

Christianity & Culture

Evangelical Theology in Post-Christian Britain Conference,
Alfreton, Derbyshire, Saturday September 25–26, 2015

Same-Sex Relationships: Final Frontier In The Sexual Revolution?

David Williams

KEY WORDS

| Human Sexuality | Sexual Revolution | Culture | Theology |

ABSTRACT

Prior to the mid-twentieth century, the weight of scholarly opinion interpreted the biblical texts in a manner that suggested homosexuality is a significant aberration and departure from biblical norms on human sexuality, thus majority opinion deemed all same-sex relationships as sinful. Subsequent to the 1960s sexual-revolution much has changed such that many heterosexuals within Western cultures now grant approval of same-sex relationships.

This paper explores the definition and trajectory of the 1960s sexual-revolution suggesting that the basis and progress of the sexual revolution since the mid-1960s provides precise philosophical and ethical grounding for the current widespread accommodation of same-sex relationships. Additionally, this paper proposes that the sexual revolution is in essence a rebellion against God's sovereignty and design of the human race. Therefore the issues involved are fundamentally and thoroughly theological. The paper concludes suggesting a number of likely future scenarios within the trajectory of the sexual revolution.

INTRODUCTION

“Space: The final frontier
These are the voyages of the Starship
Enterprise
Its five-year mission
To explore strange new worlds
To seek out new life and new civilizations
To boldly go where no man has gone
before.”

The original series of Star Trek debuted in 1966 and immediately reinvigorated the longstanding debate over the use of split infinitives. Hitherto, as early as 1897, a contributor to an Academy magazine article noted that to always insist upon eliminating the split infinitive was little more than to blindly follow the minor irritations of language mavens and pedants,¹

thus prohibiting pleasant turns of phrase. Strict grammarians, however, were outraged at the opening lines of Star Trek, insisting that ‘to boldly go’ should correctly be rendered ‘to go boldly’. Yet, already, by the mid-1960s people generally concerned themselves more with the topic of implied sexism than erroneous grammar such that Star Trek’s introductory “no man” reference generated much heated debate and complaint. Consequently, by the time *Star Trek: The Next Generation* was aired in 1987, the show’s producers had opted for the more politically correct last line, “Where no one has gone before”. With Patrick Stewart now at the helm, perhaps in truth it had become a case of

1 “Are our critics aware that Byron is the father of their split infinitive? ‘To slowly trace’ says the noble poet ‘the forest’s shady scene.’ Cited in <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/columnists/brian-viner/brian-viner-elect-a-leader-who-doesnt-split-infinitives-846271.html>. Last accessed 20th October 2015.

[co.uk/voices/columnists/brian-viner/brian-viner-elect-a-leader-who-doesnt-split-infinitives-846271.html](http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/columnists/brian-viner/brian-viner-elect-a-leader-who-doesnt-split-infinitives-846271.html). Last accessed 20th October 2015.

“to baldly go”. Nonetheless, the split infinitive remained.

This disgruntlement with perceived sexism and ambivalence to the mangling of the Queen’s good English is somewhat telling, and perhaps amusingly illustrates, in microcosm, something of the essence of the 1960s socio-cultural revolution. Certainly had the opening lines of *Star Trek* been crafted, say, twenty years earlier, the focus and debate would have been singularly the grammatical rather than nascent sexism issue. Did people suddenly get out of bed one morning in the mid 1960s and collectively decide that emergent sexism was a priority, or can other previous factors account for this change of focus? And what, if anything, does all this have to do with the topic of same-sex relationships and the sexual revolution? In this paper there is no space to address the former rather intriguing question² but hopefully I will be able to contribute some connecting points for the latter question.

I hope to address four main objectives:

1. Define what is meant by the term ‘sexual revolution’ and briefly trace the post 1960s trajectory of this movement.
2. Seek to understand why so many heterosexuals are in favour of same-sex relationships. I will suggest that the basis and progress of the sexual revolution since the mid 1960s provides precise philosophical and ethical grounding for the current widespread accommodation of same-sex relationships, such that it should be no surprise to note the current mass approval of same-sex relationships.

² For an intriguing discussion arguing for the emergence of a liberalizing sexual permissiveness and the declining influence of religion during the 1940s and 1950s, in contrast to the general consensus that views this period as one of conservative values and behaviour, see Alan Petigny, *The Permissive Society: America, 1941-1965* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

3. I will propose that in the current sexual revolution we are witnessing a wider rejection of biblical notions of ultimate truth. That is, the sexual revolution is in essence a rebellion against God’s sovereignty and design of the human race. Therefore the issues involved are fundamentally and thoroughly theological.

4. I will suggest that the current trajectory will continue such that same-sex relationships do not constitute a final frontier in the sexual revolution. I will thus conclude this paper suggesting one or two likely scenarios for the near future.

WHAT IS THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION?

It is imperative to clarify, from the outset, what is meant by the term ‘revolution’; that is, to identify which features are typical of a revolution. All revolutions are transitional in nature, and by implication can be difficult to identify, chronicle or evaluate. Broadly speaking, it can often be easier to identify a revolution in retrospect. Certainly one may confidently assert that a revolution has happened when a considerable measure of change occurs relatively quickly and with such all-encompassing breadth and depth that it becomes difficult to comprehend and absorb. Perhaps, to significantly and eisegetically misquote Paul in his second letter to the Corinthians, we may characterise any revolution by stating that “the old has been swept away, behold the new has come” (2 Corinthians 5:17). Traditions, social structures, ways of thinking and perhaps just as importantly the people who espouse such values become obsolete.

One can easily think of historical examples, even from the twentieth century, to flesh out

this understanding: German Nazism, Italian Fascism, Mao Tse-tung's China. Perhaps, for those too young to remember those situations, more contemporary examples could be provided via reference to the Iranian Revolution, the fall of various Eastern European communist regimes since the late 1980s, or the very recent Arab Spring. Yet typically each of these revolutions were primarily political in nature and obvious to recognise. By contrast, that which has been experienced in the West has been a little different, appears less ferocious, yet nonetheless has achieved as deep a mutation of culture and society as any of the above revolutions. We could label it the "seductive revolution" or the "smiling revolution" as it promises untold blessings to all, and although it has not been a revolution of *Coup d'état* velocity, it has occurred with reasonable haste.

Specifically, with respect to the topic of same-sex relationships, consider that prior to the mid-twentieth century, the weight of scholarly opinion generally interpreted the biblical texts such that homosexual activity was deemed to be both a significant aberration and a departure from biblical norms on human sexuality. For example, as recently as 1953 the Archbishop of Canterbury, Geoffrey Fisher condemned what he termed 'homosexual indulgence' as 'a shameful vice and a grievous sin from which deliverance is to be sought by every means'.³ Such a viewpoint would not have been echoed only within the various church denominations, but would have been a relatively common opinion held more broadly across society. Yet just two years later the emergence of a significant book by D Sherwin Bailey⁴

represented the first of many serious challenges to this consensus. Somewhat dated now, and although described as "careless"⁵ and having been "borrowed, often slavishly, by a number of later writers and has had a far longer innings than it deserves"⁶ Bailey's work together with a subsequent work by John Boswell⁷ both remain highly influential and represent the foundation of much of the thinking within contemporary pro-homosexual circles.

Consequently, as traditional understanding of Scripture is perpetually challenged and re-evaluated, constantly evolving revisionist approaches regularly conclude that the Bible is not as unequivocal as previously thought. A simple example from my own denomination thoroughly illustrates this point. In his April 2014 Presidential Address to members of the Governing Body of the Church in Wales, Dr Barry Morgan, Archbishop of the Church in Wales, suggested that it is no longer possible to countenance a single Christian viewpoint on the issue of same-sex relationships. He went on to assert that our attitudes are shaped by various matters including which particular part of the Bible texts we emphasize, stating that 'We often see what we want to see',⁸ before finally concluding that, in his opinion, the Church in Wales will and should eventually accept same-sex relationships.

And so the contemporary pro-homosexual

3 Quoted in Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (Chichester: Princeton, 1987), 16.

4 Bailey, D. Sherwin. (1955). *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (London: Longmans, 1955).

5 David J Atkinson, *Homosexuals in the Christian Fellowship* (Oxford: Latimer Trust, 1979), 81.

6 David F Wright, (1989). "Homosexuality: The Relevance of the Bible" *EQ* 61:4, (1989): 292

7 John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

8 Barry Morgan, "Presidential Address – Governing Body 2014." Online: <http://www.churchinwales.org.uk/structure/bishops/sermons-and-addresses-archbishop-barry-morgan/presidential-address-governing-body-april-2014/> Last accessed 20th October 2015.

movement has, perhaps in less than a single generation, achieved much of its aim of establishing itself as acceptable within mainstream opinion. It will not recede any time soon nor lose momentum in its quest for ever greater recognition and rights, largely because it is so intimately tied to the deep revolutionary changes within post 1960s Western society, in particular those associated with philosophical postmodernism. Continued resistance to the homosexual lifestyle is now increasingly impugned as illiberal, bigoted, hateful and so much worse within contemporary society and therefore an element of boldness is required to even begin to articulate a position in opposition to the zeitgeist.

HETEROSEXUAL BEHAVIOUR AND SAME-SEX APPROVAL

One commentator suggests that “Homosexuality may be the key to understanding the whole of human sexuality”⁹, yet a curious factor in this situation is why so many heterosexuals are in favour of same-sex relationships and same-sex marriages. One reason, amongst several that could be legitimately proposed¹⁰, for the current mass support of same-sex relationships is the very similar trajectory of heterosexual inter-relational behaviour since the commencement of the 1960s sexual revolution. Specifically, the fundamental presuppositions and behaviour that underscore the homosexual lifestyle are the very same principles central to the trajectory of

post 1960s heterosexual history. For example, temporary relationships, multiple partners, serial cohabitation, liberal laws that legislate for divorce upon demand and non-procreative sex replacing fecundity as the pinnacle of sexual fulfilment. This is the inherent tendency to narcissistic sexual anarchy that is common to all sexual practices and preferences that have by their very nature rejected God’s Genesis 2 design for “monogamous, exogamous, heterosexuality”,¹¹ that is the marriage of one man to one woman from outside of the immediate familial context.

Decades prior to the dream of de-closeted homosexual relationships, heterosexual culture had already deemed recreation and personal pleasure as the primary aim of all sexual activity. And so the growing dissolution of marriage as a conjugal, monogamous bond and the attendant rise of no-fault divorce provided proverbial wrecking balls for the destruction of the ancient architecture of long held Christian notions of human sexuality. Unquestionably, since the seminal decade of peace and love that was the 1960s western societies have witnessed the brisk demise of what had appeared to be relatively safely anchored cultural environments. Yet, to continue this maritime metaphor, stormy seas lay ahead, and we may now observe with hindsight that the hedonistic party has been well and truly shipwrecked by the consequences of flirtation with the mythical Sirens of lust and immorality, as the intoxicating effect of 1960s ‘free love’ made way for the decidedly darker decades that followed. The Apostle Paul warned the Galatians that a man should not be deceived, for God is not mocked and that man will reap what he sows (Galatians 6:7). That which is true individually is also true corporately, and

9 Camille Paglia, *Vamps and Tramps* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 67.

10 For a discussion on how the “sexual revolution was in large part successful because it used entertainment media as a principal tool of cultural subversion.” See Brian Mattson, “The Sexual Revolution, Entertainment, And Christian Art.” Online: <http://drbrianmattson.com/journal/2015/10/26/the-sexual-revolution-entertainment-and-christian-art> Last accessed 20th October, 2015.

11 David M. Gunn and Danna N. Fewell, *Gender, Power And Promise: The Subject of the Bible’s First Story* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), 29.

western culture has manifestly reaped what it has long sown, as, to once again change the metaphor, the chickens have come home to roost, in the form of sexually transmitted diseases (particularly the spectre of HIV/AIDS) and other wider societal implications.

The ramifications of this nihilistic narcissism are everywhere to see, be they sexual, interpersonal or even familial. Widespread spousal disgruntlement has predictably led to a tsunami of divorce on demand and the extensive acceptance (and approval) of the wreckage of marriage and the family. Narcissists require mirrors of course, and so we arrive at a thoroughly fragmented, terminally self-indulgent, self-centred, self-obsessed, lust enslaved, porn infested, postmodern individualism. Having been sold the mythical dream of the individual’s human right to romantic and erotic passions with whomever one wishes, whenever one wishes, regardless of consequence, the sexual-narcissist tragically discovers that what he believed was a lover’s swoon is in truth little more than a self-gratifier’s glance at his own image. He has fallen in love with his own sexual self and consequently we may observe that what began as narcissistic self-worship culminates ultimately in personal nihilistic destruction. The cultural environment is riddled with so many self-obsessed demands and so many diverse ways of slaking the lusts for those demands, that the confused cacophony of multiple sexual options places a perpetual assault upon the senses. All is placed before the sexual-narcissist, yet nothing has meaning, as true intimacy is foolishly exchanged for despairing egocentric sexual experimentation, be it heterosexual or homosexual. The sad irony is that this self-centred pursuit is ultimately self-destructive. W B Yeats put it well in his wonderful poem “The Second Coming”,

“Turning and turning in the widening gyre
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity”¹²

Yeats continues his poem, questioning whether something like the antithesis of the Christian notion of a “second coming” is about to occur.

“Surely some revelation is at hand;
Surely the Second coming is at hand”.

Yet rather than earthly peace, this will, instead, bring terror as things fall apart and the centre fails to hold. Yeats drives home his point culminating with his haunting climactic question, asking;

“And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,
Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?”

But Yeats’s beast isn’t deteriorating or dying in its slouching, as so many references to his poem would have us believe. No, his beast slouches in steady, dedicated progress toward a terrifying goal. The beast is coming to wreak unbounded disorder and devastation. Is this perhaps an allusion too strong to be applied to the sexual revolution generally and mass acclamation of same-sex relationships specifically? Dedicated progress? Unbounded disorder and devastation? Surely such exaggerated rhetoric is little more than strained hyperbole.

If one is tempted to think such is the case then recourse should be taken to a very important 1989 book by Marshall Kirk and

12 William Butler Yeats, *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (Churchtown, Dundrum: The Cuala Press, 1920), 19.

Hunter Madsen¹³. This seminal book emerging out of the modern homosexual movement was published with little fanfare yet was received with huge and widespread acclaim. Throughout, the authors devastatingly combine public relations savvy with sophisticated psychological techniques and mass media tactics to propose that a change in presentation, to a more benign face of the homosexual lifestyle would be required to achieve mass heterosexual acceptance of the homosexual lifestyle. The book represents a gay manifesto for the 1990s that aimed to repackage the homosexual community as a long-suffering victim of “antigay bigots”¹⁴. Note well this shrewd tactic, employed here and throughout the book, of identifying all critics of homosexual behaviour as “bigots.” This language is deliberate and purposefully employed to enhance this idea. The authors suggest that; “The trick is to get the bigot into the position of feeling a conflicting twinge of shame”¹⁵. This will be achieved by ensuring that whenever “his homohatred surfaces” then “propagandistic advertisement” can be usefully employed to;

“depict homophobic and homohating bigots as crude loudmouths and assholes
- people who say not only ‘faggot’ but
‘nigger,’ ‘kike,’ and other shameful epithets
- who are ‘not Christian.’”

The authors press the point, noting that such propaganda “can, in short, link homohating bigotry with all sorts of attributes the bigot would be ashamed to possess, and with social consequences he would find unpleasant and scary.”¹⁶

13 Marshall Kirk & Hunter Madsen, *After the Ball: How America will Conquer its Fear and Hatred of Gay in the 90s* (New York: Doubleday, 1989).

14 *Ibid*, 153.

15 *Ibid*, 151.

16 *Ibid*, 151-152.

And it works of course. It works because the psychological tactics employed are devastatingly profound as the already sexually self-centred, egocentric, hedonistic heterosexual culture is persuaded that at the root of the homosexual movement is a harmless cry for similar equality, similar liberty and similar self-fulfilment. And it works because of the peculiar vacuity that seemingly attends all public discourse, sexual or otherwise; that is, the outcome of so much of modern media’s encouragement is for fragmentary, emotive sloganeering and a childish Manichean view of cultural history. With the benefit of several decades of hindsight it is clear that this constant repetition of the “bigot” mantra has been hugely successful in eventually achieving the desired psychological effect on large masses of people. The slouching beast, that is the pan-sexual revolution has, and continues to come to wreak deliberate and unbounded disorder and devastation.

Borrowing the final line from Yeats’ poem, Joan Didion in her 1968 book “Slouching Towards Bethlehem” expands on this notion describing a social catastrophe, as things fall apart and the centre fails to hold. Didion reports from the culture of the 1960s Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco’s hippy scene, narrating accounts of mass drug taking, crude sexism, child neglect and of the disoriented youth she met there, including a troubling description of a five-year-old named Susan whose mother fed her LSD¹⁷. As she observes the young hippies, Didion states that this ‘was the first time I had dealt directly and flatly with evidence of atomization, the proof that things fall apart’¹⁸. She concludes

“At some point between 1945 and 1967
we had somehow neglected to tell these

17 Joan Didion, *Slouching Towards Bethlehem* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1968), 125-126.

18 *Ibid*, xi.

children the rules of the game we happened to be playing.”¹⁹

Subsequent to Didion, Robert Bork, also borrowing Yeats’ line, wrote of how western culture, and American culture in particular, is according to the title of his book “Slouching Towards Gomorrah.”²⁰ As he also echoes Yeats’ words that “Things fall apart and the centre cannot hold” Bork offers a prophetic critique of a culture in decline as radical individualism and the drastic reduction of limits to personal gratification have undermined morality, intellect and culture. A final example here of the borrowing of this same line from Yeats’ poem, is a 2014 book by W C Harris, an American professor of English Literature, who joyfully claims that rather than Bethlehem or Gomorrah, Western culture is in fact “Slouching Towards Gaytheism”²¹. His central argument is that homophobia will never be eradicated until religious faith is thoroughly extinguished. Harris shockingly claims, with all intended seriousness, that breeding HIV for fun is a concept of true love, in which, with clearly incestuous overtones, the infected partner becomes the daddy or the brother of the man he infects²². Harris acknowledges that such behaviour is risky but suggests that such action is morally equivalent to attending church, which he deems to be equally risky.²³ Harris’ book reaches its *reductio ad absurdum*, scarcely even attaining to the level of nonsense, when he informs his readers how there is

19 *Ibid*,123.

20 Robert Bork, *Slouching Towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996).

21 W C Harris, *Slouching Towards Gaytheism: Christianity and Queer Survival in America* (New York: Suny Press, 2014).

22 *Ibid*, 79.

23 *Ibid*, 86.

“violence recommended toward Christians or apostate Christians in Deuteronomy 18 and 82, which parallel koranic (sic) verses to slay unbelievers.”²⁴

The reader of Scripture will of course experience acute difficulty locating not just chapter 82 of Deuteronomy but any Christians therein, apostate or otherwise.

REJECTING BIBLICAL NOTIONS OF TRUTH FOR HUMAN SEXUALITY

In truth the pan-sexual revolution is fundamentally a rebellion and same-sex relationships represent merely an extreme form of this pan-sexual revolution, a moment-by-moment, day-by-day rejection of God’s sovereignty and design. At its centre there is no virtue, for such must be absent in the narcissistic self-love of rejecting one’s own God ordained essential gendered self and treating it as “only half intact”, seeking to sexually unite with what one already is, such that “two half-males unite to form a whole male, (and) two half-females unite to form a whole female.”²⁵ Same-sex relationships can offer no life affirmation and are unable to long camouflage a rebellious deviancy against God’s design. This being the case, it is no excess to assert that the pan-sexual revolution is essentially theological in nature, that is, whether it wishes to or not, it must address both the intrinsic nature of humankind as *Imago Dei* beings and the divine purposes for human sexual function.

Yet contemporary Western culture has, via

24 *Ibid*, 171.

25 Robert Gagnon, “The Bible’s Surprisingly Consistent Message on a Male-Female Requirement for Marriage”, Online: <http://www.robgagnon.net/homosexKnustCombinedResp.htm>. Last accessed 20th October 2015.

Darwinian evolution, removed both God and theological reflection, replacing the Creator with mini-creators who each define reality for themselves. This is the vitally important connection between the various strands of the pan-sexual revolution, be it heterosexual immorality, homosexual couplings or the now emerging trans-genderism of individuals such as Bruce Jenner. Users of social media website Facebook may now chose between an array of seventy-one different genders,²⁶ including the term 'gender fluid'²⁷, that is the ability to flit from one gender to another according to how one feels. This is Alice in Wonderland's "through the looking glass" territory. The caterpillar asks Alice 'who are you?' She responds to the caterpillar "I hardly know sir, just at present. I knew who I was this morning, but I've changed a few times since then".²⁸ One may indeed wonder which is stranger, the notion of talking caterpillars or that there are now seventy-one different genders. Yet why not? This is the manifestation of the autonomy of the human race, an utterly unwarranted confidence in mankind's own capacity to work out truth.

By contrast Christians should begin at a different point. In Matthew 19:4-6 Jesus is asked a tough question about divorce and his response is instructive here. "Have you not read? From the beginning, God created them male and female...". His response presupposes a worldview that includes three specific givens: Firstly, Jesus crucially presupposes a worldview that includes God as creator. Secondly, this God has spoken to mankind; a point that leads directly to Jesus' third presupposition,

26 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/facebook/10930654/Facebooks-71-gender-options-come-to-UK-users.html>.
Last accessed 20th October 2015.

27 Ibid.

28 Lewis Carroll, *Alice's Adventures In Wonderland*. (Barcelona: Children's Golden Library, 2003), 41.

namely, that which God has spoken has been communicated to mankind via a readable text. In other words mankind can know what God has spoken. This challenges the very core of the current situation for if there is a Creator, a God who has spoken in a meaningful way such that all humanity can understand, then it also follows that there is a special creation, humankind. Consequently Jesus' statement in Matthew 19 is thoroughly meaningful in outlining the pre-fall requirement for male and female identities and therefore gender and genetic distinctions or complementarities in God's design for human sexuality. To reject this notion is to remove the very core of what God commanded in the beginning, that is, in the image of God he created them, male and female, commanding them to be fruitful and multiply. Autonomous man responds with a defiant and resounding "no" to such a notion and with the command to be fruitful thus thoroughly rejected it is no surprise to note mass societal recourse to, and approval of, the destruction of the unborn via abortion. Camille Paglia succinctly summarises the predicament;

"Nature exists, whether academics like it or not. And in nature, procreation is the single relentless rule. Our sexual bodies were designed for reproduction".²⁹

So in Genesis 1 we discover the ultimate foundation is that God exists and created everything. Narrowing this down, the pinnacle of God's creation is humanity, *Imago Dei* beings, male and female brought together as one to propagate the species. Consequently the chief rejection within society is this primary foundation: God exists. Everything else follows from this rejection of primary truth. It is thus no coincidence that the redefinition of marriage

29 Paglia, *Vamps and Tramps*, 70-72.

is being currently attempted in a climate of aggressive and hostile neo-atheism. We thus witness a hostile reaction to the notion of the existence of God, a hostile reaction to any question of Darwinianism, a hostile reaction to gender distinctions and a hostile reaction to the notion of marriage as a foundation for godly society.

WHERE NEXT?

So, having painted a somewhat gloomy picture, the question remains; where are western societies headed? Are we, as the title of this paper asks, at the final frontier of the sexual revolution or are there further likely developments? I wish to suggest that there remain a few frontiers, strange new pan-sexual worlds that will likely open up in the relatively near future. Firstly, there will be increasing calls for widespread acceptance of polyamorous unions; that is multiple partner marriages. Western societies already permit and even encourage serial polyamorous unions, thus it remains a case of permitting concurrent multiple partner unions. Secondly, there will be increasing calls, and sympathy for, widespread acceptance of incestuous unions. Clarification of meaning is vital here, that is, reference here is to sympathy towards calls for mutually agreed adult-committed incest. Why these two specific frontiers?

I have alluded to Yeats' falcon that no longer hears the call of the falconer, as a metaphor for how culture rejects the Creator and his voice. Consequently culture can no longer recognise the fundamental design in creation for human sexuality, which is what God has provided in the Genesis 1 and 2 texts. Returning to Jesus' words in Matthew 19 we have seen how he appealed to these very same Genesis texts to show how important a male-female pre-

requisite was to his view of marriage and human sexuality. Specifically he argued that the twoness of the sexes, ordained by God at creation, was the foundation for restricting the number of persons in a sexual bond to two; that is a requirement for one male and one female. Removing the requirement for either one of the sexes in a sexual union is not just a direct violation of Jesus' foundational sexual ethics; it also removes any logical requirement for two persons within a sexual union. Why not three, four, five, ten? Thus the promotion and legalisation of same-sex marriages opens a door of strong logic whereby not only will we begin to encounter strong calls for recognition of multiple partner unions, but the very logic for resisting such, having been long abandoned, will no longer be useful in countering such notions. Polyamorous unions will increasingly be very much on the agenda.

Yet the intended pattern of human sexuality is not just monogamous heterosexuality, one partner of the opposite sex. The Genesis texts also clearly patterns an exogamous requirement, that is an "outside the family" criteria. "Partnership according to this agenda, demands not just gender difference but also familial difference"³⁰. Certainly if homosexuality represents sexual coupling between persons who are too alike from a gender perspective, then adult committed incest represents sexual coupling between persons who are too alike from a genetic perspective. Removing the requirement for gender distinctions within marriage opens a door of strong logic whereby it is untenable to oppose the removal of the requirement for genetic distinctions within marriage. Corporate societal approval for the former now granted, calls for acceptance of the latter will yield to the very same logic employed

30 Gunn and Fewell, *Gender, Power and Promise*, 29.

to secure approval of the former.

As postmodern man continues to reject the notion of divinely revealed morality in favour of his own constructivist approach, creating both his individual self and his collectivist world³¹, additional further sexual frontiers will inevitably open up. The emergence of an infinite number of genders exemplifies this self-invention. Likewise, a spectrum of sexual preferences will emerge, each demanding acceptance and recognition. Intriguingly a recent United Nations Family Planning Agency report commences, suggesting

“men who have sex with men” (MSM)
“should be understood to include young men, i.e. those in the age range 10-24 years”³².

This definition attempts to create a community based upon mutual behaviour, despite the fact that boys as young as ten years old may not consider it fitting for themselves to be included in such communities. The implications of this definition are clear and should not pass unnoticed.

CONCLUSION

Seeking to identify the central characteristics of any revolution, we have noted that with hindsight all revolutions are transitional in nature, and that it is generally easier to identify a revolution in retrospect once it is noted that a considerable measure of change has occurred

31 For a detailed critique of this notion, see, for example, Thomas Molnar, “Utopia, the Perennial Heresy”. (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1967).

32 United Nations Population Fund, “Implementing Comprehensive HIV and STI Programmes with Men who have Sex with Men: Practical Guidance for Collaborative Interventions”. (September 2015), xvii
Online: <http://www.unfpa.org/publications/implementing-comprehensive-hiv-and-sti-programmes-men-who-have-sex-men>.
Last accessed 20th October 2015.

with relative haste. Applying this understanding to the changes in post-1960s western society, specifically with respect to the contemporary pro-homosexual movement, we noted that in less than a single generation, advocates of the movement have achieved much of their aim of establishing itself as acceptable within mainstream opinion.

A curious factor in the situation is the sheer volume of heterosexuals who are in favour of same-sex relationships and same-sex marriages. One reason, proposed here, for this phenomenon is the very similar course that heterosexual inter-relational behaviour has tracked since the commencement of the 1960s sexual revolution. Specifically, we have seen how decades prior to the dream of de-closeted homosexual relationships, heterosexual culture had already deemed recreation and personal pleasure as the primary aim of all sexual activity.

The pan-sexual revolution is, however, fundamentally a rebellion with same-sex relationships representing an extreme form of this revolution against God’s sovereignty and design. The Christian response must commence from a biblical perspective, in the knowledge that not only does God exist but also that he has communicated to mankind via the words of scripture. Failure to do so will inevitably give rise to an utterly unwarranted confidence in mankind’s own capacity to work out sexual and ultimate truths.

In the final section it has been suggested that whilst same-sex relationships represent a frontier in the sexual revolution, they are certainly not the final frontier. Societal acceptance of same-sex relationships opens a door of logic such that calls for recognition of polyamorous relationships and adult-committed incestuous relationships become inevitable. In conclusion there are a number of additional strange new

pan-sexual worlds to visit and explore before the final frontier is reached.

David Williams

*David Williams holds a BTh [Hons] from the University of Wales [Lampeter] and an MA [Theology] from the University of Chester. He is an Approved Tutor of the University of Chester and is a member of King's Evangelical Divinity School's Academic Committee. He is the tutor for several modules on KEDS' BTh and MA programmes. Additionally he is the Director of Studies for KEDS' "Knowing Your Bible" course. He has recently published his first book, **It's All In Your Head** (2015).*

