prohibited by the Indecency with Children Act, 1960. Were the adult 'gross indecency' legislation to be repealed, it would still remain an offence indecently to assault a male person, with a minimum age of consent of 16. (Sexual Offences Act, 1956, S.15.) This would deal satisfactorily with the difficulties raised by the present law.

Female Homosexuality

Homosexuality is probably as common in women as it is in men. Although with girls today heterosexual social relationships start early, the early adolescent phase may still be a time of passionate friendships and of an adoration of an older girl or woman. Close physical contact is common: girls will dance together, share a bed, or walk arm in arm, often without any strong emotional feeling. Many women continue to attach themselves to others of their own sex beyond the phase of adolescence, but owing to their nature and

to society's different attitude, homosexuality in women takes forms differing from those in men. Female homosexuality is free from the legal, and to a large extent from the social, sanctions which are so important in the problems of male homosexuals. Analysis of the two forms, their differences and similarities, may therefore suggest what might happen if these sanctions were to be modified for men.

Any personal relationship between two people carries a sexual element, the nature of which will depend upon the balance of the male and female in each of the two personalities. A friendship between two individuals, one predominantly male and the other predominantly female, as with the normal man and woman, is different from one between two men in whom maleness predominates or between two women in whom femaleness predominates. In the first case the relationship is enriched by the stimulus of two very different mental patterns, in the second and third the richness lies in the freedom of a common background of thought process. A man, however, will sometimes enjoy in a woman a vigour of mind which he regards as masculine and the woman will equally welcome in a man an intuitive sympathy and tenderness which she regards as feminine. Similarly, at moments in a friendship between men, one may show "feminine" tenderness and care for the other and between women one may show "masculine dominance". (The latter is not always easily distinguishable from maternal dominance). These simple facts, though rarely formulated, are widely accepted and none would criticize a marriage, or a friendship between two persons of the same sex, in which they appear.

Society's criticism begins when the female element in a man or the male element in a woman is permanently and overtly dominant, a criticism which is almost as much directed against a married couple where the woman "wears the trousers", as in a relationship between two members of the same sex which has a homosexual element. Social structure has a further influence on this type of situation, however, since there is a strong feeling of condemnation of two persons of the same sex so linked that neither is likely to marry, a condemnation based on a conviction, which is probably socially valuable, that marriage and the procreation of children is a major responsibility of members of society.

Such criticism is far less violent against homosexual relations between women than those between men, and the reasons for this tolerance merit examination:

1. Maternal tenderness in a woman, expressing itself in kisses and embraces, is socially acceptable and it is probably for this reason that society is neither offended nor disturbed by seeing two women of any age or of very different ages kissing and embracing in public, nor by seeing two little girls or young women going about hand in hand, arm in arm, or with their arms round each others' waists.

2. The giving of maternal tenderness is so profound a need in a woman that much of the satisfaction from caresses between women will be of this kind. Society values this need in a woman and calls upon it freely, and there is considerable tolerance of its expression.

3. A very large number of women involved in homosexual relationships would frankly admit that they would prefer or are

looking forward to a heterosexual one. The adolescent girl whether adoring an older woman or more closely involved with a contemporary would usually reject indignantly the idea that this precludes or replaces the male lover or husband and family to which she looks forward. The pair of middle-aged women, which society on the whole views with such tolerance, often have heterosexual experiences behind them or have been deprived of marriage, as by death or by an unhappy love affair, and thankfully find comfort, consolation and happiness in each other without in any way minimizing the value of the experiences they have had or missed. Even pairs of younger women of marriageable age—the types of female homosexuality on which society looks more askance—are often at least apparently seeking male society with a view to finding husbands. This acceptance of heterosexuality as good and desirable makes for tolerance of female homosexual pairs by society.

4. Tolerance of the pair of older women, in this country at least, probably developed when it was socially unacceptable for a single woman to live alone and it was therefore taken for granted that two single women should set up house together. This tolerance was probably reinforced in this century by the long period following World War I when there was a large surplus of women.

5. It should be emphasized that two women have often lived together in a companionship which replaces many aspects of the companionship of married life and yet in which few if any caresses are exchanged—probably true of some male partnerships as well. It is recognized that such partnerships between older women, with or without physical expression, can form a useful unit in society, each partner pursuing her avocations the better for the strength of the companionship and tenderness she finds at home, and the pair together able to offer a generous and welcome hospitality.

This is the positive side. Before considering the effect which a comparably more tolerant attitude in society would have on male homosexual relationships, it is necessary to examine the negative, and to see whether what is harmful and regrettable in female homosexuality has the same form or is similar in origin to what is harmful in homosexuality among men.

The first and most conspicuous feature is that female homosexuality is often associated with deep unhappiness. In the young girl unhappiness is probably at the minimum when the object of adoration is remote, but may even then become deeply disturbing if the emotion is so dominant that it throws life entirely out of proportion. An adolescent girl is probably more likely to be subject to this kind of disturbance than is a boy, since her emotions have often developed faster than her intellect, and she has no other dominant interest to distract her such as sport, engine-spotting or the constant care of a bicycle.

When in early adult life the relationship is more intimate, many of the features already noted as harmfully characteristic of male homosexuals may again be present: we find again the restless jealousy, possessiveness, and the torments of changing partnerships. These are often associated with an overt or unacknowledged sense of guilt or of resentment at being involved in what is not giving full

satisfaction. This fact is probably far more important than would ever be acknowledged by the partners and, while some homosexuals are accurate when they say they do not want heterosexual relationships, many more, in their determined proclamations of this, are in fact doing violence to fuller impulses, which they are unable to perceive. The sense of guilt may at times be stronger in a young girl than in a man because she cannot, if she is at all feminine, escape the feeling of frustration at thus avoiding motherhood.

The same tensions and frustrations occur in unhappy partnerships of later life. The emotional strains, the deep bitterness arising from a continued search to find in another woman the satisfaction that only a man could give, produce the twisted embittered woman, only too familiar to psychiatrists. She may become cut off from society by her own self-absorption, for in such a situation self-absorption is dominant. She is a menace to her friends and colleagues and spreads unhappiness wherever she goes. Society is rightly critical and wrongly unsympathetic—yet sympathy is hard to give, for it is demanded on false grounds and when offered is often fiercely rejected.

This is the picture, then, of the positive and negative in female homosexuality. What can be deduced from it as to the possible course of male homosexuality if legal restrictions were removed and moral ostracism diminished? The most conspicuous feature that appears to be missing altogether from female homosexuality, even with the freedom which society allows it, is the brief contact of a purely or almost purely physical nature which is so characteristic of a certain section of male homosexual society. This is probably inherent in the different nature of the physical sexual responses of a man and a woman. It seems easier for most men than for most women to have physical relations without emotional involvement with the partner. The experience is thus phallus-centred and produces excitement without deep commitment. In heterosexual life a man may have fleeting affairs with other women without of necessity betraying his emotional fidelity towards his wife; in homosexual relationships he may be forever changing the partner. Women, on the other hand, are more often committed with the whole of their being; they are less likely to be genital-centred in their physical experience, but can achieve sexual satisfaction from various parts of the body. They are more personally involved, and more dependent on the partnership apart from physical contact. Women, therefore, will often try to work towards a lasting partnership, whether in marriage, in extra-marital love or in homosexual friendship.

It is important for society to recognize that young men need tenderness and affection just as much as do young girls and that an expression of these is no more to be wondered at or deplored in the one than in the other. Were this recognized, above all by the young men themselves, then many could pass through a homosexual phase of affection without a sense of guilt, and without believing that their need for this affection was evidence that they could not have normal heterosexual relationships. An easier attitude towards relationships of affection between young men, however expressed,

far from spreading permanent homosexuality, would help to make it more transient.

Unless the balance in numbers between the sexes becomes seriously upset, giving a preponderance of males, it is unlikely that pairs of older men will ever be as familiar a sight in society as pairs of older women will continue to be for several decades; but is there any reason to doubt that a permanent and loyal companionship, with the strength and security of mutual trust and affection, could be as tolerable and even valuable to society as the corresponding partnership between two women?

A Christian Attitude

There now comes the difficult matter of a Christian attitude to homosexual problems. On 16th September 1962, in his sermon in Canterbury Cathedral, the Bishop of Woolwich appealed for reform of "our utterly mediaeval treatment of homosexuals" and went on to say "as with capital punishment, one more determined push will see reform of something that is a peculiarly odious piece of English hypocrisy."

It will be clear from all that has gone before that we do not regard the standards of judgment relevant here as being different from those that apply to other sexual problems. Surely it is the nature and quality of a relationship that matters: one must not judge it by its outward appearance but by its inner worth. Homosexual affection can be as selfless as heterosexual affection, and therefore we cannot see that it is in some way morally worse.

Homosexual affection may of course be an emotion which some find aesthetically disgusting, but one cannot base Christian morality on a capacity for disgust. Neither are we happy with the thought that all homosexual behaviour is sinful: motive and circumstances degrade or ennoble any act, and we feel that to list sexual acts as sins is to follow the letter rather than the spirit, to kill rather than to give life.

Further we see no reason why the physical nature of a sexual act should be the criterion by which the question whether or not it is moral should be decided. An act which expresses true affection between two individuals and gives pleasure to them both, does not seem to us to be sinful by reason *alone* of the fact that it is homosexual. The same criteria seem to us to apply whether a relationship is heterosexual or homosexual.

"I seek only to apply to my own life the rules which govern the lives of all good men: freedom to choose a partner and, when that partner is found, to live with him discreetly and faithfully." (Wildeblood, 1957, p. 175.)

Is the homosexual to have that freedom, or must he, in Housman's words, "curse the God that made him for the colour of his hair"?

It is now necessary to emphasize that we are not saying that all homosexual acts or relationships are to be encouraged. It is difficult shortly to suggest circumstances which may give them a quality of sin. But first of all any element of force or coercion, or abuse of some superior position, must obviously put an act beyond the pale

and leave it to be condemned. The authors of this essay have been depressed quite as much by the utter abandon of many homosexuals, especially those who live in homosexual circles as such, as by the absurdity of the condemnation rained down upon the well-behaved. One must disapprove of the promiscuity and selfishness, the lack of any real affection, which is the stamp of so many adult relationships, heterosexual as well as homosexual. We see nothing in them often but thinly disguised lust, unredeemed by that real concern which has always been the essential Christian requirement in a human relationship.

But it is also obvious that the really promiscuous and degraded homosexual has not been helped by the total rejection he has had to face. Society has not said "if you do that, that is all right, but as to the other, we cannot approve of that". It has said "whatever you do must be wrong: indeed you *are* wrong".

Only if Society is prepared to revise this judgment and to accept even degraded homosexuals as human beings, can they be helped to face the moral implications of their selfish relationships.

IV. A NEW MORALITY NEEDED

The Church and Sexuality

It will be relevant at this point to refer to the history of the Church's attitude to sexuality throughout the centuries, and to elements in that attitude that seem inconsistent with some of the deepest insights in the Bible.

Throughout nearly all its history and in some sections of the Church today, the myth of Adam and Eve (called without justification the Fall of Man)* is treated as though it were historical fact on which logical arguments can be built. In this way, sexuality came to be regarded as necessarily polluted with sin in that event. Even when rejected as historical fact, this myth still has its effect upon the attitude of some Christians to sexuality; it will therefore be wise to think more about it. First, this, like other myths, had an earlier Babylonian origin and was used for religious purposes by the Jewish teachers. Further, like all myths, it is a poetic and symbolic representation of the condition and predicament of man. It is not exclusively or even primarily concerned with sexuality. It is a myth representing the transition of man, either in his racial history (phylogenesis) or his development from babyhood (ontogenesis) from an unreflective obedience to instinct to a condition in which he is responsible for his actions, in which he can reflect on them and make judgments and moral choices, weighing up possible courses of action in the light of a concept of good and evil.

It is a story, not of man's fall, but of man's growing up, and of the pain that growing up involves. It is significant that God is recorded as saying (*Gen. 3, v. 22*): "Behold, the man is become *one of us*, to know good and evil." To recognize and love what is good is to know also what is evil, to fear it and to be tempted by it. To know the good is to know joy, but it is also to experience pain, to be tempted to pride and presumption.

It is unfortunate that sexual intercourse takes place between Adam and Eve only after the expulsion from the Garden; this perhaps provides an excuse for thinking that sexual intimacy is associated with a sinful and disobedient state. But this is not given in the text nor is it a necessary implication. Indeed Eve claims the help of God in the matter. The shame associated with nakedness immediately after the eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge need not imply that sex became tainted there and then with sin: it may imply a recognition that our sexuality more than anything else in us can lift us to the heights of self-realization or plunge us into degradation; it is the focus of our self-awareness. The awareness of

* This was never suggested by Jesus, but seems to have come from Paul; see *Romans 5, v. 12-14*.

nakedness may further be a symbol of the awareness of vulnerability, of exposure to pain that must come with self-consciousness.

No doubt from the earliest days of Christianity there have been men and women for whom the sexual relationship was illumined and deepened by the Christian message of love, for whom it expressed a true equality, an equal-sided valuation and respect, for whom coitus was an expression of tenderness and unity, not merely the gratification of animal urges. But it is one of the great tragedies of history that not until recent times has this implication of Christianity found public expression.

Dr. Sherwin Bailey, a leading Anglican authority on this subject, can find no evidence of this expression in any theological writing before the appearance in the seventeenth century of *Holy Living*, by Jeremy Taylor, a married bishop of the English Church who owed much to the support and companionship of his wife. In that book coitus is for the first time referred to as an act that relates two people in togetherness. It was an experience "to lighten the cares and sadness of household affairs, and to endear each other." Dr. Bailey writes; "Taylor maintains that marriage is the queen of friendships, and husband and wife the best of all friends; the love that binds them together is a 'union of all things excellent': it contains in it proportion and satisfaction and rest and confidence." (Bailey, 1959.)

In contrast to this, for the previous fifteen hundred years almost every writer and leader in the Church, both Catholic and Reformed, regarded sexuality as unavoidably tainted with sin, and the sex-relationship in marriage (apart from procreation) as a licensed outlet for the bestial impulses in man. This latter concept of marriage is overwhelmingly repulsive to many of us now, yet it is no exaggeration to say that it has lingered in the Church almost to the present day, and only recently has it become possible to be married in church without hearing an echo of it in the marriage service.

Dr. Sherwin Bailey, writing of earlier centuries, says: "... the general impression left by the Church's teaching upon simple and unlearned people can only have been that the physical relationship of the sexes was regarded by religion as unworthy, if not as shameful and obscene. The effect of such teaching must necessarily have been grave; it caused a distortion of principles and values which has left an indelible mark upon Christian sexual thought and we can only guess at the psychological disturbances and conflicts which it has produced in the lives of individuals." (Bailey, 1959.)

Only in the present century have Christians dared in any general way to follow in the steps of Jeremy Taylor and to accept that, irrespective of any other purpose, coitus can be justified and dignified as the expression of a deep relation between two persons. We do not blame Christianity and Christians of earlier centuries; we can seek the origin of misconceived attitudes in the compromise between pagan and Christian thought and in the social conditions of the Dark Ages.

We have then to reject the idea that there is anything necessarily sinful about sexual activity. A better understanding of the nature and value of myth, and a more scientific approach to problems of human behaviour, have delivered many Christians from this

oppressive and destructive idea. Sexual activity is essentially neither good nor evil; it is a normal biological activity which, like most other human activities, can be indulged in destructively or creatively.

Further, if we take impulses and experiences that are potentially wholesome and in a large measure unavoidable and characterize these as sinful, we create a great volume of unnecessary guilt and an explosive tension within the personality. When, as so often happens, the impulse breaks through the restriction, it does so with a ruthlessness and destructive energy that might not otherwise have been there. A distorted Christianity must bear some of the blame for the sexual disorders of society.

A Way Forward

In trying to summarize the feelings and judgments that have come to us in the course of our several years' deliberations, we must keep this historical survey in mind. It supports us in rejecting almost completely the traditional approach of the organized Christian church to morality, with its supposition that it knows precisely what is right and what is wrong, that this distinction can be made in terms of an external pattern of behaviour, and that the greatest good will come only through universal adherence to that pattern. Nothing that has come to light in the course of our studies has altered the conviction that came to us when we began to examine the actual experiences of people—the conviction that love cannot be confined to a pattern. The waywardness of love is part of its nature and this is both its glory and its tragedy. If love did not tend to leap every barrier, if it could be tamed, it would not be the tremendous creative power we know it to be and want it to be.

So we are concerned with the homosexuals who say to each other "I love you" in the hopeless and bitter awareness of a hostile criminal code and hypocritical public opinion, and also with the anguish of men and women who know they love one another when marriage is impossible and only suffering can be envisaged. We recognize that, while most examples of the "eternal triangle" are produced by boredom and primitive misconduct, others may arise from the fact that the very experience of loving one person with depth and perception may sensitize a man or woman to the lovable qualities in others.

We think it our duty, not to stand on a peak of perfectionism, asking for an impossible conformity while the tide of human life sweeps by us, but to recognize, in compassion, the complications and bewilderment that love creates and to ask how we can discover a constructive way in each of an immense variety of particular experiences. It is not by checking our impulse to love that we keep love sweet. The man who swallows the words "I love you" when he meets another woman, may in that moment and for that reason begin to resent his wife's existence; but it is also true that love may be creative if honestly acknowledged though not openly confessed. We need to know much more about ourselves and what we do to our

inner life when we follow codes or ideals that do not come from the heart.

Those who have read so far will recognize how difficult it has been for us to come to definite conclusions as to what people ought or ought not to do. But although we cannot produce a ready-made external morality to replace the conventional code, there are some things about which we can be definite. *The first is that there must be a morality of some sort to govern sexual relationships.* An experience so profound in its effect upon people and upon the community cannot be left wholly to private judgment. It will never be right for two people to say to each other "We'll do what we want, and what happens between us is nobody else's business." However private an act, it is never without its impact on society, and we must never behave as though society—which includes our other friends—did not exist. *Secondly, the need to preserve marriage and family life has been in the forefront of our minds throughout our work.* It is in marriage that sexual impulses have their greatest opportunity for joyful and creative expression, and where two people can enter into each other's lives and hearts most intimately. Here the greatest freedom can be experienced—the freedom conferred by an unreserved commitment to each other, by loving and fearless friendship, and by openness to the world. In marriage, two people thus committed can bring children into the world, provide them with the security of love and home and in this way fulfil their sexual nature. *Finally, we accept the definition of sin given by an Anglican broadcaster, as covering those actions that involve exploitation of the other person.* This is a concept of wrong-doing that applies both to homosexual and heterosexual actions and to actions within marriage as well as outside it. It condemns as fundamentally immoral every sexual action that is not, as far as is humanly ascertainable, the result of a mutual decision. It condemns seduction and even persuasion, and every instance of coitus which, by reason of disparity of age or intelligence or emotional condition, cannot be a matter of mutual responsibility.

It is clear that we need a much deeper morality, one that will enable people to find a constructive way through even the most difficult and unpredictable situations—a way that is not simply one of withdrawal and abnegation. There are many who say that when people find themselves in a situation where it is difficult to be consistently moral, they must practise self-denial and "bear their cross". This is often the right way; but it is a serious misconception of the Cross to suggest that it is related only to self-denial.

Morality should be creative. God is primarily Creator, not rule-maker. Quakerism from the beginning rejected the idea of particular observances, rituals or sacrament, and instead regarded the whole of life's activities as potentially sacramental. The Quaker movement arose in a time of spiritual stirring. By rejecting all authority save that of the Holy Spirit and the headship of Christ, its vital witness was to an authority which begins in personal experience, in the encounter of man and God in the human spirit and mind. Quakerism begins with a search and its method is experimental.

Every true Christian, of whatever branch of the Church, accepts that the whole of his life must be brought before God. The Society

of Friends places particular emphasis on our individual and personal responsibility. We cannot accept as true a statement that is given us merely because it is given with the authority of tradition or of a Church. We have to make that truth our own—if it is a truth—through diligent and prayerful search and a rigorous discipline of thought and feeling. Man is intended to be a moral being. That is not to say that he should accept a formal morality, an observance of *mores*, but that his actions should come under searching scrutiny in the light that comes from the Gospels and the working of God within us.

There have been periods in our Quaker history when the effort to achieve consistency and integrity toppled over into a humourless scrupulosity, leading to a restricted life in which a pattern of conduct was secured at the expense of warmth and joy and creativeness. Friends, if they keep in mind the need to avoid this error, could help to discover that kind of conduct and inner discipline through which the sexual energy of men and women can bring health of mind and spirit to a world where man's energy always threatens to become destructive. We need a release of love, warmth and generosity into the world, in the everyday contacts of life, a positive force that will weaken our fear of one another and our tendencies toward aggression and power-seeking. We need to recognize fearlessly and thankfully the sexual origin of this force.

This search is a move forward into the unknown; it implies a high standard of responsibility, thinking and awareness—something much harder than simple obedience to a moral code. Further, the responsibility that it implies cannot be accepted alone; it must be responsibility within a group whose members are equally committed to the search for God's will.

Perhaps our last words should be to those, equally aware of the tragedy, who may be distressed and put off by our rejection of a morality that has seemed to them a product of Christianity. We do know, from the intimate experience of several of us, that it is possible to give substance to the traditional code, to live within its requirements, enriched by an experience of love at its most generous and tender, and conscious of our debt to Christ in showing us what love implies. We would ask those who cannot easily follow our thoughts to recognize what has driven us—Christians and Friends, trying to live up to the high standard of integrity that our religious society asks of us—to our insistent questioning.

It is the awareness that the traditional code, in itself, does not come from the heart; for the great majority of men and women it has no roots in feeling or true conviction. We have been seeking a morality that will indeed have its roots in the depths of our being and in our awareness of the true needs of our fellows.

We believe that there is indeed a place for discipline, but that it can only be fully healthy as well as fully Christian when it is found in application to the *whole* of life. The challenge to each of us is clear: accustom yourself to seeking God's will and to the experience of his love and power, become used in your daily life to the simple but tremendous spiritual fact that what God asks he enables, provided only and always that we want to do his will.

Men and women thus accustomed will not be less exposed to sexual difficulties—heterosexual or homosexual—than others whose lives are not “under discipline” in this way. As we see it, the difference lies in their response to the claims of sexual urges. Whereas the emotional or “moral” response focusses attention on the control of the sexual urge in isolation, the way of life we have described makes it likely that the particular sexual problem will be seen in the full context of ordinary daily living, and thus be kept in perspective as something for which God has not only a solution but a positive purpose.

Such positive purpose may—and often does—involve the acceptance of suffering by the person concerned. We have no unity with those who regard all tension and all frustration as being by definition bad or unhealthy: such a view is utterly without psychological foundation. The mental and spiritual well-being of a person depends rather on his or her developed capacity to deal with tensions and frustrations as and when they arise. The Christian cannot escape the implications of the Cross. In the power of the Holy Spirit, there are no dangers from which strength cannot be gained, no apparent disaster which cannot be transformed into spiritual opportunities.

V. CONCLUSION

What we have put forward already, and what appears in the appendices, give some idea of the great range of problems which may be brought by troubled people to those whom they trust and respect. Helping to alleviate disorders of the sort we have described is profoundly difficult, let no one doubt that: other problems such as poverty or physical ill-health are nothing compared with the more deeply ingrained sexual disorders which root themselves within the personality and seemingly defy the best attempts at relief. Individual counsellors may feel uncertain and unprepared, and it is to them that this section is directed. An understanding humility is no bad equipment. Such understanding of these disorders as we are able to share in these pages is directed towards a single aim, to give help.

Experience from discussions in our own group, the help we have had over the past five years from those within and without the Society of Friends, and the correspondence in *The Friend* and elsewhere, convince us that the desire to understand, to think deeply and to help, is widespread both amongst Friends and in other churches, but mere personal concern is not enough in a counselling situation. The over-confident or clumsy “do-gooder” can do much damage by treading with heavy feet among the tender problems of those in trouble. It is, however, also true that it is unnecessary for all enquirers to be sent automatically to the nearest marriage guidance bureau or psychiatric clinic. Such facilities already have more work than they can cope with in handling the more serious disorders, and such a step may magnify a problem that could be dealt with through ordinary understanding friendliness.

Men and women in sexual trouble usually feel that they are alone, cast out and rejected. Sympathetic friends may be of inestimable help, and indeed with many passing problems a listening ear and the reassurance which that can give are often all that is required. Most of those, for example, who are anxious about masturbation do not need psychiatric treatment but they may need help in overcoming a dominating habit. In only a few will this anxiety be a symptom of deeper disturbance. Sexual worries are often short-lived. They may be stirred up by life's passing crises (overwork, an examination, courtship, the death of a relative) and soon pass into oblivion.

Counselling at any level makes certain demands: first and foremost that of accessibility. It is hard to discuss one's sexual difficulties with others and it can be assumed that anyone wishing to do so is in some desperation, only coming after much heart-searching and plucking up of courage. Tuesday week, or even tomorrow evening, may be too late: the magic moment passes, courage may fail, a temporary but ultimately unsatisfactory solution may offer itself or, as in a few known cases, actual suicide may occur. Accessibility is thus both

crucial and a dual problem: the "right" person must also somehow be readily reached.

Next is the need to listen with compassion but without judgment. Sexually troubled people are often overloaded with guilt about their condition: automatic censure is nothing new to them and serves only to increase their distress and isolation. Emotional reactions from the counsellor, arising mostly from origins of which he or she is not aware, are unhelpful. The realities of sexual conduct are far more complex than many yet realize, as we have tried to show; the counsellor must therefore be interested but unshockable, neither gleefully inquisitive nor blatantly horrified. The interest shown by some counsellors has a vicariously erotic flavour, and this can help neither party. Finally there is the need for absolute discretion, a secrecy equal to that of the confessional. Intimate details must only be given away with the person's consent, and in effect this means only to those who may be called on to help more expertly in treatment. With homosexual disorders in particular, the illegal nature of certain types of conduct may place some counsellors in a difficult position, but their duty is as clear as it is to the priest.

Because of the complexity of many of the matters herein discussed, we believe it right that for Christians, especially in larger congregations, one or two experienced counsellors should be known to be available, but we recognize that in sparsely populated rural areas this may not be possible.

Those who are called upon to give intimate and personal counsel will soon be aware of changing attitudes to morality among their fellow-members and they may feel it necessary to initiate group discussion on sexual matters. There is a danger that any compassionate view that is published—like this present essay—may be misread. A reader here and there may accept *some* of our ideas, and then proceed to put his interpretation of them into action—imposing on his victims the consequences of a permissiveness that we appear to support. It must therefore be said that at no point does our approach approve of mere permissiveness. To the question "May we do what we like?" we do *not* answer "Yes, you may". We have been led to ask what may be the actual and ultimate result in the persons concerned of love affairs involving coitus, and have implied that the result is not necessarily or invariably destructive. We do not, however, encourage anyone to think that it would be "perfectly all right" to make love with a casual friend who equally desires the experience.

The true answer to our open question might prove to be as critical of "free love" as of mere obedience to an external morality. Sexual actions can never be primitively "innocent". We are not in the Garden of Eden. We are a complex race of people with the imprint of a long history on our spirits. Sexual actions stir us far below the level of consciousness, and may do more than we know to shape our future. There is an almost overwhelming urge throughout society towards the trivializing of sexual actions and the separating of them from the rest of life. A young man, whose whole working life is given to preparation for a responsible career, may nevertheless think it all right to propose "going to bed" to a girl he has only just

met and whose surname is unknown to him. We think it probable that to use one's capacity for love-making in so tenuous a relationship is to reduce ultimately one's capacity for any depth of feeling or commitment. For in many such liaisons there is a deliberate intention to steer clear of being involved, to have fun without commitment.

In trying to work out the implications of the high standard of responsibility demanded in this essay, we have been unable to avoid the continual challenge of the questions—*when is it right to have sexual intercourse?* and, *is it ever right outside marriage?* The problem of sexual behaviour outside marriage is everywhere under discussion at the present time, and the needs of many who want guidance are not met by the simple statement that chastity is right and un-chastity wrong. Such a statement leaves many untouched and some desperate.

We condemn exploitation in any form. Exploitation is using the partner to satisfy a physical or an emotional need without considering the other as a person. There are many forms of exploitation from the extreme of prostitution for material gain to exploitation in marriage. It is exploitation if the insecure boy enhances his sense of masculine adulthood by sexual adventures, without considering the girl's feelings. It is equally exploitation if the girl leads the young man into marriage by using her attraction as a bait without thinking about his welfare. Exploitation can also happen in non-sexual relationships when the stronger character accepts adoration from the weaker and the less mature, or when one person uses the other to enrich his or her status or self-confidence. This can occur not only between unequal, but also between equal partners. In marriage it is also exploitation if the man uses the woman to show his masculine prowess or the woman uses the man to establish her social status as a married woman, or as one who is attractive and valued. Neither partner has stopped to consider the other's value.

In seeking to find a truly Christian judgment of this problem, we have again and again been brought to the quality of human relationships as the only final criterion. To base our judgment on whether or not the sex-act has taken place is often to falsify that judgment fantastically. Is the girl who remains chaste, but leaves would-be lovers stimulated to the point where desire would almost certainly seek relief elsewhere, more or less blameworthy than the girl who surrenders, whether in mistaken generosity or in the pathetic desire to "keep her boy"? *The Christian standard of chastity should not be measured by a physical act, but should be a standard of human relationship, applicable within marriage as well as outside it* (see p. 56).

Moreover, the problem of what to say to the early developing, over-stimulated youth of the present time is not the same as the problem of what to say to the responsible young men and women equipped by experience and education to analyse and evaluate a situation in which they find themselves. A simple "thou shalt not" meets the needs of neither.

When human relationships are judged by this criterion, it is found to result in an assessment of behaviour not very different from that of conventional Christian morality, but it brings us to a new realization

of the true nature of chastity. True chastity is a quality of the spirit: it entails the deepest respect and a profound value for human relationships. It involves the most generous giving, which may mean the restraint of withholding, but it is not solely measured in physical terms. Further, there are lives which are being lived unconventionally with more true chastity than some lived in obedience to conventional codes.

If chastity means respect for oneself and others, then promiscuity is the final denial of it. It denies the importance of personality, and those who seek relief in this way of life imprison their true selves—they are sexual deviants damaging both themselves and their transitory partner by divorcing the physical from the spiritual and keeping impersonal what should involve the whole personality. Yet wherever the most transient relationship has, as it may have, an element of true tenderness and mutual giving and receiving, it has in it something of good.

Promiscuity cannot be countered by the mere statement that it is sinful: its causes need to be sought and understood. It is often the expression of loneliness and insecurity, born of a lack of experience of real relationships with others. Promiscuity is exploitation—one-sided or mutual—but the wrongfulness of exploitation cannot be realized unless the significance of personality is perceived, until it is recognized, as Von Hügel put it, that "caring is the greatest thing, caring matters most."

Easier to judge with compassion, but in some ways more difficult to contend with, are the boy and girl relationships where both believe themselves totally committed and so have intercourse together. Today the dangers of pregnancy must and should be clearly set forth, and the wrongfulness of irresponsibly creating a life is something which boy and girl should know before they are deeply involved. Even were society's attitude to the child born out of wedlock to become more charitable, still the fatherless child is deprived of the family background that is its natural, right environment.

We must be prepared, however, to look ahead to the time when contraception is completely reliable and pregnancy is not a danger, and consider what sanctions and what motives can then be put forward. It is right and proper that many boys and girls and young men and women should fall in and out of love a number of times before they marry—and this process will involve emotional heights and depths. If these experiences are to be educative, they must involve all the personality, but such a series of experiences will be, generally, less disruptive if the final sexual commitment is avoided. Society can and should offer educational relationships by giving opportunities for the young to do things together. While they have no resources but to sit entwined in the cinema, watching huge photographs of impassioned love scenes, they will learn no outlet for their feelings for each other save those of passionate love-making. But an activity shared with other couples may help a pair to look outward at life together rather than inward at each other, and so save them from being deeply committed physically before they are otherwise ready.

Impersonal exploitation, the dangers of pregnancy, the disruptive effect of a series of love affairs involving intercourse—these are

heavy arguments in favour of continence in the young unmarried. Should we go further and say unequivocally that it is utterly wrong to have intercourse outside marriage, and if so on what grounds? Only those who remain virgin until marriage can tell the value of this in their married lives, and the number of couples who express their joy at having done this, constitutes an impressive argument to offer to the young unmarried. As one couple has said, "the trouble is that until you are married, you don't realize why it is so important not to beforehand". We feel, however, constrained to say, what we believe to be true, that many deeply rich and happy marriages exist when one or both partners has had previous sexual experience, and that it would be both cruel and untrue to suggest otherwise. This same truth is borne out in the experience of the many happy second marriages which abound. It is, of course, easy to say that the individual who has moved carelessly from one liaison to another is unlikely to be successful or faithful in marriage. Even this does not necessarily follow if the transitory affairs were the expression of an insecurity or immaturity which genuine love later enables him to supersede. Moreover, it must be recognized that there are those who before marriage allow themselves a sexual freedom which they would indignantly repudiate as permissible within the marriage bond.

It has indeed been claimed that marriages are more successful where there has been previous sexual experience. This claim can be neither proved nor disproved. Those who are happily married may attribute their happiness to whatever previous experiences they have had. Those who believe in sexual freedom before marriage may claim that their marriages are happy rather than admit the possibility that they were wrong; the same may be true of those who came virgin to marriage, and would be unwilling to acknowledge, or might even be unaware of, a lack of adjustment due to their inexperience. Where an experience previous to marriage has been one of depth and integrity, where the individual has learnt from it, even if the lesson were one of suffering, then the resulting growth of personality could be a strength and not a weakness in the marriage.

We have so far considered only pre-marital relationships with others than the future wife or husband. For a couple to have intercourse before marriage merely to see whether they really want to marry, is likely to be a disastrously misleading experiment. For some, harmony experienced before marriage disappears once they are committed in marriage; others may mistake for failure what is, in fact, a lack of mutual adjustment which experience could overcome. More important than either, perhaps, the atmosphere of tentativeness prevents the mutual abandonment essential to happy adjustment.

We have felt that a distinction should be drawn between this situation and that of the couple, who, with their wedding day fixed and imminent, deliberately anticipate it, in order that the moment when they take each other as man and wife shall be completely private to themselves alone. For them, their marriage begins then and there. Censure seems, in such a case, impertinent; yet it must also be said that for others their great joy is to wait until they have gladly and publicly exchanged their promises. It should be stressed that,

where either partner feels doubt or guilt, it would be dangerous for them to anticipate their wedding night.

Finally, something must be said of those who are adult and unmarried and find themselves deeply in love, in a situation where marriage is impossible. When two people are deeply committed to each other, but for some reason unable to marry, then the level of judgment is a totally different one. They may, in fact, live as husband and wife and their union may, in its inherent quality, be indistinguishable from that of a legally married couple. There are faithful, permanent and rich partnerships of this sort that deserve our deepest sympathy and often our respect. Yet such a relationship can affect others beside the couple concerned and the full cost of this has to be counted.

What then is chastity? It is the antithesis of what was recently described to one of us as "the hire purchase attitude of this age"—the attitude that implies: "I want it *now* and I must have it. I will pay later—perhaps—if I can". It is not rigid restraint nor refusal to be involved; it is not arid self-discipline nor living according to a moral pattern. It is a wholeness of personality, courtesy and charity, sincerity and purity of heart. It is not necessarily measured in physical terms; it is a total absence of exploitation; it is as necessary a part of marriage as of a single life.

There are no clear-cut answers to the questions we have posed, and this nearly every counsellor will be forced to admit if he seeks to understand fully a particular situation. This is precisely because we are dealing with human relationships at their deepest, the point where rules are irrelevant. But the point where rules cease to apply is also the point at which our first and greatest need is to seek the will of God. This at least we can say to our fellow members of the Society of Friends: that if the traditional code seems now to be of little value, either in restraining us or in pointing out the way to generous living, then more than ever we need the presence of God in our judgments and decisions. And Christianity, precisely because it is concerned with the quality of human relationships, is more relevant to the unforeseen and the intensely difficult than it is to the neatly patterned way of life.

What now can we say to those who do not accept God in their lives and may indeed reject any religious influence?—to the numerous boys and girls who tumble into sexual intimacy when they are little more than children, who are confused by what it does to them and escape from confusion into toughness; to the young adults whose bottle parties are followed by indiscriminate sexual indulgence; to those whose marriages are unsatisfying and who seek distraction elsewhere; to the homosexuals living in a hell in which they are torn between a genuine impulse to tenderness and an overwhelming sense of lust? For those who are already involved we can do little, except in so far as we meet particular cases; and then our approach has to be through compassion—the reverse of moral judgment. Through this we may be admitted to their lives and their problems, and our questions may become worthy of their consideration; it is by helping them in their self-questioning rather than by giving judgment that truth can be brought to light.

The response of Friends and counsellors generally to the problem as a whole must obviously be through a clearer concept of the purpose of education and of life in community. The fulfilment of our nature as distinctively human beings is through relationships that are *personal*, through the kind of friendship that is its own justification. To some this must seem so obvious as to make them forget that to an enormous extent the structure of society and the incentives it offers constitute a flat denial of this view. Almost the whole of the time spent in educational training is directed towards the study of groups and not of individuals; that is, towards a functional relationship, not a personal one, and significance is thought of as social significance, in terms of power and prestige. The recognition of personal relationship and the understanding of its nature are left to chance. This subject has been fully discussed by Rhymes (1964, pp. 53–56).

Some schools now admit counsellors trained by the Marriage Guidance Council to talk to their pupils about problems of sexual conduct and marriage, and a very important part of their work has proved to be a discussion of the nature of personal relationships, showing how young people can grow to maturity through them. It is clear that this is not self-evident to young people; the recognition of what is personal is not provided by instinct or common sense and it is confused by the meretricious attractions and influences of our urban and affluent society. A personal relationship is a loving relationship in its most meaningful sense—the sense implied by "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . and thy neighbour as thyself*". This is a love that has no ulterior purpose. It contains its own fulfilment in itself. Much has yet to be done to understand and clarify the nature of love. Too much attention has been given to love as an ideal, good or bad, noble or sentimental; too little to it as a form of action, a continuing and developing experience. Most novels are devoted to the analysis of the breakdown of love, the working out of its painful or tragic aspect in stock situations; few describe its fulfilment through the difficulties and crises of ordinary life. Everyone knows the passion, the excitement, the adoration that are the content of sexual experience in the first stage; but the nature of love as an established relationship is less easy to demonstrate in a convincing way to those who are caught in these first obsessions. This demonstration is an urgent necessity, for much more needs to be known as to what gives love stability and endurance and, conversely, what may leave it open to destruction.

The philosophic and religious approach to the nature of personal relationship has been explored by two outstanding thinkers in our time: Martin Buber and John Macmurray. It is to the latter that we owe the clearest exposition in English. His *Reason and Emotion*, first published in 1935, threw a new and startling light on sexual and general morality at a time when, because of the collapse of Western economy, many people were thinking furiously, and constructively, about the purpose of life and society. This book is equally relevant to our problems today. Those who wish to share our search for a new and effective morality will benefit from reading it, and, if obtainable, its predecessor *Freedom in the Modern World*.

Macmurray puts forward a new definition of chastity as "emotional

sincerity", linking it with the sense in which a work of art can be said to be chaste and with the meaning of the words of Jesus, "Blessed are the pure in heart". Chastity, he says, is "sincerity in the expression of what we feel; and it is the fundamental virtue, from one point of view, of a Christian morality... It is the condition of personal integrity." The awareness with which our group has done its work may well be put in these lines from *Reason and Emotion*:

Though Europe has developed itself intellectually with a steady growth upwards, has progressed in its grasp of principle, in scholarship and understanding, in the organisation and control of life and the world, it has remained all but completely barbarous on the emotional side. Our civilization, for all its scientific and administrative capacity, has remained emotionally vulgar and primitive, unchaste in the extreme. We do not indeed recognize this, of course, because it is simply the reflection of our own inner insensibility. That insensibility is the inevitable result of a morality based upon will and reason, imposing itself upon the emotions and so destroying their integrity. Until we insist upon emotional sincerity, until we cease playing ducks and drakes with our feelings in the mistaken desire to dragoon them into conformity with what we conceive to be our 'duties', until we begin to trust our emotional life, this state of affairs will necessarily go on. Our sex-morality, in particular, will remain blind, barbarous and unreal, a vulgarity and a scandal (p. 132).

It might be added that our sex-morality, because it has not met the needs of people as persons, has been unable to prevent, and may indeed have caused, a great measure of personal tragedy between men and women and in the lives of their children.

Often it is the very idealism of a religious group that prevents its members from understanding the actions and needs of people. Idealism can be a sign of spontaneous and selfless devotion in an integrated personality. But too often it is the attachment of emotion to a pattern of ideas or morals, and this kind of idealism can be an escape from having to face the darker levels of our own nature. In this shadowed region of the personality, all that we consciously repudiate lives on, for the time being so overlaid by fine sentiments that we are unaware of its existence. It is in a crisis, when controls give way, that this shadow-life tends to become active and ravaged feelings make communication impossible just when it is most needed. A deeper morality must be concerned with the whole nature of man, not merely with his conscious intentions and sentiments.

In view of this, those who genuinely wish to give help to others in sexual confusion and distress will—if they really understand what their task is—be compelled to consider every aspect of family life and especially the relationships through which young people grow up. They must always reflect on the experiences that will decide whether their impulses and feelings remain confused and destructive under the surface of apparently good behaviour, or whether they will come to know themselves and discover the discipline through which their feelings and impulses can work towards a creative end.

APPENDIX A

ORIGINS OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR

In defending freedom in human sexual relationships the claim that promiscuity is "natural" is often made; and in condemning some kinds of sexual behaviour, especially homosexual relationships between men, the term "unnatural" is used. "Natural" and "unnatural" are usually undefined; but they often seem to refer either to the animal kingdom, or to something vaguely thought of as "primitive man". It is with these two judgments in mind that the following sections have been written, the first relating to sexuality in the animal kingdom, and the second to sexuality in man from the standpoint of anthropology.

I A Biological Viewpoint

Maleness and femaleness are characteristics of most plants and animals. In many marine animals which live together in large numbers, such as jelly-fish, star-fish, cod and herring, the male and female elements (sperm and eggs) are liberated into the sea, without direct contact between the parents. Males and females of the same species usually reach sexual maturity at the same time (a rhythm which is a widespread feature of both plants and animals), and liberation of eggs may stimulate liberation of sperm, a two-fold synchronization which increases the likelihood of fertilization. Yet of the enormous numbers of tiny, unprotected larvae that then develop, most die or are eaten before reaching adult form. There are, however, a number of marine animals, such as whelks and dog-fish, in which internal fertilization ensures insemination and permits the female to surround a much smaller number of fertilized eggs with shells, before they are laid. Such eggs are rich in yolk, which nourishes the protected young, so that they reach an advanced stage of development before hatching and have a good chance of survival. For terrestrial animals, such as insects, reptiles, birds and mammals, internal fertilization is essential, otherwise the sperm and ova would dry up and die. In the first three groups mentioned the resistant and waterproof shell saves the developing young from desiccation. All but the most primitive mammals have, however, evolved a different way of protecting their young within the uterus of the mother, and of nourishing them through the placenta, so that yolk and shell are alike unnecessary and the egg is minute.

Internal fertilization by copulation is associated with more or less complex patterns of mating behaviour which may broadly be described as courtship. Courtship has both physiological and social value. Physiologically, it initiates the relevant hormonal activity and often facilitates fertilization by inducing the simultaneous release of eggs and sperm; its social effect is to overcome the natural tendency

in many animals to avoid close contact. Especially for territorial species, or for those which fight for food, clear signals must be given to indicate why an approach is being made. Readiness to mate in one partner may release the mating response in the other. Display by cock birds stimulates the hens to respond; but in most mammals it is the hormonally controlled oestrous cycle in the female that determines the rhythm of mating for both sexes, for, although the male can mate at any time, the female will only accept him during her short phase of oestrous or "heat".

Among primates, however (though female baboons may mate in oestrous), there is no such limitation on the time of mating in most monkeys and apes, nor in the human; nor do these show any special oestrous behaviour. From an early age mating actions are included with other play activities, like wrestling and jumping; and in the mature, copulation is not confined to any particular season. Nevertheless, the rhythmic recurrence of menstruation in monkeys, as in the human, reflects a phase of the same underlying oestrous cycle, as in other mammals.

In both birds and mammals, courtship and mating are but the first stages in a reproductive cycle that usually includes, not only incubation or gestation, but also feeding of the young and much other parental care. Birds building their nests or a lioness teaching her cubs are all following out their particular cycle. If, as often happens, both parents are employed in feeding and protecting the young, they may be closely associated for weeks or months without sexually exciting one another.

The complete reproductive cycle of different species varies greatly in detail from one to another; but it is always controlled by hormones. The cycle of many small birds and mammals is short and enables them to rear several families in one season, with little respite from sexual activity for the parents; if the cycle is long, however, it may occur only once in the year and be so related to the seasons, that the new generation appears in the Spring, when it is most likely to survive. Then, after the young become independent, there may be some months when the sex-drive is latent and the entire energies of the pair, herd or pack, are devoted to seeking food and avoiding danger.

Pairing in some birds and mammals may be for one cycle only; but it is often for life. Even when mating is not restricted to a single pair, the sexual pattern is far from being one of total promiscuity. Courting behaviour may be frequent, and often casual; but mating is not casual. Individual relationships are important and often of long duration. Among mammals and birds, and even some fish, monogamy and what for humans would be called "faithfulness" are commonly observed. In primates the pattern is varied: male baboons prevent weaker males from having access to their wives; but the females will mate with the other males, if their overlord's attention is temporarily distracted. Among other monkeys and the apes there may be close-knit family units, within which mating takes place in a constant pattern, or there may be permanent, monogamous pairs.

Homosexual behaviour has been recorded in a wide range of animals and under a variety of conditions. In many species young

animals seem at first unable to distinguish male from female and attempt to copulate indiscriminately with either. The young bachelor males of herds where the overlord male jealously protects his harem will mount each other, sometimes in a regular hierarchy. Both males and females in some highly social fishes, birds and mammals have been observed to adopt the behaviour of the opposite sex. This alternation of sexual behaviour is closely linked with dominance: in a dominance series of three individuals, the middle individual behaves as female to the upper, and as male to the lower ranking individual, whatever the sex of each one of the three. Reversal of sexual behaviour can also be associated with a state of high sexual excitement and stock-breeders recognize masculine behaviour by sows, mares and cows as a reliable sign of readiness to breed. Apart from these cases, which might be classified as due to inexperience or dominance, male rats in a high state of excitement have been seen to mount males as well as females, although in this case the male was clearly a substitute. More permanent homosexual partnerships have been observed rarely in porpoises but often in monkeys, where males and females have been seen to alternate freely between heterosexual and homosexual partnerships.

The basic pattern of man's sexual behaviour resembles that of other primates rather than that of more rigidly cyclic bird and mammalian groups. While in a few primates, the oestrous cycle of the female still plays an important part in determining both male and female behaviour, in most primates, including man, both sexes can be stimulated at virtually all times and seasons. Man's power of abstract thought and language, however, enables him to be sexually excited by sights, scents and sounds not directly related to sexual behaviour. If man's primate nature is to be taken as a criterion, then infantile sex-play, homosexual activity and varying degrees of heterosexual promiscuity must all equally be described as "natural".

Nevertheless, when man's sexual pattern is critically examined, it becomes clear, as in birds and other mammals, that there is no society in which sexual behaviour is "natural" in the sense of being totally uninhibited.

II The Contribution of Anthropology

To gain some understanding of human sexual conduct it is useful to step back from our own particular society, with its long standing taboos and ready-made moral attitudes, and to examine the sexual codes of different communities.

Anthropological literature is so rich in accounts of sexuality in distant places, that it is possible to prove almost anything about sex by reference to parts of these writings. The overall picture, of which we can give but the smallest glimpse, engenders wonder at the infinite variety of man. (Ford and Beach, 1951.)

Within this bewildering variety of sexual codes and conduct certain generalizations can probably be made. If a community is to survive children must be born, and heterosexuality is always accepted as the principal sexual outlet, even in those tribes which elevate homosexual acts to a high place in tribal ceremony. Nevertheless,

homosexuality seems to be invariably found, even in tribes that punish it by death, and it may play an important part in puberty rituals. Transvestite homosexuals (see p. 73) are occasionally elevated to a position of honour and dignity, and in cultivated communities from Mesopotamia to Mexico, homosexuality has played a respected part in the life of the community.

Comparison of different cultures confirms the presence of underlying sexual drives in children, just as in immature animals. Love-play is probably universal and may be greeted by adults in one place with pleasure and encouragement, and in another with stern suppression. There is evidence which suggests that adult heterosexuality presents fewer problems where early love-play is tolerated than where it is suppressed. It seems that some inhibited, taboo-ridden, traditional cultures are shot through with sexual troubles from which more permissive societies are largely free. It has been claimed that women in certain societies which forbid adolescent and pre-adolescent sex-play are usually passive, take little part in coitus and rarely enjoy orgasm. The reverse applies to women from easy-going cultures.

Masturbation seems to occur in animals as well as in every human community. Adult masturbation is almost always proscribed in humans—perhaps to promote fecundity, but possibly due to a mistaken belief that it has profound ill effects. Manual or oral stimulation of the genitals by the love-partner are also of the widest occurrence in animals and man: in general it is the male that takes the more active role. This form of love-making may, rarely, be taboo. The only virtually universal prohibition emerging from studies of different races seems to be that against incest between siblings or between parent and child. Such behaviour occurs readily in animals, though seldom in humans, but incest thoughts appear in the unconscious mind, and are sometimes expressed in dreams. Some anthropologists have concluded that this taboo is of social origin, designed to protect the basic unit of society—the “nuclear” family—from disintegration. Another common rule is that against intercourse during menstruation.

More differences in forms of love-making can exist within a culture than is often recognized. In the U.S.A. (and probably in this country) orogenital contact seems much less common in what are often called the lower social classes. Such class variations in our culture are of considerable importance and many from lower income groups, contrary to what might be thought, retain firm sexual proscriptions. For example married couples often think it vulgar to view each other (or to copulate) naked, and any posture other than with the woman supine and the man on top is thought perverted. There seems no good reason for these beliefs.

In primates also, with their highly-developed powers of experiment and learning, various methods of mating have been observed in the same species. *Homo sapiens*, especially the male, needs most tuition of all, and his anatomical freedom permits that vast repertoire of heterosexual expression found, for example, in earlier Indian culture and preserved for us in sculpture and writing. When it is “not done” to discuss sexuality—as in many Western sub-cultures—

the lack, or inaccuracy, of information can be expected to hamper adult sexual expression.

Heterosexual variation may be in posture or fore-play and, as expected, it is the least inhibited cultures that experiment most. Varied and extended fore-play, often learned in adolescence, has the function of synchronizing orgasm for the more slowly aroused female. Whatever may be the moral implications of such an inference, it would seem that the prohibition of physical intimacies before marriage (taking place usually in the twenties) may hamper for some its full enjoyment later.

As has been stated already, there is almost no society in which sexual behaviour is “natural” in the sense of being uninhibited. Almost without exception, human societies all over the world have evolved complex codes of behaviour, the breaking of which is in some regarded with tolerance, in others punished with death. What is permitted, encouraged, or forbidden varies enormously from one society to another. Love-play between children, paederasty, adult homosexuality, free heterosexual relations between the young unmarried or between the married, each of these can, in different societies, be rigidly forbidden, tolerated, or encouraged.

The facts referred to in these two brief surveys are useful in providing a perspective, but it is clear that they cannot legitimately be used to justify either our desires or our prejudices. The criteria which we use to determine the pattern of sexual behaviour in our own society cannot be derived either from a study of the animal kingdom or from other human societies, but only from our conception of the whole nature of man, and of his responsibilities.

III Sex and Personality

The factors which determine our sexual conduct and which can cause it to go wrong are little known. Conclusive studies scarcely exist and present methods are so far too crude to measure much of the delicate emotion of the human being. Of theories, however, there are plenty, and essentially they are of two kinds: the *genetic* or *organic* theories which link sexual orientation to bodily chemical factors (the hormones and genes) and the *environmental* or *cultural* theories which attribute sexual expression to influences from without during the growth process. These theories, of course, reflect the age-old controversy of “nature” versus “nurture”. Even the most diehard proponents of one or other theory would doubtless admit that the truth lies in a combination of both factors, but within that truism lie crucial differences of emphasis. A Gallup Poll of the nation would probably reveal an overwhelming impression that sexual deviants are born and not made. But this does not seem to be so. The discussion which follows relates especially to homosexuality because this is numerically the most important deviation and also the one most fully studied.

(a) *Genetic Theory*. It is commonly believed that the appearance and mannerisms of some homosexuals (but by no means all), together with the fact that such traits can often be traced to an early

age, suggest an innate origin for such cases. Furthermore a frequently quoted study of identical twins gave what seemed to be the strongest support for the genetic theory of homosexuality.

The discovery that each sex secretes some hormones of the opposite sex seemed to imply a physiological mechanism and hopes once ran high that sexual behaviour might be influenced and corrected by the use of hormones. New methods of examining the hormones and chromosomes of sex were expected to tell us more about "genetic" homosexuality, but results so far have run counter to that theory.

It is now possible to recognize and classify those rare people (hermaphrodites) who lie mid-way between male and female in a bodily sense; and who, owing to an abnormality of development, possess within themselves some organs of both sexes and external physical features of an intermediate kind. In particular, conditions may occur in which the rather uncertain external appearance suggests the opposite of the sex indicated by the cell nucleus. The parents being mistaken, such cases may be brought up in the wrong gender, and, according to their genes, should surely become homosexual, but this does not seem to happen. Such people either grow into an adjustment to the sexual role thus allotted to them, although the sexual drive is sometimes weak or absent, or they may revolt and change to their genetic sex. Though extremely rare, such cases are obviously of great importance to our understanding of the physiology and psychology of sex; but they are not, contrary to popular belief, related to homosexuality.

Again, studies of the hormones, the chromosomes, and the bodily structure of undoubted homosexuals, including males of effeminate type, have failed to distinguish them from normal people of the same sex. Injections or tablets of sex hormone do not alter sexual orientation; in general male hormone increases the drive and female decreases it, but the direction of sexual interest remains the same.

The genetic theory, then, seems far from established. An inherited tendency to react in certain ways to some difficult life situations may well exist, and would account for some of the conflicting evidence above. So far, however, we must say that environmental influences are the most crucial, and some examples which have special relevance to homosexuality are described below.

(b) *Psychological Factors.* The psychoanalytic school founded by Freud at the turn of the century ascribes a large role to the sexual drive in human thought and behaviour. The interpretation of the very word "sex" is extremely wide and a variety of everyday phenomena are held to conceal sexual motives. The origins of emotional reactions—normal and abnormal—are thought to lie in the infant's progress through phases of oral, anal and genital pleasure. Failure to pass through these stages (for reasons of "constitution" or inadequacies of upbringing) will, it is held, produce neurotic or sexual troubles later on, together with certain distinctive personality traits. Early relationships with both parents are crucial in helping or obstructing this process of development; the male infant is held to desire his mother in an elementary sexual way, and to regard the father as a dangerous rival. This is the Oedipus situation, through

which it is claimed all male children pass. Its female counterpart is called the Electra situation, but this appears a rather less powerful and significant event in the life of the girl, than is the Oedipus situation to the boy. It is through difficulties at these stages—between two and five years—that sexual disorders are held to commence. The deep-rootedness of sexual adjustment supports the clinical observation that those who successfully pass these stages are seldom threatened by the maladjustments of those whom they may happen to meet in later life. Conversely an ingrained disorder is seldom helped merely by altering the adult sexual environment: "the love of a good woman" is more likely to precipitate acute anxiety in a homosexual than to help him.

Stress has been laid by psychiatrists of almost every school of thought on the personalities of the parents in furthering the child's sexual development. The child identifies himself with them, imitates their behaviour and assumes the role of the same-sexed parent. Failure to identify in this way seems to produce much sexual disorder. The mother of the male homosexual frequently seems to be forceful, protective and possessive, retaining a powerful emotional hold over the lad well into maturity, while the father is often either weak and ineffectual, or remote and punitive. It is sobering to note that in many Quaker families the father bears careful witness to pacific ideals while the mother adopts a more active, aggressive and "emancipated" role. The types of background associated with homosexual difficulties are, however, more complex than this and need elaborating. The psychological mechanisms described work at varying levels of conscious awareness.

(i) A strong bond may exist between the child and the parent of the opposite sex while the expression of affection is inhibited. On the one hand, there is the adored but unapproachable mother who is often herself afraid of men and loves her boy without appreciating his sexuality. On the other, there is the girl who loves her father and is loved by him, while he rejects or is afraid of her femininity. The child comes in his inner mind to feel that the sexual part of him (or her) is not lovable, is dangerous and needs to be suppressed in order to find favour with the loved parent. Because the bond is strong, the influence is lasting. The child's resulting uncertainty about his or her own genital power intensifies and prolongs the usual homosexual phase of puberty. This course is by no means inevitable and other influences, especially from brothers and sisters, or from other people of the opposite sex, may play a great part in intensifying or counteracting the effects of the parental relationship, as may also the child's tendency to rebel or not to rebel against the parental attitude.

(ii) The parent of the same sex may play an insignificant role in the child's life because of frequent or prolonged absences, or poor ability to assert himself or herself, against the other parent's more dominant role. A similar situation occurs if the marriage is disturbed, and one parent is blamed for all wrongs. If, for example, the absent father is pictured as bad and weak the son may strive to become unlike him and, if he lacks other examples of manhood, he may strive to resemble his mother. (A boy held to resemble a father who was ridiculed by the mother and her family, came to hate himself and his maleness and

desired to be like a woman). Any situation which causes the child to be ashamed of the parent of the same sex may have such an influence. Again, as under (i), the child will tend to seek reassurance from close contact with his companions during the normal homosexual phase and success in doing so is likely to prolong this phase.

(iii) There is a close bond with the parent of the same sex who appreciates, fosters, and loves the child's sexuality, but derives rather too much satisfaction therefrom, so that the sexual nature of this relationship is reinforced and with it feelings of incest-guilt, especially in the child. This situation may cause the boy or girl later to shirk contact with the opposite sex for fear of violating the incest barrier. In such cases the fear may become less when the parent ages or dies, and the person frees himself from the tie. The incest barrier operates more strongly if the close tie is with a sibling instead of a parent. The situation becomes graver when the small boy's or girl's desire for physical contact with the parent of the opposite sex meets with rebuff and repulsion rather than with that acceptance which would permit the Oedipus phase to be "worked through". It is again the parent's fear of this contact which causes the child's inhibition.

(iv) A child's sexuality can be depreciated if it is belittled by parents, siblings, family or associates. This can happen more easily when a physical defect or imagined weakness hinders easy expression of those parts of life commonly thought of as "male" or "female". Thus a boy who has often been ill, who is physically puny or short in stature, would more likely despair about his masculine abilities than would other boys and would suffer still more if he experienced family ridicule, in particular from the stronger father or elder brother. He would tend, again, to seek reassurance in homosexual relationships and contacts, and thereby intensify and prolong these beyond the normal phase. Similarly a girl who believes herself to lack grace or beauty or other feminine features, will be more likely to develop masculine qualities—especially if a feminine and good-looking mother depreciates her.

In all these cases it is not the strong affection between child and parent that causes harm to the child's feelings about his sex, although a very strong bond does seem to delay maturity. What matters is the quality of the relationship, and especially the parents' valuation of the child's sexual role. If a mother depreciates her boy's growing masculinity because she herself is frightened of maleness, the boy may deny his masculine tendencies in an attempt to please her. A girl who, in a loving relationship with her father, fosters her masculine assertion because he appreciates it, will not find pleasure in her own femininity. But even this picture is too simple. A boy may be so strongly linked with the father and lacking in relationship with his mother that he comes to take on a female role in relation to his own father. The same may be said about an exclusive link between mother and daughter, though this may become equivalent to a sister relationship.

(v) The relationship between brothers and sisters or other children with whom the child lives in close contact can be as influential as that with the parents, especially where the latter have emotional difficulties. The bond between parent and child usually weakens

with approaching adolescence, but the bond between brother and sisters or with other children, may outlast the period of rebellion and its influence can therefore be more lasting. The sex-play which takes place normally between children of the same and opposite sexes during childhood may cause guilt-feelings and determine later fears of sex relationships. Difficulties here, however, probably arise mostly through the reaction and attitude of the parents. The influence of siblings is stronger when the child finds himself to be the only one amongst a number of children of the opposite sex or isolated because of a large age gap or through other causes such as illness. The boy amongst a number of girls may well find it difficult to assert his masculinity and similar problems face the girl amongst a group of boys. A tie may develop between brother and sister so close that neither can relate to members of the opposite sex. The sexual connotation which this bond may have from early childhood remains unrecognized through the force of the "incest taboo". As a result, heterosexual feelings towards others are unconsciously identified as "brother-sister relationships" and come under the same taboo. Thus a feeling of guilt becomes connected unconsciously with all outside sexual relationships. Brother and sister remain bound to each other by a bond as close and strengthening as that between identical twins but are unable to develop heterosexual interests.

(vi) Doubts about their sexual role can develop in children and young people at a time when their interests and feelings become overtly sexual. A sensitive boy passing through the homosexual phase and expressing his feelings openly may be likened to a girl. Being called "sissy", he becomes ashamed of his feelings and uncertain about his ability to be a man. He may come to see himself, wrongly, as homosexual. The girl, too, if restricted during her healthy "tom-boy" phase to feminine tasks and activities which she detests, may come to reject all feminine behaviour and envy her brothers their greater freedom. In an attempt to become like them she strengthens any slight or passing homosexual trend and persists in her masculine role beyond the usual period. Any failure, real or imagined, in reaching the prevailing ideal of masculinity or femininity may induce the child or young person to deny his or her real sexual feeling and identify with the opposite sex.

(vii) As we observed, homosexual trends are by no means synonymous with a certain outward appearance, and homosexuality is often assumed in a person whose looks are not typical of the prevailing sexual ideal. The very powerful masculine, athletic man, fully occupied in manly pursuits, can just as readily be homosexual as the puny, undersized "feminine" type. Similarly, a feminine figure and great sexual attractiveness do not exclude ardent homosexual friendships in women. The picture of "causation" becomes even more confused when we consider that people may be "latent" homosexuals living an apparently heterosexual life but who are, in the depths of their personalities, attracted only by their own sex—a latent trend which may become apparent only at critical stages during life. Such people may inveigh heavily against the very difficulties in others which they suppress in themselves. Many of them, however, assume an appropriate occupation or interest which satisfies this

trend so that their homosexuality needs no physical outlet and does not disturb marriage or family life.

(viii) Influences in later years, adolescence and early adult life may play a part: lack of opportunity in a strongly one-sex education, fear of disapproval or fear of pregnancy, fear of the unknown in the personality of the other sex—all such factors can help to prolong sexual immaturity.

(ix) Weak sexuality, which may have physical or psychological origins, is not synonymous with homosexuality. The individual with weak sexual drives will not usually turn towards homosexuality but will more likely form friendships with the opposite sex without commitment to sexual union. Many stable marriages have existed between men and women of weak sexual drive and if both partners are of similar disposition, the union is usually a happy one and the parental responsibility and affection often very high.

Although these descriptions are phrased in "causal" terms, the most one can claim is that the situation as given seems to be the principal one of a number of factors influencing a child's personality, the most elusive factor being his genetic endowment. There is the further difficulty that many psychoanalytic concepts lack verification. Disputes between different schools of psychoanalytic thought make it clear that these ideas are but hypotheses—inspired ones maybe—and their origins in the recollections of Freud's middle-class Jewish patients in pre-1914 Vienna, may make their application less relevant to other peoples in other places and at other times. Nevertheless the clinical observations we have noted, plus the special nature of fetish objects (see Appendix B), strongly suggest that many sexual disorders stem from experiences in infancy—reinforced, or perhaps neutralized, by what comes after. And we must stress again that the psychological mechanisms outlined above operate partly at the conscious, but largely at the unconscious, level of the mind, beyond the ordinary reach of coherent thought and expression.

Though psychoanalytic ideas will continue to change, they have already focussed interest on the upbringing of children and have humanized the public attitude towards those whose sexual behaviour is unusual. They also offer the only systematic theory explaining varied phenomena. In the present state of knowledge it seems reasonable to accept in general the psychoanalytic approach to the problems under discussion but to predict that its most useful application may well prove to be preventive rather than therapeutic—in the home and school rather than on the couch. But we are aware of the danger that indiscriminate application of what are popularly supposed to be Freud's theories (e.g., complete permissiveness of upbringing) may do a great deal of harm.

Another psychological approach—superficially a very different one—bases itself upon the work and theories of Pavlov who showed how dogs could be "conditioned" to respond in certain predictable ways to a variety of sights, sounds, smells and shocks. Experiments elsewhere on the development of behaviour patterns in other animals, and in man, have shown that simple responses to stimuli can be built up or broken down according to certain "laws of learning". Speech, here, acts as a vastly complex stimulus, the response to

which depends upon accumulated past experience stored in the brain. Much research is going ahead, in a rapidly expanding field, with the aim of interpreting human conduct (including sexual conduct) in these terms, and methods are being devised to treat disordered behaviour along "learning theory" lines. Whereas the psychoanalyst regards the symptom as but the fringe of the disorder, to be largely ignored while the tangles beneath are sorted out, the learning theorist—or "behaviour therapist" as he is then called—sees the symptom as synonymous with the disease and directs training procedures of various kinds towards extinguishing the symptom or surmounting it. At the time of writing a small number of impressive results have been obtained, but the technique remains experimental and lacking in verification.

At this point the differences between these two approaches to human conduct seem very great and the different origins of these two major streams of thought make common ground between them hard to find. But many of the differences are more apparent than real and an uncommitted observer can look forward hopefully to the day when Freudians apply the laws of learning to study how the Oedipus complex develops, and the learning theorists draw on psychoanalytical findings to guide their experiments.

(c) *The Relevance of Schooling.* We noted earlier that education in sexual matters needs to be a continuous "normal" process from the earliest years, and one which accepts sexual along with other phenomena as part of everyday life. It follows that both parents and school have responsibilities here—responsibilities which neither must shirk, but which are too often ignored by both. Personality factors, however, develop through subtler yet more powerful ways than formal instruction and sound education is not enough, nor does lack of it explain all disorders.

One school factor that must influence the sexual outlook of the child in some measure is the chance he has of mixing freely with members of the opposite sex, of adjusting to their differences in physique and temperament, and of absorbing the attitudes and customs of his closest friends. Obviously these circumstances will differ greatly between children in segregated and those in coeducational schools—and between those in boarding and those in day schools. It is lamentable that so little has been investigated, over the years, of the effects upon subsequent sexual adjustment which such different forms of education have, and that argument between educationists should still rest on merely subjective judgment.

We think it important to record that some members of our group, from their contacts with ordinary children and with psychiatric patients, feel strongly that sexual disorder and sexual anxieties in adult life are made less likely under a liberal coeducational regime. Such a regime does not automatically achieve what we seek, but a coeducational community provides a better opportunity for conscious effort towards a wholesome sexual adjustment. Epidemics of homosexual behaviour occur quite frequently in segregated boarding schools (and probably very rarely, if ever, in coeducational ones), and whereas the healthy personality has little difficulty in passing through them, we cannot see such experience as beneficial, and are convinced

that susceptible children may suffer afterwards. It may not be that the homosexuality is so harmful as the lack of opportunity for a concurrent heterosexual interest which would normally live with and gradually replace homosexual entanglements. The extent of the damage caused by segregation at and before puberty is quite unknown, so one cannot be dogmatic on educational policy. But we believe this to be a matter for urgent research.

APPENDIX B

SOME DEVIATIONS CONSIDERED

Sexual Incapacity

Different cultures at different times have placed differing emphases on sexual capacity. The ability to produce large numbers of children has been regarded as a mark of success and power for a variety of reasons in many different human societies. In frontier conditions or settled agricultural societies children represent an economic asset; when wars are frequent or catastrophic, speedy replacement and adequate reserves of males are obviously desirable; or a high infant mortality may necessitate a high birth rate. In any community and at any time, however, underlying the welcome given a large family is the intuitive feeling that it reflects a vigorous and effective parental sexual life, itself essentially natural and praiseworthy. Even in our own contemporary culture, potency is still sought, whether its value be expressed as convivial saloon bar boastfulness or recognized indirectly through the bounty of the State in the form of special income tax rates and family allowances. Much medical effort goes into restoring potency and fertility to men and women. Ideas about sexual virility owe much at the present time to a vague pleasure-seeking popular philosophy and mistaken ideas about current psychology (especially Freudian) to the effect that "repression" is harmful and indulgence necessarily healthy.

But many people do not conform to so-called normal capacity and may suffer much distress at the hands of their colleagues, their consciences or their marital partners. Guilt feelings about failure in the sexual role form a frequent feature of mental disorder, and while its importance in causing mental illness can be overstressed, social pressures undoubtedly do cause unnecessary suffering among the sexually inadequate, just as they do among the sexually deviated. Sexual potency, it must be stressed, varies enormously from person to person. A good number of those who complain of their symptoms are in no sense abnormal or "deviated" but merely happen to lie towards the inactive end of the potency spectrum, in the way that some people are short and others tall. Sexual capacity is also linked with general wellbeing, and bodily fatigue may reduce sexual interest.

Impotence—the failure by the man to secure erection and orgasm—is not to be confused with sterility, that is, the ejaculation of seminal fluid which is infertile. Sexual potency decreases with age but complete impotence is rare under 70, after which the incidence rises rapidly. While the average for young men is about three orgasms per week, there are large numbers of healthy people who ejaculate only once in several months (Kinsey records one apparently fit and normal man who had only one in 30 years) and conversely men who have 10, 20 or even more orgasms every week for long periods.

Early puberty correlates with active sexuality, and observation of animal behaviour, too, suggests that such differences are in large part biological, and call for no sophisticated psychological explanation or treatment. Unfortunately it appears that those of low sexual drive are often pillars of respectability who find it easy to enjoin upon others (especially upon deviants) the sexual abstinence which comes naturally to them.

Factors that are more firmly psychological do, however, sometimes play an important part. Thus it may happen that a man who achieves sublime sexual satisfaction during pre-marital courtship or in extra-marital liaisons finds intercourse of a regular and lawful nature during marriage impossibly difficult. Pre-marital sexual compatibility is therefore no guarantee of happy married life. Again, sexual conflicts—perhaps of homosexual or kindred nature—which have long lain dormant or unconscious, may be activated by later experience or by the ageing process and produce impotence of late onset. Physical disease of the generative organs is only rarely a cause, but psychiatric illnesses, particularly depressions and alcoholism, quite often show this symptom which may, indeed, be what the patient complains of first. It seems unlikely from present knowledge that impotence results from earlier sexual excesses.

The sexual impotence which increases with age affects all sexual outlets, including masturbation, homosexuality and nocturnal emissions. Though physically part of the ageing process there is also a mental factor, for a new sexual partner or new sexual technique can increase sexual performance. Some men experience an "Indian summer" around the fifties, sixties or later; a re-awakening of sexual desire of great intensity. Though little understood, this seems partly due to the fear of approaching old age and senescence, and the desire desperately to prove a manly virility. Sexual deviations, including exhibitionism, especially concerning children of either sex, may make their appearance at this time in predisposed persons.

Frigidity. The capacity of the woman to enjoy love-making and penetration is similarly subject to biological variation. As already shown, her response is diffused where that of the man is focussed. It is thus especially hard, in cases of frigidity, to judge what part is due to low biological drive, to a sexually-inhibited upbringing, to early psychiatric illness or to inadequacies of the love-partner during pre-coital play. The upbringing whereby girls learned of coitus as a loathsome and degrading necessity of life has much to answer for. The sad fact that one third of the 2,500 married women interviewed by Kinsey and his colleagues had never experienced orgasm must, in our view, be related to such cultural factors. But "frigidity", a rather unsatisfactory term, implies more than failure to have orgasm: it is the inability to enjoy love-making and penetration. As with the man, it is not to be confused with sterility, which arises from physiological causes. Sexual intercourse may be pleasurable to and sought for by women who do not experience a climax. Other women co-operate willingly in, for them, a rather arid marital intercourse for the sake of domestic peace, without actually finding it distressing. The sexual life is but one aspect of marital adjustment

of which it is as easy to make too much as it is to make too little. A few women, however, who are hypersensitive, or who find the sexual experience intensely frightening, distressing and painful, have muscular spasms of the legs and abdomen which often effectively prevent penetration. Fear of childbirth may play a conscious or unconscious part in such women who commonly also suffer disorders of menstruation, and who can sometimes gain much from psychiatric help. It may be noted that highly decorative and flirtatious women may carry the deepest sexual inhibitions—advertising, as it were, what they do not possess. As with impotence, sexual adequacy in pre- or extra-marital situations carries no guarantee against frigidity in the marriage itself. Physical disease of the organs of reproduction may also make intercourse distressing.

The Sterile Marriage. The marriage which is involuntarily childless can be so from a number of causes, of which sterility of one partner is the most usual. Procreation may also be hindered by failure of the partners to achieve simultaneous orgasm, which may be due to imbalance of sexual capacity between the partners in either direction as well as to ignorance of love-making technique. Here psychiatric treatment can be helpful. In an extreme case of sexual incapacity the man cannot achieve, or the woman permit, penetration, so that the marriage is inevitably sterile without some form of artificial insemination, which is seldom acceptable and is hard to obtain. For the couple who can by no means achieve children of their own there is always adoption.

Other Deviations

Where the normal heterosexual outlet cannot be expressed, where it becomes "blocked", and sexual satisfaction can be achieved only through abnormal or perverse practices of one kind or another, the condition is termed "sexual perversion". We do not propose, however, to use the word "perversion", because of the moral judgment this now implies, but to describe these conditions under the general heading of "deviations". It must be made clear that this label only applies where all or most of the sexual outlet is achieved through deviant behaviour: "perverse" elements exist in the heterosexual love-play or the fantasy life of many if not most normal people, and even those who are unaware of such possibilities within themselves carry the germs thereof in the hidden recesses of the mind. The variety of deviant behaviour is enormous, ranging from the harmless voyeur peering at courting couples in the park to the repetitive sadistic murderer. The cruelty and obscenity of some deviations—though happily very rare, even in psychiatric and penal spheres—pose perplexing challenges to those who seek "that of God in every man". The common forms group themselves quite clearly.

Fetishism involves the focussing of sexual attention upon an object or upon one part of the loved-one, instead of upon the whole person. Long hair, for example, is traditionally a sign of beauty and excessive preoccupation with this feature forms one of the commonest deviations: feet, shoes, and stockings are other common fetish objects; as

are rubber materials and furs. The fact that perambulators, safety-pins or rubber teats may occasionally be chosen, illustrates very clearly the origins of these conditions in early experience. The psychoanalytic theory that instinct becomes "fixed" at early levels of development seems most relevant here but response to psychological treatment is frequently discouraging. Fetishists seldom impinge upon society though they are often tiresome to themselves and their disorder may occasion much marital unhappiness and disappointment. Some recoveries with "deconditioning" treatment, along Pavlovian lines (see page 66) have been described with this condition.

Exhibitionism and the associated disorder *Voyeurism* (Peeping-Tom) involve sexual pleasure obtained respectively from displaying the naked body and especially the private parts to others, or from observing the sexual acts or organs of other people. The choice of situation and person that trigger off such behaviour have unconscious meaning to the deviant and, as with fetishists, are founded in long-forgotten events. Though troublesome and undesirable, these acts are of small moment in their ultimate effect and a great many offences go unreported to the police. The quite common involvement of children, though frightening to them at the time (the exhibitionist's aim is often only to cause fright), seems ultimately to be less harmful than is often thought. Children taught prudish standards are especially likely to be upset. Should some such incident occur, the less fuss made, so far as the child is concerned, the better. Legal requirements regarding statements to the police, court appearance and cross-examination, appear far more damaging psychologically, and there is widespread dissatisfaction with present police and court procedure. The traditional image of the "sexual pervert" as a sort of all-devouring ogre, a terrifying combination of Sweeney Tod and Jack the Ripper, is not a true picture of those who suffer the above disorders, nor of the vast majority of deviants. Such people are usually timid, of small stature and inadequate personality, riven through with guilt feelings; their behaviour is precipitated by the frequent frustrations with which life faces them. Far from their sexual demands being excessive the reverse usually applies and though many get married, sexual intercourse is mostly infrequent and disappointing. Male exhibitionists in particular are seeking through their sexually aggressive act to assert their impoverished sexuality and reassure themselves about their doubtfully masculine role. Were a woman to whom he exposed himself to respond sexually, the average exhibitionist would run a mile; not all, however, can be described as harmless. Tendencies of this kind in women are usually concealed in our society by the fact that feminine display is accepted and indeed welcomed. Male exhibitionism again, is closely linked with the sexual organ, whereas exhibitionism in women relates more to the whole body.

Sado-masochism is the term applied to the condition of those few whose erotic release mainly depends upon inflicting (sadism) or suffering (masochism) pain or humiliation. One aspect may predominate in a given person or both may co-exist. The orgies of flagellation which swept through the country in mediaeval times

suggest that there can be a fashion in these things. A strong belief in the virtues of corporal punishment is likely to reflect deviant sexuality at one or other level of consciousness.

Clinical instances of sado-masochism are not sufficiently numerous to constitute a threat to society, but the opposite is true of sadism in its more diffused form. From the conduct of political action and from the nature of cheap literature and entertainment, it is obvious that sadistic impulses and interests exist unconsciously in probably the majority of people and in many of them strongly and destructively. Aggressiveness and the impulse to dominate and hurt interfere on an enormous scale with human co-operation. Some sociologists and psychologists correlate this general sadism with a widespread failure in society to achieve genuine tenderness, compassion and release in sexual relationships.

Transvestism. The desire to assume the outward appearance of the opposite sex seems closely and obviously allied to homosexuality. In men—about whom most information is available—the transsexual urge occasionally reaches the point of completely assuming the female role, the subject dressing, living and working as a woman, characteristically in menial or domestic capacity and even sharing a room with other women who remain unaware of the state of affairs. Some go on the stage as female impersonators. From time to time such people approach surgeons or psychiatrists in search of the physical completeness which their mental condition calls for, and occasionally incessant demands for amputation of the penis are acceded to, but the operation is understandably not popular with doctors, even when no possible hope remains of the subject ever resuming normal life.

Less extreme forms show episodes of trans-sexual life during an otherwise normal career—even during normal marriage—or the disorder may be experienced only in the fantasy life, or through the occasional wearing of an item of female clothing, such as stockings, or high heeled shoes. Or it may co-exist with other deviations.

The kinship of transvestism with homosexuality and with fetishism, already considered, is close, and the disorder (which often dates from childhood) springs from similar roots. But in few cases does overt homosexual behaviour occur and in fewer still is it a problem—usually in those who fail in their adopted role and fall back on homosexual prostitution to make a living. Although often thought of as the most typical of homosexuals transvestites are a very small minority of the sexually disordered; objects of interest to medical science but of singular distaste to almost everyone, of whatever sexual orientation. There is, however, no law against transvestism as such and unless such men make a spectacle of themselves in public they are usually left alone.

That some such state occurs in women is clear. "Masculine protest" was coined to describe a very common phase in women, and some continue in a lifelong identification with the masculine role to the point of assuming some male habits and models of dress. But the disorder does not meet with society's censure in the same way, nor does it seem ever to clash with the police.

Paedophilia and Paederasty. One of the features of ancient Greek

life was the glorification of paederasty, that is a sexual relationship between men and young boys. Praised in poetry and philosophical writing, this behaviour was held superior to ordinary heterosexuality, though not for exclusively sexual reasons, and arose in large part from the allegedly inferior intellectual status of women. Currently, however, it is regarded by the public and in the law courts as the most obnoxious and blame-worthy form of homosexuality, and it is one to which all whose work brings them into fairly constant contact with boys are peculiarly at risk. People who choose to work with the young may do so for conscious or unconscious reasons of affection which may carry a sexual component. The daily opportunity and stimulus arising from the work make the desires more and more likely to be expressed physically. But paedophilia is not always homosexual, it may involve erotic love towards opposite-sexed children, or those of both sexes. In theory the range of behaviour is as large as that of adult sexuality, but in practice the adult is of such sexual inadequacy that usually little more than mild masturbation and exhibitionism take place. Very rarely the child may be injured by attempts at some form of intercourse. Paedophilia seems to arise from a variety of early experiences and inadequacies of upbringing which make sexual relationships with adults frightening, and which make the paedophilic especially sympathetic towards, and identified with, the state of childhood and immaturity.

* * * *

One feature common to deviations (including homosexuality) which are expressed periodically is that episodes of isolation or depression are particularly likely to precipitate deviant acts. Such isolation is quite often self-imposed from a subjective feeling of "being different", or it may arise from a person's rejection by society—and even by family and friends. Actual persecution by imprisonment and the ostracism which so often follows might almost be designed to make the deviation still worse.

APPENDIX C

SOURCES OF PROFESSIONAL HELP

Those seeking expert psychological help with sexual difficulties should, as a general rule, go first to the general practitioner, who may be prepared to undertake counselling and treatment himself, or who can refer to specialists nearby.

A. *Children.* Parents and those who have charge of children can receive advice freely at child guidance clinics or the outpatient departments run by children's or general hospitals. Both the child and the mother and often also the father are interviewed, and in most clinics the work is carried out by a team consisting of the psychiatrist, the psychiatric social worker (who takes the history from the parent and continues to see the parent should treatment be advised) and the psychologist who assesses the child's intelligence and deals with any matter concerning his school education.

Sometimes it is sufficient to give advice on one or two occasions only. In other instances treatment is recommended which varies according to the clinic's resources and the child's needs. In very young children, parent and child are seen together. The child expresses his feeling mostly through play or through painting and modelling and these activities are the main implements of treatment. Often a child's sexual problem seems to be caused mainly through the parent's inability to solve their own problems, and in these cases the parents require treatment too. Usually it is found advisable to treat each member of the family by one member of the team; so that the child may have treatment with a play therapist while the mother is interviewed by the psychiatric social worker and the father, if more seriously disturbed, is treated by the psychiatrist. Frequent conferences permit the team to work in accord, but the separation of their roles in relation to the family prevents their being dragged into the conflict that has caused the disturbance.

B. *Adolescents.* These are seen at child guidance clinics or at psychiatric outpatient clinics for adults. Unfortunately the latter seldom have enough time for the intensive treatment that may be required in sexual disturbances of adolescence, and a few special teenage Clinics have been started (see page 77). The first interview differs little from that with children, but subsequent treatment usually requires more intensive work with the adolescent and often less with the parent, for at that age the pattern of behaviour has already formed and cannot so easily be changed by the parents' influence. The method of treatment resembles more that of adults, although activities, such as painting, modelling, drama or music are sometimes used; and there is more conversation than in the treatment of most younger children. Experiencing insecurity when he tries to live without the parents' support, the adolescent may become dependent on the psychiatrist. Such treatment, even if it is not following the tenets of

one of the psychoanalytical schools, can be lengthy. It aims at helping the person to face those sides of his personality that have remained undeveloped or have been rejected, thought to be "bad" and which may have caused uneven development. He needs help in bringing these "repressed" aspects to development, and in reaching a more balanced maturity. He may need to recognize his limitations and adjust his aims accordingly.

C. *Adults*. These can be referred under the National Health Service to hospitals or to special clinics (see below). A psychiatric social worker may be helpful in advising on adjustment to family life, work or living conditions. Other members of the family often need to be seen, as they may become affected by or have some effect on, the patient's disturbance, or they may need to be given some special understanding in relation to the patient. In such cases the other member(s) may be interviewed by the psychiatric social worker or by another psychiatrist, though some psychiatrists prefer to see members of a family together. Whether treatment is intensive, i.e. aiming at a deeper change of personality, or less intensive, with the aim of adjustment to a situation, depends largely on the patient's ability to tolerate the tension and stress of intensive treatment, on his life situation (age, time, other commitments) and on the psychiatric diagnosis. One cannot, for example, advise psychoanalysis for every homosexual and expect that he will become heterosexual in due course: understanding of the patient may not be easy and most psychiatrists will be cautious in their early advice. "Cure" can by no means always be expected.

Psychiatric treatment differs from many forms of medical treatment in that it can be carried out only with the patient's full co-operation. People who suffer from sexual deviations, especially those which may bring them into conflict with the law, are sometimes advised to seek psychiatric treatment. The Courts too may order a person to undergo treatment for a specified time as a condition of probation. Fear of the law is seldom an adequate basis for a form of treatment that demands the person's willing co-operation. Such treatment could succeed only if he acquired a genuine wish to alter, not only the action that brought him to Court, but his whole emotional life and personal relationships. He may be sent to prison for ostensibly the same reason: such facilities are, however, limited within the prison service, although the existence of the special psychiatric prison at Grendon gives some ground for hope.

Even where radical change is not possible because of a long-standing pattern of behaviour, or because of other hindrances and limitations, it may still be possible to achieve a fuller and happier life. New occupations may be discovered that give expression to those feelings which cannot find a place in personal relationships, and adjustments in marriage may become possible even if basic trends cannot be altered. In coming to terms with his limitations, the person may diminish the compulsive character of the deviation and thereby lessen tension and achieve a happier and more balanced existence.

In London there are a number of psychotherapy clinics which give treatment for sexual difficulties, on the basis that these are usually

but symptoms of deeper personality problems which need to be tackled just as urgently as do the symptoms. Among the main clinics are:

C. G. Jung Clinic, 30 Devonshire Place, W.1.

Cassel Hospital Outpatient Clinic, Ham Common, Richmond, Surrey.

Institute of Psychoanalysis, 63 New Cavendish Street, W.1.

Langham Clinic, 37 Queen Anne Street, W.1.

Marlborough Day Hospital, 38 Marlborough Place, N.W.8.

Maudsley Hospital, Denmark Hill, S.E.5.

Portman Clinic, 8 Bourdon Street, Davies Street, W.1.

Tavistock Clinic, 2 Beaumont Street, W.1.

Most of these clinics, if not all, have waiting lists of perhaps up to six and even 18 months and the impossibility of giving prolonged and intensive help to all who seek it makes them inevitably select those whom they feel they can help most. The initial diagnostic interview can usually be had quite quickly, however. In addition to these services all the large teaching hospitals have psychiatric outpatient departments of varying size and with more or less psychotherapeutic help to hand, as do the large majority of general hospitals. These services will be free, but some special clinics make a charge according to means, or of perhaps two guineas per session for the group psychotherapy which is so often recommended. There is virtually no full-scale individual psychoanalytic treatment obtainable under the National Health Service.

Outside London, so far as the National Health Service is concerned, the facilities in general and teaching hospitals are similar. But the shortage of psychiatrists often makes waiting lists longer and psychotherapy harder to obtain. However, in some parts of the country special provisions are made: the family doctor will know—or will easily be able to find out—what facilities are available. It must, unfortunately, be said that some general practitioners are out of sympathy with the medical treatment of sexual disorders, in particular sexual offenders. Even now, the teaching of psychiatry to medical students often leaves much to be desired. In these circumstances it may be necessary either to insist on referral to a specialist or to change the general practitioner. Friends in particular may like to know that those in need of psychiatric help can ask their own doctor to refer them to *The Retreat* at York or, if more convenient, to one of the consulting rooms maintained by *The Retreat* at Leeds, Hull or Middlesbrough.

A directory of Child Guidance Clinics can be obtained from the National Association for Mental Health, 39 Queen Anne Street, W.1. Cases are referred to these Clinics by a variety of agencies such as the school medical service, probation officers and by the parents direct. Several have started "Teen-age Clinics" where young people can be seen without parental referral or, indeed, without parental knowledge, though it is a good rule to channel these things through the family doctor. An independent "Teen-age Clinic" has been set up at Hampstead (Young Peoples Consultative Centre, 11 Kings College Road, N.W.3), and may be approached by the teenage directly. This seems to be the beginning of a new movement.

Private psychotherapy is more easily obtained than that under the National Health Service, though mainly in London and a few other large centres. Such treatment is lengthy and therefore costly. Charges per hour vary from two to ten guineas with an average of four or five. Length of treatment varies from weekly interviews over a month or so to three, five or more years' of daily sessions for classical psychoanalysis.

All medical facilities share the ethical code related to medical secrecy. Any of those whose disorder places them outside the law can consult a doctor with complete confidence: details from medical case notes may be revealed to others only with the patient's consent or under the direct orders of a Judge during a court action. The latter event is of the greatest rarity.

GLOSSARY

This short glossary is provided for the convenience of readers to whom some of the terms used in the text or appendices may be unfamiliar. No attempt has been made to cover fully the technical or colloquial language relating to sexual matters.

ADOLESCENCE. Period between childhood and manhood or womanhood, commencing with puberty—the onset of sexual capacity.

ADULTERY. Sexual intercourse between a married person and a person of the opposite sex, not the spouse.

AGAPE. "Spiritual" love as contrasted with "physical" love (see also Eros).

ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION. A mechanical means of transferring seminal fluid from the male to the vagina of the female, without copulation.

AUTOEROTICISM. See p. 19.

BESTIALITY. See Buggery.

BUGGERY. Includes sodomy and bestiality—anal intercourse between humans and between humans and animals respectively.

CASTRATION. The loss of sexual organs by surgery, disease or accident. In the female this implies the ovaries; in the male, the penis and/or testes. In the adult, there are no significant effects other than sterility and the lessening of sexual desire. Castration before the onset of puberty arrests sexual development and interferes with secondary sexual characteristics—voice, hair, breasts, etc.

CHROMOSOMES. Minute filaments within the nucleus of each cell, each carrying multitudes of genes, i.e. complex chemical bodies which determine hereditary characteristics.

CIRCUMCISION. Excision of surplus skin over tip (glans) of penis. An ancient ritual of Hebraic origin held by psychoanalysts to represent a symbolic act of castration and by anthropologists to be a substitute for human sacrifice. The only medical justification is if the orifice will not permit adequate washing of the glans, causing soreness.

CLITORIS. A small knot of erectile tissue at the forward end of the vagina (q.v.). The clitoris represents a rudiment (which, in the male, grows into the penis) and is highly sensitive, playing a major part in sexual arousal. Failure of a husband to recognize this may be the cause of much frustration in marriage.

COITUS. The act of sexual intercourse; penetration of the vagina by the penis with emission of seminal fluid.

COITUS INTERRUPTUS. The practice of withdrawing the penis before emission, in order to prevent conception. A grossly unreliable method, thought by most psychiatrists to produce tension-states in many women by depriving them of sexual orgasm (q.v.).

COMMITMENT. The act or state of pledging oneself.

COMPLEX. A group of ideas, thoughts and feelings with strong emotional content, often wholly repressed, as in Oedipus phase (q.v.).

CONSUMMATION. The end of a developing process—specifically, the physical completion of a marriage.

CONTRACEPTIVE. A device designed to prevent conception, usually by interposing a barrier between the male emission of seminal fluid and the female uterus (womb). Various devices within the womb itself, producing sterility, have fallen mostly into disuse. Chemicals to be inserted into the vagina, or for the woman to take by mouth, have also been developed. A contraceptive pill for men is under development.

CYCLE. A series of recurring events—e.g. menstrual cycle.

DEPRESSION. Lowering of psycho-physical activity, caused by an emotional attitude involving feelings of inadequacy and hopelessness. Common during menopause (see under Menstruation).

DEVIATION. Divergence from the normal.

ELECTRA COMPLEX. See Oedipus phase.

EMISSION. See Seminal emission.

ENDOCRINE GLANDS. Ductless glands within the body producing hormones (q.v.) in minute quantities to regulate the body's activities. Examples are the thyroid, pancreas, adrenal, testis and ovary. The "master gland" is the pituitary, under the base of the brain; hormones from the pituitary interact between the brain and the other endocrine glands.

ENVIRONMENT. Includes physical, mental, spiritual and social aspects of surroundings. It affects development after conception. Contrast with ancestry. "Nurture" as opposed to "Nature".

ERECTION. The state of the penis (q.v.) during sexual excitement. The penis, normally soft and flabby, swells to several times its usual size due to engorgement with blood, and becomes erect and rigid and hence capable of penetrating the vagina. The clitoris (q.v.) is somewhat engorged under the same circumstances.

EROS. God of (physical) love. Contrast with agape (q.v.). Hence *Erotic*, pertaining to physical aspects of sexual love (or affection); *Erotogenic* and *Erotogenous*, sexually arousing, terms used for certain zones of the body, stimulation of which is especially pleasurable (mouth, genitals, breast).

EXTRA-MARITAL. Literally "outside marriage", implying adulterous sexual intercourse, or intercourse between unmarried persons.

FETISH. Some object to which special sexual significance is attached. Hence *Fetishism*. See p. 71.

FORNICATION. Sexual intercourse between unmarried persons, or between a married man and an unmarried woman.

GENES. See chromosomes.

GENITALIA. Penis and testicles (testes) in males; vagina, clitoris, uterus and ovaries in females. *Adj.* genital.

HETEROSEXUAL. Pertaining to opposite sexes.

HOMOSEXUAL. Pertaining to the same sex.

HORMONES. Chemical "messengers" secreted in minute amounts by the endocrine glands (q.v.) to control specific functions of the body including sexual development in both sexes and the cyclic sexual changes in women. Male sex hormone is secreted in the testis and in the adrenal gland of both sexes. Two hormones are secreted alternately by the female ovary: one of these (oestrogen) induces "heat" in the oestrous cycle (q.v.) and is also secreted in the adrenal gland of both sexes; the other (progesterone) is secreted before menstruation (q.v.) and during pregnancy.

HYPOTHESIS. A theory as yet unproved.

IMPOTENCE. Absence of sexual power, see p. 69.

INCEST. Sexual intercourse between near kindred. See p. 60.

INHIBITION. A voluntary or involuntary "holding back". A mental barrier erected against some thought or act, the result of past experience and training—particularly by parental teaching and example. Inhibitions, which are universal to varying degrees, operate mostly below the level of conscious awareness, and we are seldom aware of their origins. Also used as a term in Pavlovian psychology, the opposite of excitation, both of which can be induced or removed experimentally.

INNATE. Inborn.

INVERSION. Loose term for homosexuality; hence, *Invert*, homosexual person.

INTIMACY. Close friendship, but also used as a synonym for sexual intercourse (q.v.).

LATENT. Undeveloped or inactive.

LIBIDO. The term used by Jung and Freud to signify in a wide sense "sexual" energy. Often seen as a sort of life-force arising from within, which must be dealt with by *cathecting* it (expressing it), *suppressing* it, *sublimating* it (into other activities), etc. Hence *Libidinal*—pertaining to the libido; a sexual pleasurable activity, but often loosely taken to imply something lewd or obscene.

MASOCHISM. Obtaining pleasure (usually sexual) through suffering pain, subjugation or humiliation. See p. 72.

MASTURBATION. Autoeroticism. See p. 18.

MENSTRUATION. The "monthly" flow of blood lasting 1 to 7 days in women between the ages of approximately 12 and 50; it usually occurs once every 24 to 32 days, but varies considerably. The lining of the womb is prepared by the second of the female sex hormones (q.v.) to receive the fertilized egg and is cast off at this time, if the egg is not fertilized. *Menarche*—the age of onset of menstruation (usually 11–16), and *Menopause*—the age of cessation (usually 38–55).

MONOGAMY. The practice of having only one partner at a time.

MORALS. Customary codes, conduct and behaviour, especially (but not necessarily) with reference to sexual matters.

MORES. The climate of conduct and belief at a particular time and place. Hence *Moral*.

MYTH. Legend or tradition embodying a belief—a poetic and symbolic representation of man's condition.

NARCISSISM. Self-love, often with sexual connotations. According to Freud, the child goes through stages of narcissism and if development is arrested, sincere emotional attachments to persons other than the self become difficult or impossible.

NORMAL. Usual, accepted, customary. In a more scientific sense the mean or average within a prescribed environment. Often taken to imply an ideal state, for example, it is "normal", in a statistical sense, to suffer from both neurotic symptoms and decayed teeth, although both can be looked on as disease states, and in that way "abnormal".

OEDIPUS PHASE. Freudian term for a stage in male development (age 2–5) in which awakening sexuality fixes on the mother, where the child is alleged to see the father as a dangerous rival. Failure to resolve this situation is said to cause an Oedipus Complex and to bring psychological disabilities of various kinds. For females a similar situation (the Electra Complex) is said to exist, but to be of lesser importance. Origins in Greek Mythology.

OESTROUS CYCLE. Female reproductive cycle during which the onset of "heat", or readiness for sexual intercourse, marks the time of ovulation in all mammals except the higher primates, including humans.

ORGASM. The climax of the sexual act; an intensely pleasurable experience accompanying seminal emission (q.v.) in the man. The woman has no such obvious physical accompaniment, and orgasm is more complex, longer lasting, and less frequently experienced than in the man. Women experience orgasm located in the clitoris (q.v.) and, at a deeper level, in the vagina (q.v.).

OVERT. Open, declared, admitted, unconcealed.

PAEDERASTY. Sexual relations between men and young boys; often misused for other forms of homosexuality, especially anal intercourse. See p. 74.

PAEDOPHILIA. Erotic love of children. See p. 74.

PENIS. The male sexual organ, comprising the *glans*, an area of highly sensitive tissue at the tip of the *shaft*, and covered in the natural state by the *foreskin*. After *circumcision* (q.v.) the glans is usually exposed. See also Phallus.

PERVERSION. Socially unacceptable deviation from the normal.

PHALLUS. The male sexual organ, the penis. Hence *Phallic*, pertaining to or resembling a penis—a term much used by Freudian psychoanalysts in the interpretation of dreams, and other symbols. Almost anything that is large, elongated, powerful, and sticking upwards or outwards, can be interpreted as a "phallic symbol".

POLYANDRY. The practice of a woman marrying more than one husband at the same time: permitted at one time in Tibet and certain primitive communities.

POLYGAMY. Covers both Polyandry and Polygyny.

POLYGyny. The practice of a man marrying more than one woman at the same time. Permitted or condoned by most Eastern religions.

PORNOGRAPHY. Indecency, licentiousness in words or pictures.

POTENCY. Power, performance, strength, especially in relation to sexual capacity.

PRE-MARITAL. Before marriage.

PROMISCUITY. Mixed, disordered condition; commonly used for indiscriminate sexual relations.

PUBERTY. Onset of sexual potency: the phase of rapid growth in the early 'teens when the secondary sexual characteristics develop (voice, hair, breasts) and physical maturity is achieved. A state of emotional turmoil is a common accompaniment together with a striving towards independence from the parents.

"QUEER". Slang term in common use for a homosexual person.

REPRESSION. Psychological mechanism for unconsciously pushing out of awareness thoughts which are disturbing.

SADISM. Obtaining pleasure (usually sexual) through inflicting pain on another, or by subjugating or humiliating them. See p. 72.

SEDUCTION. Leading astray, especially with reference to sexual matters.

SEMINAL EMISSION. Emission of seminal fluid, containing sperm, from the penis during sexual relations, by masturbation or spontaneously at night during "wet dreams". The term used without qualification usually implies the latter.

SEXUAL INTERCOUSE. Penetration of the vagina (q.v.) by the penis (q.v.) with the emission of seminal fluid by the male.

SIBLING. Brother or sister.

SODOMY. Anal intercourse between humans. See p. 33.

STERILIZATION. Rendering sterile (unable to reproduce) by destruction of germ cells, or removal of ovary or testicles; or by cutting or constricting the sex ducts.

SUPPRESSION. As repression (q.v.) but with conscious deliberateness.

TABOO. Ban, prohibition strongly imposed by society.

TRANSVESTISM. The assumption of the clothing, habits and mannerisms of the opposite sex, or a desire to do so. See p. 73.

VAGINA. The female sexual organ which receives the penis. A cleft lined with mucus-secreting skin between the legs, passing upwards and inwards for several inches and leading to the uterus or womb. What can be seen from without is strictly the vulva enclosed on each side by a fold of flesh—the *labia majora*. The vagina is an aperture leading in from the vulva. The urethra, the passage for urine, enters the vulva above and in front of the vagina.

BOOK LIST

This is not intended to represent a complete bibliography, but rather a selection of some works which might help in further study. The list includes sources referred to in the text.

Bailey, D. Sherwin. *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*. Longmans, 1955.

Bailey, D. Sherwin (Ed.). *Sexual Offenders and Social Punishment*. Church Information Board, 1956.

Includes the evidence submitted on behalf of the Church of England to the Wolfenden Committee.

Bailey, D. Sherwin. *The Man-Woman Relation in Christian Thought*. Longmans, 1959.

Bailey, D. Sherwin. *Common Sense about Sexual Ethics: A Christian View*. Gollancz, 1962.

Barnes, K. S. *He and She*. Penguin Books, 1962.

An account of sexuality as it presents itself to the teenager; it takes account of present day realities. Especially suitable for adolescents whose parents have difficulty in discussing such matters with them.

Barnes, K. S. and Barnes, G. F. *Sex, Friendship and Marriage*. Allen and Unwin, 1938.

An account of the physiology of reproduction and related matters.

British Medical Association. *Getting Married*. 1962.

A useful booklet by various authors covering varied and important aspects of its subject.

Cole, W. G. *Sex and Love in the Bible*. Hodder and Stoughton, 1960.

A thorough and lucid exposition which helps to make Biblical concepts relevant to modern situations.

Christian Faith and Practice in the Experience of the Religious Society of Friends. London Yearly Meeting, 1960.

De Beauvoir, S. *The Second Sex*. Four Square, 1960.

A serious yet amusing treatise on the place of women in society, in particular on the significance and consequences of equality between the sexes.

Ellis, Havelock. *Psychology of Sex*. Pan Books, 1959.

A classic of the early literature: one of the first systematic studies but out of date in terminology and conclusions (here reprinted).

Ford, C. S. and Beach, F. A. *Patterns of Sexual Behaviour*. Harper, 1951.

Garland, Rodney. *The Heart in Exile*. W. H. Allen, 1958.

Hall, Radcliffe. *Adam's Breed*. H. Hammond, 1957.

Herbert, A. P. *Holy Deadlock*. Methuen, 1949.

Housman, A. E. *The Collected Poems*. Cape, 1962.

Hyde, H. M. (Ed.). *The Trials of Oscar Wilde*. Notable British Trials. W. Hodge, 1948.

Kennedy, G. A. Studdert. *The Warrior, the Woman and the Christ*. Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.

A work which draws attention to the masculinity in women and femininity in men, and relates these to Christ's teaching and personality.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B. and Martin, C. E. *Sexual Behaviour of the Human Male*. W. B. Saunders, 1948.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B. and Martin, C. E. *Sexual Behaviour of the Human Female*, W. B. Saunders, 1953.

These two books form the most comprehensive survey of human sexual conduct yet attempted: a mine of biological information and not yet seriously challenged as to the major findings, though largely based on replies from U.S. respondents only.

MacKinnon, D. M., Root, H. E., Montefiore, H. W. and Burnaby, J. *God, Sex and War*. Fontana, 1963.

Macmurray, John. *Freedom in the Modern World*. Faber, 1935.

Macmurray, John. *Reason and Emotion*. Faber, 1962.

Marriage and Parenthood Committee of the Society of Friends. *Marriage and Parenthood*. Friends Book Centre, Revised edition, 1958.

Peters, Fritz. *Finistère*. Gollancz, 1951.

Plato. *Symposium*. Penguin Books, 1951.

The classic treatise on love relationships (in all aspects), especially on the spiritual aspects of homosexuality, as understood in Athens of pre-Christian times.

Proust, M. (Trans. Scott Moncrieff). *Remembrance of Things Past*. Vol. VII. Chatto and Windus, 1949.

A sympathetic and moving account of a boy's feelings towards adults and in particular towards the aloof, yet adored, mother.

Renault, Mary. *The Charioteer*. Longmans, 1953.

An unusually perceptive novel about a young homosexual, set in the 1939-45 war.

Rhymes, Douglas. *No New Morality*. Constable, 1964.

Root, H. E. *Ethical Problems of Sex*. Theology, Vol. LXV, No. 508, p. 408, 1962.

Storr, Anthony. *The Integrity of the Personality*. Heinemann, 1960.

An account of psychological mechanisms operating in childhood and adolescence and of the origins of sexual deviations. Suitable for intelligent lay readers.

Storr, Anthony. *Sexual Deviation*. Penguin Books, 1964.

A useful review of the commoner deviations in greater detail than is attempted in this essay.

Suttie, I. D. *Origins of Love and Hate*. Penguin books, 1960.

A classic of 30 years ago, which analyses the teachings of Freud and takes them further (here reprinted).

Tillich, Paul. *The New Being*. S.C.M., 1956.

Vidal, Gore. *The City and the Pillar*. Lehmann, 1949.

Vidler, Alec. (Ed). *Soundings*. Cambridge University Press, 1962.

A joint volume of essays by Cambridge theologians; the fruit of many group discussions. See, especially, the chapter on Theology and Awareness by the Rev. H. Williams, in relation to sexual morality.

West, D. J. *Homosexuality*. Penguin Books, 1960.

An outstandingly clear, learned and accurate account of its subject from general and psychiatric points of view. Unreservedly recommended.

Westwood, Gordon. *Society and the Homosexual*. Gollancz, 1952 (out of print).

Wildeblood, Peter. *Against the Law*. Penguin Books, 1957.

An account of the problems met in and out of prison by an acknowledged homosexual.

Wilson, R. C. *Authority, leadership and concern*. Swarthmore Lecture. Allen and Unwin, 1949.

Wolfenden, Report. *Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*. H.M.S.O., 1957.

A model of the close, careful reasoning of a good Departmental Committee.