

If we develop models of mind keyed to brain and absent heart and emotion, then we are playing into the hand of the mainstreams of Western science, which cannot lead us into a new era of peace. We need new models if we are to begin to make sense of Rev. Moon's statement that "the human mind is more elevated than the human body and the spirit is more elevated than the mind. God resides in a place more elevated than the spirit world."

Hopefully Dr. Ishii's model can serve as a stepping-stone to a much more comprehensive model.

Toward a Unification Theory of Sexuality

Dr. Kurt Frey,

Associate Professor of Psychology
University of Bridgeport, USA

Today, we need a complete solution for the problems of sexual immorality, family breakdown, and alienation among young people.

- Sun Myung Moon (1997c, p. 38) -

I. Introduction

In an article entitled "Toward a Unification Psychology," Frey (2006) asserted that Unification Thought should expand its scope by addressing issues germane to the field psychology, in order to have greater relevance and impact in today's world. Topics within psychology that deserve immediate attention are *personality*, *sexuality*, *social psychology*, and *psychopathology*. (Unification Thought chapters on Epistemology and Logic already shed light on the important topic of *cognition*.) Frey (2006) tentatively explored the first of these topics, namely personality. The present paper addresses the second topic, namely sexuality. This paper is in no way definitive. However, it will hopefully inspire further efforts to flesh out a more accurate and formal Unification Theory of Sexuality. Such a theory can then guide, and be informed by, scientific research on sexuality (see Leshner, 2003).

Sexuality is a topic of vital significance. The field of sexology covers a wide range of issues pertaining to sexual arousal, sexual scripts, conception, contraception, pregnancy, abortion, premarital sex, extramarital sex, gender roles, sexual orientation, paraphilias, sexual addiction, sexual dysfunction, sex therapy, sexual coercion, pornography, prostitution, sexually transmitted diseases, and so on (Hyde & DeLamater,

2006). Human beings have been engaging in sexual intercourse for tens of thousands of years, and the vast majority of people in every existing culture engage in sex. Sexual behavior has profound physical, emotional, mental, spiritual, and social consequences. Efforts to improve the human condition cannot afford to ignore this important topic.

The present paper addresses four topics: love and sex, the purposes of sex, sexual scripts, and false sex. Again, it should be kept in mind that this paper is merely an exploratory extrapolation of Unification Thought to the topic of sexuality. Any controversy this paper provokes will hopefully prompt further efforts to articulate a Unification Theory of Sexuality.

II. Love and Sex

If the human beings Adam and Eve had become one body under the love of God, everything would have been complete and perfect.

- Sun Myung Moon (1997a, p. 1) -

The first section of this paper makes some general points about love and sex that will serve as background for the subsequent sections on the purposes of sex, sexual scripts, and types of false sex. From the perspective of Unification Thought, love and sex are inextricably related, or at least they should be. The relationship between love and sex is that between *sungsang* (subject) and *hyungsang* (object). Love is internal, primary, and directive; sex is external, secondary, and responsive. The motive behind sex should be love, and sex should be an expression of love. Thus, any emerging Unification theory of sexuality will need to be grounded in the Unification Thought account of love.

Philosophers and poets have been expressing views on love for millennia. In recent decades, psychologists and other social scientists have used empirical methods to better understand love. Controversial at first, their investigations have focused on *components* of love (Sternberg, 1986), *attitudes* toward love (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986), and the cognitive and behavioral hallmarks of being in love (Aron, 1991). Unification Thought focuses on the source and characteristics of *true love* and contrasts it with *false love*.

1. God's Love

According to Unification Thought, true love begins in the core of

God's being. God's most fundamental attribute is *Heart*, the impulse to love unconditionally. As such, God requires an object—someone who can receive His great love. God cannot be happy without a partner with whom He can share His love and happiness. God created human beings to be the greatest objects of His love.

Thus, God created out of a pure desire to love. His love is totally unselfish. He gives absolute and unconditional love to humankind and the rest of creation. God wanted everything for His first children, Adam and Eve. He wanted to give them the entire universe and the fullness of life. He wanted to bless them with rich lives, including rich sexual lives. Importantly, a man by himself, even though he may be completely devoted to God, is not God's ultimate love partner. Nor is a woman by herself God's ultimate love partner. Instead, God finds His ultimate love partner in a man and woman who are united together as husband and wife in a marriage blessed by God. God abides in that couple's marriage and family.

In fact, God's love is meant to penetrate every aspect of marriage and family life, including a couple's sexual relationship. God's heart of unselfish love is meant to find full expression in human sexual interactions. God wants to take great delight in the sexual ecstasy shared by a husband and wife.

2. Family Love

God's love is expressed divisionally within the family. Unification Thought identifies four *spheres of love* within the family—*children's love*, *sibling's love*, *spouse's love*, and *parent's love* (see UTI, 2005, pp. 558-567). Human beings come to know God through experiencing these various types of love. Through experiencing love as a child, as a brother or sister, as a husband or wife, and finally as a parent, one comes to know God's heart of love. Experiencing these loves within the family is necessary for the development of one's conscience and heart. Each sphere of love provides lessons in how to love. In this sense, the family is the *school of love*.

The spheres of love can be understood as concentric circles of love within the family. At the core is children's love, which is encircled by sibling's love, spouse's love, and parent's love. Experiencing children's love prepares one to experience sibling's love, which prepares one to experience spouse's love, which prepares one to experience parent's love. Children's love is the most basic love, while parent's love is the most inclusive love. Parent's love incorporates the other three types of love as well as an additional quality of love.

While parent's love is the most inclusive love, spouse's love is the most representative Spouse's love—also known as *conjugal love*—represents the entire masculine and feminine loves within the family, humankind, and the creation, as well as the masculine and feminine loves of God. Importantly, conjugal love is the only love that should be expressed sexually. Sex should not take place before marriage or outside of marriage, nor should it occur with same-sex partners or with siblings or children. Premarital, extramarital, homosexual, pedophilic, and incestuous interactions wrongfully occur when relationships other than the conjugal relationship become sexualized.

Sexual intercourse between spouses allows them to become parents and experience parental love. Sexual intercourse is the point of transition between conjugal love (the most representative love) and parental love (the most inclusive love). Only through sexual intercourse does conjugal love expand into parental love (which includes but also supersedes conjugal love). Sexual intercourse is also the point of connection between one's family of origin and a newly created family.

3. True Love and True Sexuality

As mentioned, God is the source of true love. Human beings were meant to inherit God's true love through experiencing the various types of love in the family. They were meant to be part of the lineage of God, expressing the true love of God. They were created to embody and practice true love and be intoxicated by God's love each and every moment. Upon fully experiencing God's love as individuals, they would become a true husband and wife and then true parents. They would share true love with each other, their children, extended family members, and others in society. Children born into families of true love would easily learn true love, qualify for marriage and parenthood, and perpetuate true love from one generation to the next. True love in the family would expand to true love in the society, nation, and world.

In general, true love involves living for the sake of others. It is completely altruistic. It involves treating others with a warm and caring heart. True love involves approaching others in a gentle manner, seeking to understand their circumstances, protecting them and helping them out of difficulties, supporting and cooperating with them, and forgiving their imperfections and transgressions. If necessary, true love is self-sacrificial. All of these characteristics of true love should apply to sex. True sexuality is caring, gentle, understanding, protective, supporting, cooperative, and forgiving. True sexuality is altruistic and self-sacrificial. God created the first man and woman

hoping that they would become the embodiments of true love and true sexuality, and then have children who would also become the embodiments of true love and, in due time, true sexuality. As already mentioned, the ideal relationship between love and sex should be that between *sungsang* (subject) and *hyungsang* (object). True sexuality expresses true love.

According to Unification Thought, God's masculine (*Yang*) and feminine (*Yin*) characteristics are harmoniously united. When true love unites a man (a substantial *yang* being) and a woman (a substantial *yin* being), God and the united couple are mutually attract to each other. God is attracted to the union between the man and the woman and the united man and woman are attracted to God. God's *vertical love* and the man and woman's *horizontal love* unite. Together they create dynamic circular motion (UTI, 2005, pp. 153-160). This is the most dramatic union in all of the cosmos (see Moon, 1997b, p. 22). The sexual act is perhaps the most intense expression of this dramatic union, because in the sexual act a man and a woman are the most completely united. God is most attracted to a true husband and wife in those moments when they are sexually united. Indeed, the dwelling place of God is the place where husband and wife become completely one (Moon, 1997c, p. 47). Moreover, a true husband and wife would feel the closest to God in those moments when they are sexually united.

4. The Human Fall

Unification Thought explains that the first human ancestors ("Adam" and "Eve" in the book of Genesis) disobeyed God's explicit instructions during the time when they were growing to maturity. Specifically, before perfecting their personalities and establishing inviolable relationships with God, they engaged in a premature sexual relationship with each other. According to Reverend Moon, it is significant that, after defying God's commandment to not "eat of the fruit," Adam and Eve covered their lower parts and fearfully hid themselves among the trees (Moon, 1997a, p. 6; see Genesis, Chapter 3, and HSA-UWC, 1973, pp. 65-80). Adam and Eve's behavior indicates that they sinned through the misuse of their sexual organs. That is, they engaged in sexual intercourse. They did so prematurely and before they were blessed in marriage. Reverend Moon has explained "the only possible sin that could have been fatal in the Garden of Eden, where Adam and Eve were in communication with God and living in joy, was the sin of illicit love" (Moon, 1997a, p. 5).

Although Adam and Eve did not die physically from their actions, they did suffer a degree of spiritual death.

The human fall represented the breaking of God's lineage. With the fall, God lost His children. He lost His hold over the human heart. As a result of their actions, Adam and Eve became alienated from God. They failed to fully experience or embody true love. They were never filled with the joy of true love. The love they inherited was *false love*, tainted with selfishness and accompanied by guilt, shame, anxiety, fear, frustration, anger, and emptiness. False love is all that Adam and Eve could now express. Their hearts became cold and hard, unable to express the natural impulse to love. Their spiritual desires took a back seat to their physical desires. Adam and Eve entered into conjugal love unprepared to meet its true requirements. They gave birth to children who were ignorant of God and essentially selfish. This same "fallen nature" was passed onto subsequent generations. People throughout history and the billions of people living today inherited this tragic legacy.

One of the results of the fall is that human beings lost their ability to practice and experience true sexuality. Human sexuality became selfishly lustful and compulsive, devoid of true love. It became fraught with guilt, shame, anxiety, fear, frustrations, anger, and emptiness. Human beings never fully understood the true purposes of sex. They never adopted a true script for their sexual interactions. They entered into myriad forms of deviant sex and pursued physical satisfaction and superficial intimacy at the expense of their deeper desires for truth, beauty, goodness, and true love.

III. The Purposes of Sex

According to the ideal of love, all love relationships in the animal and plant kingdom are for reproduction only. Human beings are the sole exception. Only they enjoy freedom in the conjugal relationship of love. This is humanity's sexual privilege as the lord of all Creation. God gave the blessing and infinite joy of love to His sons and daughters. However, the True Freedom that God allowed requires human responsibility. If an individual were to insist upon and practice freedom of love without responsibility, how much destruction would take place.

- Sun Myung Moon (1997a, p. 6) -

A common purpose of sex is reproduction. As sexual beings we

engage in sexual intercourse in order to reproduce. The so-called reproductive bias—found in many historical eras and cultures—is the belief that reproduction is the sole purpose of sexual behavior. It is a bias in the sense that it ignores other purposes, such as pair bonding and pleasure. A related view was the early Christian belief that the sexual act was essentially evil and a threat to one's spiritual growth; only through procreation did it become good (Bullough & Bullough, 1995). Other common purposes of sex include affection and physical pleasure. Few people in today's world would argue with the idea that sex reinforces pair bonding and is a source of exquisite pleasure.

Unification Thought has yet to clearly identify the purposes of sex. However, it does describe how connected beings have *dual purposes*—a *purpose for the individual* and a *purpose for the whole*. A connected being's "purpose for the individual is to maintain its existence and development as an individual, and its purpose for the whole is to live for the existence and development of the whole" (UTI, 2005, p. 139). Unification Thought also asserts that, "For human beings, the purpose for the whole is to exist for the sake of God" (UTI, 2005, p. 140). Furthermore, Unification Thought makes a distinction between the *sungsang* purpose for the whole and the *hyungsang* purpose for the whole in created beings (p. 140). *Sungsang* refers to the aspect of an entity that is relatively internal, central, and primary. *Hyungsang* refers to the aspect of an entity that is relatively external, peripheral, and secondary. For example, the brain is the *sungsang* aspect of a person's physical self, while the body is its *hyungsang* aspect. In created beings (other than human beings), the *hyungsang* purpose for the whole is that of forming a created being of a higher dimension. The *sungsang* purpose for the whole is that of existing for the sake of human beings. For example, the planet Mars exists to form the solar system as well as to support and bring joy to human beings.

If it is possible for there to be *sungsang* and *hyungsang* purposes for the whole, than one can assume that there can also be *sungsang* and *hyungsang* purposes for the individual. Given these possibilities, one can articulate four sexual purposes—the *sungsang sexual purpose for the whole* (to give joy to God), the *hyungsang sexual purpose for the whole* (to establish a true family in which God can abide), the *sungsang sexual purpose for the individual* (to have children and thereby extend one's lineage), and, finally, the *hyungsang sexual purpose for the individual* (to share intimacy and pleasure). What follows is a brief description of each of these sexual purposes.

1. Give Joy to God

The *sungsang aspect of the sexual purpose for the whole* is to give joy to God. Unification Thought would assert that human beings should never engage in sex without a commitment to the purpose of pleasing God. According to heart motivation theory (UTI, 2005, p. 44), God created human beings in order to obtain joy through love. He created human beings in the form of male and female in order to manifest His *Yang* and *Yin* qualities, respectively. God experiences great joy through vicariously experiencing the love between a husband and wife who are each fully united with Him in love. There is perhaps no human activity that brings more delight and joy to God than sexual intercourse between a true husband and true wife. God abides in the heart of the person who has perfected his or her personality and character. Even more so, God abides in the relationship between two such individuals of the opposite sex who have committed themselves to each other in a God-centered marriage, and especially when they are fully and unselfishly sexually united.

Related to this purpose of giving joy to God are the words of Dr. Sang Hun Lee. Dr. Lee was one of Reverend Moon's earliest students and the author of several Unification Thought books. He died in 1997 but has been able to report some of his observations of the spirit world through an earthly medium. He described one couple's lovemaking in the spirit world:

Their love is to give joy to God. When they make love in the fields of flowers, on waves, on the blue grass, in the mountain where the birds are singing, and in the midst of a forest, all surroundings will dance and be harmonized with them, which we can never imagine with our practical minds (Lee, 1998, p. xiii).

Again, the most central and primary purpose of sex is to give joy to God. How many couples have been unaware of this purpose or have neglected it in their sexual interactions?

2. Establish a True Family

The *hyungsang aspect of the sexual purpose for the whole* is to establish a true family, one in which God can abide and which can serve the greater social good. A family can normally only be established through sexual intercourse. Through the act of sexual intercourse a couple establishes a family, wherein there occur all four types of love.

Before beginning a family, a couple only experiences conjugal love together. As individuals they would have experienced children's love and sibling's love in their family of origin. Then, through their marriage they experience conjugal love together. After sexual intercourse and conceiving a child, they begin to experience parental love together. Thus, sexual intercourse is the act through which a couple can expand their love together. Thereafter, their ongoing sexual relationship should be integrated with the rest of their family life. Sexual episodes are occasions within a marriage when husband and wife can commune deeply with God and each other. This allows them to renew their love for God and each other, and also be refreshed for family life.

Reverend Moon frequently speaks of the importance of God-centered marriages. He often asserts that God is the root of love in the family and that the family is the basis of world peace. It is for this reason that he and his wife, Dr. Hak Ja Han Moon, have sponsored numerous international marriages and blessing ceremonies. The collapse of the family has brought intractable social, political, and economic problems. Practicing true love and true sex within true families is the only hope of preventing and solving such problems.

3. Conceive Children

The *sungsang aspect of the sexual purpose for the individual* is to have children. Through conceiving and raising children one confronts perpetual challenges and enjoys continuous rewards. Through having children one develops one's parental heart and thereby more fully understands God's heart. Being a parent requires constant self-sacrifice that ultimately expands one's ability to love in the way that God loves. As mentioned previously, parental love is the most inclusive love. True parental love is only possible on the basis of children's love, sibling's love, and spouse's love.

Parents can experience great joy through seeing them reflected in their children's personalities. Unification Thought explains: "When parents look at their children, they perceive each child with his or her character as so beautiful and lovely, since children are the manifestation of their parents" (UTI, 2005, p. 185). Importantly, a child's genotype is more than the blending of his or her parent's genotypes. Unification Thought explains that a child's uniqueness derives not only from the combined genetic influences of both parents. It also derives from an additional creative input from God (UTI, 2005, p. 184-185). Thus, having children allows a couple to participate with God in the co-creation of a completely unique new person.

Furthermore, by having children, a husband and wife are able to extend their respective lineages and leave a substantial legacy on earth after physical death. A couple is survived by its offspring. Sociobiologists emphasize the biological imperative of propagating one's genes into the next generation. The sexual instinct is so powerful because whatever genes support it is carried along in the gene pool. A strong sexual appetite gives one a so-call differential reproductive advantage. Sexual intercourse is the sine qua non of human survival (see Barash, 1980, and Wilson, 1980). However, sociobiologists have generally failed to recognize the sexual purpose for the whole, especially its *sungsang* aspect, which is to give joy to God. Interestingly, Reverend Moon has emphasized the importance of lineage, claiming that lineage is greater than life and love, because lineage is the fruit of the unity of life and love. Reverend Moon also teaches that human beings must be reconnected to God's lineage (UPF, 2006).

4. Share Intimacy and Pleasure

The *hyungsang* aspect of the sexual purpose for the individual is to share psychological intimacy and physical pleasure with one's spouse. A true husband is unselfishly intimate with his wife and a true wife is unselfishly intimate with her husband. Each of them gives physical pleasure to the other. Through learning about the most effective techniques of communication and sexual arousal, and through giving completely and unconditionally to each other, a husband and wife can enjoy the most intense and sublime intimacy and pleasure imaginable together. According to Unification Thought, such intimacy and pleasure is consistent with God's purpose of creation. In fact, human beings are by far the most sexually expressive and responsive of God's creations. It is even possible that God, who is not a physical being, envies the great sexual potential he bestowed on human beings.

The forgoing sexual purposes are interdependent and overlap in many ways. All four purposes are important. One can see what happens when only some of these purposes are fulfilled. For example, if the purpose for the whole is ignored, then one is left with only the purposes of sharing intimacy and pleasure and conceiving children. We see the tragic outcome of following only these two purposes when we look at the millions of cases of children who are born out of wedlock or aborted because they are unwanted. Furthermore, other sexual purposes are subsumed under these four purposes. For example, the purpose of experiencing orgasm can be subsumed under the purpose of sharing intimacy and physical pleasure. If there are

other purposes, at odds with these four purposes, they fall outside of the realm of true sexuality. For example, one common purpose of sex—not a true purpose and not endorsed by Unification Thought—is its commercial purpose. Sadly, sex is often viewed as a commodity to be bought and sold; revealing just how little the true sexual purposes are recognized and respected.

IV. Sexual Scripts

What is the difference between man and woman? It is their bodies, including their sexual organs. Then to whom is man's sexual organ absolutely necessary? Man's sexual organ exists for the sake of woman. The human sexual organs are shaped as concave and convex. Why are they shaped that way? Both of them could be pointed or both could be flat. Why are they shaped differently? Each is for the sake of the other. Woman absolutely wants what is man's. And man absolutely wants what is woman's. Until now, we did not know the fact that, absolutely, woman's sexual organ is man's and man's sexual organ is woman's. By owning each other's sexual organs man and woman come to know True Love.

- Sun Myung Moon (1997c, p. 47) -

Psychological scripts, in general, are mental schemas that guide how one acts in a given social situation. Scripts dictate the events and order of events in a particular situation (a restaurant, job interview, or wedding). They represent individual and shared expectations about the specific behaviors involved in a situation (see Abelson, 1981, and Tompkins, 1987).

Sexual scripts, in particular, determine the specific behaviors involved in a sexual encounter, along with the meanings and emotions that are attached to it. Sexual scripts have both a performative aspect (the actual sequence of sexual behaviors) and a cognitive aspect (thoughts, fantasies, and attitudes) and are constructed at cultural, interpersonal, and intrapsychic levels (see Gagnon, 1973; Gagnon & Simon, 1987; Jemail & Geer, 1977; and Simon & Gagnon, 1986).

Mosher (1980) identified three prominent sexual scripts, namely *role enactment*, *sexual trance*, and *partner engagement* (see also Frey and Hojjat, 1998). These scripts are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive. That is, they can blend together, and less common scripts no doubt exist. However, these three scripts tend to be quite distinct

and describe the majority of human sexual episodes (see validations of Mosher's framework in Sirken, 1985, and Klayman, 1994).

1. Role Enactment

The goal of *role enactment* is drama-generated *excitement*. Sexual partners take on and coordinate dramatic roles as if they are on stage or being filmed. Recognizing one's role, feeling congruent with that role, and having the skills to perform it well are important. Erotica, mirrors, sex toys, sexy lingerie, unusual settings, and lusty talk provide novelty and dramatic support. There is an emphasis on variety and skill in oral sex and positions of sexual intercourse, and on being sexually responsive.

2. Sexual Trance

The goal of sexual trance is intense sensory *pleasure*. Within this script, one "becomes" one's genitalia (or one's partner's genitalia). One attempts to become fully immersed in the sensations of the sexual organs, nipples, fingers, lips, tongue, and so on. This script requires privacy and freedom from intrusions, as sexual partners seek to become insulated and detached from the world in a self-absorbed focus on pleasurable sensations. Characteristics of the environment, such as temperature and lighting, and relaxing and getting in the mood for sex are critical. Variety in sexual technique is less important than is the precise pacing and patterning of sexual stimulation. Sex talk tends to be infrequent and deliberate. It often includes pacing, pressure, and technique instructions as well as verbal feedback concerning sensations and feelings.

3. Partner Engagement

The focus of *partner engagement* is on *romance* and the special quality of love and commitment between the sexual partners. This script involves a narrow range of acceptable partners and a sufficiently loving relationship. The setting of the sexual episode is a reminder of the love relationship and the couple's history together. The mood is deliberately romantic. Verbal endearments and intimate conversation are likely to precede, accompany, and follow sexual intercourse. The emphasis is on closeness, full body contact, kissing, cuddling, and other expressions of affection.

4. Absolute Sex

Unification Thought does not give specific recommendations regarding the micromanagement of sexual behavior. However, it does suggest some general guidelines regarding the scripting of sexual episodes. Importantly, these guidelines do not in any way undermine the potential for excitement, pleasure, and romance that are sought in the three aforementioned sexual scripts. The script that embodies these guidelines is here referred to as the *absolute sex* script (Reverend Moon coined the term and often talks about "Absolute Sex"; see, for example, Moon, 1997c, p. 39). The absolute sex script has at least three main characteristics. First, it involves all four of the previously described sexual purposes. Second, it involves the unselfish ownership and responsible use of the sexual organs. Third, it invites the presence and emotional participation of God.

The first main characteristic of absolute sex is that it involves the four sexual purposes described previously. That is, absolute sex seeks to please and give joy to God. This is the *sungsang sexual purpose for the whole*. This purpose is accomplished by sexual partners who are psychologically and spiritually mature enough to have sex and whose relationship God has sanctified through a marriage blessing. This purpose is also fulfilled when the two sexual partners have an attitude of honoring and being grateful to God and deliberately inviting God into the sexual relationship. It would not be unusual in absolute sex for a husband and wife to offer a prayer before or after engaging in sex. At the very least, they would make a conscious effort to draw close to God by maintaining a prayerful attitude during sex.

Absolute sex also seeks the establishment and maintenance of a true family, wherein God's spirit can abide. This is the *hyungsang sexual purpose for the whole*. The sexual episode is integrated with family life. It is a time for marriage partners to fellowship deeply with God and with each other. Sexual intercourse is meant to be a holy act symbolizing a husband and wife's rededication to God, each other, and their children and other family members.

Furthermore, absolute sex includes a desire to conceive and raise children. While not every sexual episode will have the purpose of conceiving a child, at least some sexual episodes deliberately will. According to this purpose, absolute sex also seeks the extension of the husband and wife's lineages. This is the *sungsang sexual purpose for the individual*.

Finally, absolute sex has the purpose of sharing intimacy and physical pleasure. This is the *hyungsang aspect of the sexual purpose for the individual*. By having an attitude of giving unselfishly to each

other and by practicing the most effective sexual techniques, a husband and wife can enjoy the most intense and sublime intimacy and pleasure imaginable together. According to Unification Thought, God's heart-based purpose of creation is for every husband and wife to continuously share such intimacy and pleasure.

Thus, absolute sex takes place within the context of a committed relationship between a spiritually and psychologically mature husband and wife. Both the husband and wife are eager to raise children and establish a God-centered family together, and are eager to please and satisfy each other sexually. Such a context is much more important than physical setting, psychological mood, or being "in love." Again, Unification Thought emphasizes that a man and a woman should only engage in sexual intercourse and other forms of sexual intimacy on the foundation of achieving individual maturity or perfection. This involves the mind's becoming completely one with God's heart, love, truth, and will, as well as the mind's maintaining subjective dominion over the body. The body should follow the directions of the mind, which in turn should follow the directions of God. Only in this manner should two individuals engage in sexual intercourse, and then only after they have been married with God's blessing. These are the "ground rules" of the absolute sex script.

The second main characteristic of absolute sex is that it involves the unselfish ownership of the sexual organs. Reverend Moon has provocatively claimed that "The owner of man's sexual organ is woman, and the owner of woman's sexual organ is man." (Moon, 1997b, p. 21). Men tend to think that they are the owners of their sexual organs, and women tend to think that they are the owners of their sexual organs. Men naturally say, "my penis," and women naturally say, "my vagina." However, Reverend Moon's words and Unification Thought in general suggest that this is a mistaken sentiment. One's sexual organs are meant ultimately for one's spouse. Indeed, the fall of Adam and Eve resulted from selfish thinking regarding the sexual organs. Adam and Eve each thought that their sexual organ was their own possession. Each presumed that, "This is my sexual organ; I can do what I want with it." They did not understand that their sexual organs were meant for the highest expressions of unselfish love centered upon God (see Moon, 1997b, pp. 21-22).

What does it mean for a husband to "own" his wife's sexual organ and vice versa? It means that the two sexual partners transcend selfish attitudes. They recognize their oneness and care as much about each other's joy and happiness as they do their own. There is no selfish "holding back," sexually or otherwise. One engages in sex as an expression of love

for God and for one's partner, not simply for one's own gratification. One should value one's sexual organ because it belongs to one's spouse, and ultimately it belongs to God: "God is the original owner of the sexual organs" (Moon, 1997b, p. 35).

As long as a husband and wife share their sexual organs unselfishly and responsibly in the context of a God-centered marriage, they are quite free to express themselves sexually however they wish. Absolute sex does not explicitly forbid any particular sexual behavior, including man-on-top, woman-on-top, side-to-side, or rear-entry coital positions, oral-genital sex in the form of cunnilingus, fellatio, or souxante-neuf, or unilateral or mutual masturbation (anal intercourse and analingus have a more questionable status).

Reverend Moon teaches that valuing the sexual organs is among the greatest virtues. He has explained that, in creating human beings, God invested the greatest effort into designing the sexual organs. To value and be in harmony with one's sexual organs is "to go beyond traditional categories of virtue, religion, and any other human norms" (Moon, 1997b, p. 21). However, the sexual organs have often been misused. They have frequently been used prematurely, premaritally, extramaritally, adulterously, homosexually, and in other deviant ways (see next section). Reverend Moon teaches that, to restore true love and human sexual relations, humankind must learn to use the sexual organs unselfishly and responsibly, in the way that God intended (Moon, 1997). The proper use of the sexual organs is even integral to the establishment of a better and more peaceful world. "What force can turn around this world of Hell? It is impossible to achieve this unless our sexual organ is used in accordance with an absolute, unique, unchanging, and eternal standard centering on God's true love, which is absolute, unique, unchanging, and eternal love" (Moon, 1997b, p. 35).

The third main characteristic of absolute sex is that it invites the presence and emotional participation of God. When a husband and wife are fully united in love, their horizontal love intersects with God's vertical love. Husband and wife and God are one in love. Similarly, in absolute sex, husband and wife and God are one sexually. Together they represent a "sexual trinity" that co-conducts each sexual episode. It may seem odd, even blasphemous, to view God as a sexual partner. However, one should relate with God during sex just as one would during any other activity. God should not be intentionally ignored or conveniently forgotten during sex. Reverend Moon has said, "Absolute Sex is centered on God" (Moon, 1997c, p. 47). Thus, in absolute sex, God, husband, and wife are brought together in the most intimate spiritual-emotional-physical union.

Many people hold the view that sexual intercourse is not an occasion for thinking about or experiencing God. One imagines that God is present in church but not during sex. However, Unification Thought would assert that God is only alienated by sex between partners who have not perfected their hearts and have not been blessed by God in marriage. Also, it is often not so much a matter of God removing himself from human sexual relationships as it is His being pushed away or marginalized by sexual participants. How often is God invited into human sexual relationships? Unification Thought would suggest that such tendencies are a result of the human fall. God never intended for husbands and wives to exclude Him from their sexual relationships. The sexual act between a true husband and wife was meant to attract and involve God. He would revel in the love and joy experienced by a husband and wife during sexual intercourse. Indeed, God's original hope was that Adam and Eve and every subsequent couple would engage in absolute sex.

The foregoing guidelines need not have any negative effect on sexual expression and experience whatsoever. In fact, these guidelines are vital and must be followed if the most satisfying and fulfilling sex is to occur. God intended sexual intercourse to be among the most sublime and ecstatic of human experiences.

V. False Sex

When a sexual organ is used in the same way a blind person wanders aimlessly without direction, it will undoubtedly lead its owner to Hell. By the same token, one will be lead high up into Heaven when he or she uses the sexual organ according to the standard of God's absolute love.

- Sun Myung Moon (1997b, p. 32) -

The final section of this paper delineates various types of false sex. While God created human beings with the potential for true sex, He also allowed for the possibility of false sex. Indeed, the fall of the first human ancestors, Adam and Eve, involved a tragic case of false sex. False sex involves individuals who are immature in heart and not fully connected to God. It often takes place outside of a committed marital relationship, but it can also occur within such a relationship. False sex inevitably has negative consequences: sexually transmitted diseases, unwanted pregnancies, relationship problems, divorce, sexual addiction, sexual dysfunction, guilt, shame, regret, fear,

frustration, and anger. False sex inevitably leaves one feeling dissatisfied, empty, and depressed. It represents an unsuccessful strategy for finding true love. Sex can be false in a number of ways. Specifically, it can be premature, premarital, extramarital, or homosexual.

1. Premature Sex

Sex is false when it is premature. Individuals who engage in sexual intercourse before they have achieved complete mind and body unity centered upon God inevitably engage in false sex. Only on the foundation of having established an inviolable relationship with God is one qualified to engage in sexual intercourse (and then only after marriage and within the context of marriage). Before engaging in sexual intercourse, one's spirit mind, which pursues truth, beauty, goodness, and true love, should be fully mature and able to control the physical desires of the physical mind. Feeling sexually aroused is not a sufficient condition for engaging in sex, nor is simply feeling that one is "in love."

No doubt, premature sex is rampant and has become normative in many societies. In fact, many teenagers in the United States are sexually active and about 10% of teenage girls in the United States become pregnant (the rate is the highest of any Western nation) (Alan Guttmacher Institute, 2004). About 80% of the teens that become pregnant are not married (USDHHS, 1999). One wonders how emotionally mature and otherwise prepared for a truly loving relationship and for parenthood these young unmarried girls and their male partners are.

Unification Thought explains that the human fall involved a premature sexual relationship. Adam and Eve engaged in an illicit sexual relationship before becoming fully united with God. In doing so, they severed their lineal connection to God and all but forfeited their relationship with God. All premature sexual relationships represent a tragic forfeiture of true love and true sexuality.

2. Premarital Sex

Various scripts govern premarital sex. According to Reiss (1964), the abstinence script prohibits any form of sexual behavior prior to marriage. Although this script has become less common in recent decades in the United States, it may once again be gaining in popularity. However, overall, the acceptance of premarital sexual intercourse has increased steadily in the United States during the past several decades. About two-thirds of Americans now believe that premarital

intercourse is never or almost never wrong (National Opinion Research, 2004). The *permissiveness with affection* script holds that premarital sex is acceptable if the partners are in love or have some type of emotional bond. This script is dominant in most Western cultures. The *permissiveness without affection* script holds that sex is acceptable without an emotional bond or commitment as long as both partners consent to the sex. This script is also quite common, perhaps increasingly so. The *double standard* script holds that premarital sexual standards are more acceptable for men than for women. For example, it is often deemed desirable for men to be sexually experienced and for women to be virginal.

Individuals engage in premarital sexual intercourse for a variety of reasons, including wanting to express love or affection for a partner, experiencing physical arousal or desire, wanting physical pleasure and relief from sexual tension, wanting to get pregnant, or feeling pressure from a partner or from peers (Sprecher & McKinney, 1993). Research finds that premarital intercourse often fails to live up to expectations, especially for females (Sprecher, Barbee, & Schwartz, 1995).

Unification Thought asserts that sex is false when it is premarital. Individuals should not engage in sex before committing to a God-centered marriage. Even then, however, sex would be false if a husband and wife were less than fully mature in their relationship with God. However, this would not be so tragic if the individuals involved were to remain committed and faithful to their marriage and to continue to grow in their love for God and each other.

Unification Thought explains that God wanted to bless Adam and Eve in marriage as soon as they reached maturity. However, the fall took place before this could occur. There is no record of God's having blessed Adam and Eve in marriage. Instead there is a record of His blocking Adam and Eve from reaching the True of Life and expelling them from the Garden of Eden (see Genesis 3: 22-24).

3. Extramarital Sex

Sexuality is false when it takes place outside of marriage, that is, when it occurs with a person other than one's spouse. The majority of Americans still view extramarital sex as unacceptable under any circumstances, and yet about 25% of married men and about 15% of married women report having engaged in extramarital sex at least once (Laumann et al. (1994). Glass and Wright (1992) outlined four major reasons for extramarital sexual involvement. The first is *sexual*

desire—the desire for novelty, variety, and increased sexual activity. The second is *romantic love*—falling in love with a person other than one's spouse. The third is *emotional intimacy*—wanting to meet one's emotional needs for closeness and intimacy. The fourth is *lifestyle objectives* — such as seeking a job promotion or some other benefit. Extramarital sex is typically interpreted as a sign of a troubled relationship and is often the coup de grace of a marriage, although this is not inevitable (Reibstein & Richards, 1993; see also Thompson, 1983).

According to Unification Thought, extramarital sex violates the structure of the *family four-position base* by introducing a second subject partner (another man) or second object partner (another woman). This violation cripples a couple's relationship and harms the family as a whole. Reverend Moon has explained that conjugal love is different from parent's love and children's love in that it loses its potential for perfection the moment it is divided (Moon, 1997a, pp. 6-7). An extramarital relationship represents the dividing of conjugal love. Extramarital sex undermines the potential for smooth harmonious give-and-receive action between a husband and wife that is necessary for a viable marriage. Marriage is the means of finding love and creating life. It is the place where a man's lineage combines with a woman's lineage. It is the ultimate fulfillment of the meaning of one's existence. Extramarital sex undermines all of these potentials. It often does irreparable damage to a marriage. Moreover, it negatively impacts children either directly or through the process of a divorce.

4. Homosexuality

The prevalence of homosexuality in the human population is debatable, although rigorous surveys are yielding increasingly similar percentages. Kinsey (1948, 1953) found that 50% of men are exclusively heterosexual, 4% are exclusively homosexual, and 46% are bisexual. He found that 72% of women are exclusively heterosexual, 2% are exclusively homosexual, and 26% are bisexual. However, Janus and Janus (1993) found that 91% of men are exclusively heterosexual, 4% are exclusively homosexual, and 5% are bisexual. They found that 95% of women are exclusively heterosexual, 2% are exclusively homosexual, and 3% are bisexual. Laumann et al. (1994) found that 93.8% of men are exclusively heterosexual, 2.4% are exclusively homosexual, and 3.9% are bisexual. They found that 95.6% of women are exclusively heterosexual, 0.3% are exclusively homosexual, and 4.1% are bisexual. While all of these surveys found comparatively low rates of exclusive

homosexuality, the two more recent surveys found relatively higher rates of exclusive heterosexuality and lower rates of bisexuality.

Much attention has focused on identifying the cause or interacting causes of homosexuality. Freud's earlier writings (1905/1953) suggest that homosexuality results from a child's over-identification with the other-sex parent in the struggle for the affection of the same sex parent. Freud's later writings (1920/1957) suggest that all infants are "polymorphous perverse" and that all people are inherently bisexual and that, therefore, homosexuality is normal. Other researchers have suggested that homosexuality is a learned response, just as heterosexuality is (e.g., Green, 1985; Greenspoon & Lamal, 1987). Biological theories emphasize the possible role of genetics, hormones, and neuroanatomical features in the etiology of homosexuality (e.g., Allen & Gorski, 1992; Bailey & Pillard, 1991, 1995; Bailey et al., 1993; Byne et al., 2000; Byne & Parsons, 1993; Hamer et al., 1993; Haynes, 1995; Kendler et al., 2000; Levay, 1991; Meyer-Bahlbury, 1984; Pillard & Weinrich, 1986). Interactive approaches (e.g., Bem, 1996, and Kauth & Kalichman, 1995) have tended to focus on the dual roles of nature and nurture in determining one's sexual orientation (see also Money, 1981, and Storms, 1988). Given the research findings to date, it seems likely that some combination of biological predisposition, life experiences, and personal decisions combine to determine one's sexual orientation. Such a confluence of factors suggests that one's sexual orientation is not necessarily entirely inborn and immutable. Importantly, just as homosexuality does not have a single cause, it is also does not have a single manifestation (see Murray, 2000).

In 1974, members of the American Psychiatric Association (APA) ratified a resolution that "homosexuality per se implies no impairment in judgment, stability, reliability or general social or vocational capabilities." Thus, homosexuality would no longer be considered a form of mental illness. More recently, ego-dystonic homosexuality, which includes persistent personal distress about one's own sexual orientation, was similarly stricken from the APA's list of mental disorders (Researchers continue to explore the prevalence of mental disorders, psychological distress, and mental health service use among gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. —see Cochran, Sullivan, & Mays, 2003, and Gonsiorek, 1996). Besides the APA's pronouncements, homosexuality has also been widely defended by others. The biologist Alfred Kinsey stated "The living world is a continuum in each and every of its aspects. The sooner we learn this concerning human sexual behavior the sooner we shall reach a sounder understanding of the realities of sex" (1948, p. 639). In other words, viewing sexual orientation

in black and white terms is too simplistic. The anthropologist Margaret Mead asserted, "a large number of human beings —probably the majority— are bisexual in their capacity for love" (1975, p. 6). In other words, bisexuality is probably more normal than either heterosexuality or homosexuality. The novelist James Baldwin claimed that heterosexual and homosexual is "an artificial division...There's nothing in me that is not in everybody else, and nothing in everybody else which is not in me" (1984, p. 14). In other words, the full range of sexual orientation is found in every person and therefore normal.

Reverend Moon has on numerous occasions denounced homosexuality. In a recent speech, he mentioned the "corrupting influence of the decadent Western culture of homosexuality and free sex" (1997, p. 29). In that same speech, he claimed that, "When there is absolute sex, an absolute couple will emerge automatically. Words such as free sex, homosexual, and lesbian will naturally disappear." If Unification Thought is a systematization of Reverend Moon's thought, then, clearly, it must denounce homosexuality as something that must disappear. Of course, Unification Thought is not alone in denouncing homosexuality. Homosexuality is condemned in the Bible as well (although, see Furnish, 1994, Helminiak, 2000, and McNeil, 1987). Needless to say, such denunciations alone are unlikely to change the minds of the many social scientists and psychologists in particular who believe that homosexuality is no less normal and healthy than heterosexuality. Nor is it likely to sway more than a few of the many individuals who identify themselves as being gay, lesbian, or bisexual. If Unification Thought intends to embrace Reverend Moon's denunciations of homosexuality, it has the responsibility to flesh out cogent arguments for doing so.

Why is heterosexuality normal and homosexuality abnormal? One answer can be found in the very nature of God. God possesses the harmonized dual characteristics of *Yang* (positivity) and *Yin* (negativity). He therefore "developed life from the simplest and lowest levels up to the human level in pairs, subject and object and positive and negative, to form reciprocal relationships under the ideal of love" (Moon, 2005a, p. 4). God's creation of a first man and first woman was deliberate. God did not create two original males or two original females because doing so would have been inconsistent with the dual attributes of His own nature. God's creation of an original man and an original woman set the stage for the pattern of conjugal love. If homosexuality had been intended in God's original ideal, He would have created two original men or two original women.

When a fully mature man and woman unite in marriage and then

sexually, God can experience joy through witnessing the fullest expression of His own internal unity. Nothing is more stimulating and fulfilling to God than a true husband and wife who are lovingly and sexually united. Indeed, sexual intercourse allows them to experience parental love and become more like Him. A homosexual relationship has none of the same potential. It was never meant to have the same potential. Instead of being stimulating and fulfilling to God, homosexuality is an affront to God.

To be sure, God meant for men to love men and women to love women. However, same-sex love was meant to conform to sibling's love (brother-brother love or sister-sister love), not conjugal love. Same sex relationships were never intended to have the status of conjugal love. Upon reaching maturity and being blessed in marriage, Adam and Eve were to be God's "substantial bride" (Moon, 2005a, p. 4). God does find such a bride in the pseudo-conjugal relationship between two men or two women. Homosexual relationships can only attempt to imitate conjugal relationships. Indeed, in many homosexual relationships, one partner plays the role of "top" and the other plays the role of "bottom," imitating the roles of the male (subject) and female (object) in a relationship. Although God can abide in the heart of any sincere and earnest gay or lesbian who seeks Him, he cannot abide in any romanticized and sexualized gay or lesbian relationship.

Thus, homosexuality violates the *Way of Heaven* (see UTI, 2005, p. 167). Homosexual "intercourse" and "marriage" fly in the face of God's purpose in creating the first human beings, Adam and Eve, and men and women in general. God's love cannot enter a sexualized relationship between two men or two women, primarily because God, as a being of harmonized *Yang* and *Yin*, does not identify with or experience joy from such relationships. Although heterosexual relationships often do not conform to God's ideal (because they are premature, premarital, or extramarital), homosexual relationships can never conform to God's ideal. No matter how much those relationships attempt to imitate heterosexual relationships and to involve true love, they will inevitably fail.

Homosexuality has become increasingly controversial in recent decades. At the center of this controversy is the fight for the legalization of gay marriages (see Peterson, 2004, and The Roper Center, 2004). How should Unification Thought respond to this controversy? It should do so cautiously and compassionately. It should do so cautiously because there is still much that is not yet known about homosexuality. Ward and Swarts (1994) suggested that greater impartial scientific research and media attention should focus on the etiology of homosexuality, on

reports from individuals who claim to have successfully transitioned from homosexuality to heterosexuality, and on the effects of increasing social tolerance and educational promotion on the prevalence of self-described homosexuals in the general population. Social scientists and sex researchers have a responsibility to objectively study homosexuality by asking the right questions, gather appropriate data, and drawing unbiased conclusions.

Unification Thought should also approach the issue of homosexuality compassionately. Indeed, the Unification Thought concept of heart calls for compassion towards homosexuals. Heart is the most essential aspect of the Original Image (UTI, 2005, p. 44) and also the most essential aspect of original human nature (p. 186). Anything less than a heart of love and compassion for homosexuals is prejudicial and harmful, regardless of what Unification Thought comes to assert about the false or sinful nature of homosexual behavior itself. Homosexuals have suffered from much *homophobia* and *antigay prejudice*. The former refers to the strong, irrational fear of homosexuals (Herek, 1984; Fyfe, 1983; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). The latter refers to hateful prejudice and discrimination toward homosexuals (Herek, 2000). Unification Thought does not endorse either approach. Rather, it calls for compassion toward homosexuals along with clearly defined reasons for opposing homosexuality (see Boswell, 1980).

Unification Thought should be careful about blindly endorsing therapies designed to help gays transition to heterosexuality, at least until more is learned about the efficacy of such therapies. Therapies to change one's sexual orientation have only been modestly effective, with "cure" rates ranging from 10% to 30% (APA, 2000; see also Davison, 1991; Ford, 2001; and Haldeman, 1994, 2001).

Finally, it has been suggested that homosexual liaisons are actually less "false" or "sinful" than extramarital heterosexual liaisons. This is somewhat ironic given that God never intended homosexual relationships while he did intend heterosexual relationships. However, homosexual liaisons are perhaps less egregious because their corrupting effects are not transmitted to offspring and lineal descendants (Deshotel, 2006, personal communication).

5. Other Types of False Sex

In addition to premature, premarital, extramarital, and homosexual sex, there are other forms of sex that are deviant and harmful from a Unification Thought perspective. Rape, pedophilia, and bestiality fall into this category. These forms of sex arguably represent some of the

most reprehensible acts to result from the human fall. Needless to say, sex is also problematic whenever it becomes compulsive or addictive (see Carnes, 2001). Two additional types of sex are worth examining here—masturbation and sexual fantasies.

Historically, a great deal of misconception, guilt, and fear has surrounded the practice of masturbation (also referred to as autoeroticism). The story of Onan in the Old Testament (Genesis 38:6-9) is sometimes interpreted to mean that masturbation is a sinful wasting of “seed.” Jesus’ words (Matthew 5:28) regarding the adulterous implications of lust could also be interpreted as a condemnation of masturbation, given that masturbation is often accompanied by lustful fantasies. And yet masturbation is probably the most common form of sex for most individuals in most cultures (Breakwell & Fife-Schaw, 1992). According to Janus and Janus (1993), 50% of single men, and 44% of married men, report masturbating once a week or more often, while 34% of single women, and 16% of married women, report masturbating once a week or more often.

Despite prevalent negative attitudes toward masturbation in some past and even present cultures, masturbation may play a vital role in the development of a healthy and rewarding sex life. It is probably not coincidental that women tend to masturbate less than men and also experience far fewer orgasms than men (despite the fact that in certain respects than have more orgasmic potential than men). Laumann et al. (1994) found that approximately 75% of men, but only 29% of women, always have an orgasm during sex. In fact, the vast majority of males (90%), but only a small minority of females (7%), experience orgasm during their first experience of sexual intercourse (Laumann, 1994). A common finding among sex therapists is that women who find it difficult to experience orgasm during sex with a partner often do not know how to produce orgasms on their own through masturbation (see Heiman, 1988). It is conceivable that at least some women experience disappointment during first intercourse and subsequently during sex because they have not masturbated enough to know how to achieve orgasm and therefore cannot explain to their partner what they need to achieve orgasm (see Sprecher, Barbee, & Schwartz, 1995).

Thus, most sexologists affirm the positive value of masturbation. They view sexual satisfaction as a basic human desire and masturbation as a natural sexual activity. Masturbation is a means by which one discovers one’s eroticism and learns to respond sexually (Dodson, 1987, p. 36). Unification Thought does not contradict such sentiments. It does not condemn masturbation. This is not to say that Unification

Thought does not recognize how masturbation can become compulsive, excessive, and otherwise unhealthy. As a general rule, Unification Thought might consider whether a particular act of masturbation was ultimately selfish or unselfish and whether it helps to fulfill (or at least does not interfere with) the four purposes of sexuality described previously.

Sigmund Freud (1905/1953) suggested that sexual fantasies reflect insecurity and sexual frustration. However, sexologists and therapists today tend to focus on the positive functions that sexual fantasies serve. Specifically, sexual fantasies allow one to rehearse for upcoming sexual episodes, they are a source of entertainment in their own right, and they can enhance and intensify arousal during sex. Given these functions, it is possible that sexual fantasies can play a role in absolute sex. For example, once married, an individual might mentally rehearse his or her first sexual experience or perhaps a new approach to his or her partner after many years of sexual experience together. Also, a husband and wife might entertain sexual fantasies about each other whenever they are apart. Furthermore, during sexual intimacy, one might fantasize about their being in a more romantic venue together.

One might even claim that a complete lack of sexual fantasies would be an improbable aberration. Consider how many times the average couple engages in sexual intercourse during a lifetime. At an average of three times a week (which is typical after the first five years of marriage), the total number of sexual episodes is in the thousands. Sexual monotony can become a problem in long-standing marriages. It is perhaps for this reason that research finds that 84% of males and 82% of females report that they fantasized at least some of the time during intercourse (Cado & Leitenberg, 1990). In fact, almost all men and women report engaging in sexual fantasy at one time or another (Leitenberg & Henning, 1995).

Of course, sexual fantasies can—and often do—have nothing to do with true love and true sexuality, as when one fantasizes about sex with someone other than his or her spouse. The hallmark of such sexual fantasies is that they do not uphold all of the purposes of sex or conform to the absolute sex script described previously. A critical question about masturbation and sexual fantasies, from a Unification Thought perspective, might be whether one can enjoy them while being conscious of the intimate presence of God. Does one feel comfortable inviting God into one’s masturbation or sexual fantasies?

VI. Conclusion

Although Unification Thought is ripe with relevant insights into human behavior and human sexuality in particular, it does not yet possess a coherent formal theory of sexuality. The main goal of the present paper is to provoke and encourage further scholarly writing and dialogue on this topic from a Unification Thought perspective.

Sexual expression and experience are integral to human life and, according to Unification Thought, to the purpose of God's creation. In this age of sexual confusion, sexual addiction, the commercialization of sex, devastating sexually transmitted diseases, unwanted pregnancies, and so on, it is crucial for humankind to search for the most correct understanding of human sexuality. Such an understanding must consider the true nature of the relationship between love and sex, the fundamental purposes of sex, the sexual scripts that influence sexual behavior, and the various ways in which sex can be false and thereby lead to emptiness, suffering, and destruction. The present paper has attempted to describe Unification Thought's account of the link between love and sex, the four main purposes of sex, an alternative God-centered sexual script, and four prominent forms of false sex. It is hoped that sexologists, along with scholars and practitioners in allied fields, will build upon these admittedly preliminary and possibly controversial formulations and that this will instigate a new sexual revolution. In this revolution, the link between true love and true sex would be reinforced, sex would fulfill multifaceted purposes that serve both the individual and the whole, and "absolute sex" would replace "free sex."

References

Abelson, R. A. (1981). Psychological status of the script concept. *American Psychologist*, 36, 715-729.

Alan Guttmacher Institute. (2004). *U.S. teenage pregnancy statistics*. New York: Alan Guttmacher Institute. www.agi-usa.org.

Allen, L. S., & Gorski, R. A. (1992, August). Sexual orientation and the size of the anterior commissure in the human brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences*, 89, 7199-7202.

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). Position statement on therapies focused on attempts to change sexual orientation (reparative or conversion therapies). *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 157, 1719-1721.

Aron, A. (1991). Close relationships as involving other in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 241-253.

Bailey, J. M., & Pillard, R. C. (1991). A genetic study of male sexual orientation. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 48, 1089-1096.

Bailey, J. M., & Pillard, R. C. (1995). Genetics of human sexual orientation. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 6, 126-150.

Bailey, J. M., Pillard, R. D., Neale, M. C., & Agyei, Y. (1993). Heritable factors influence sexual orientation in women. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50, 217-223.

Baldwin, J. (1984, June 26). "Go the way your blood beats": An interview by Richard Goldstein. *Village Voice*, 13-14, 16.

Barash, D. (1980). *Sociobiology: The Whisperings Within*. London: Souvenir Press Ltd.

Bem, D. J. (1996). Exotic becomes erotic: A developmental theory of sexual orientation. *Psychological Review*, 103, 320-335.

Boswell, J. (1980). *Christianity, social tolerance, and homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Breakwell, G. M., & Fife-Schaw, C. (1992). Sexual activities and preferences in a United Kingdom sample of 16-to-20 year olds. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 21, 271-293.

Bullough, V. L., & Bullough, B. (1995). *Sexual attitudes: Myths and realities*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Byne, W., & Parsons, B. (1993, March). Human sexual orientation: The biological theories reappraised. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50, 228-239.

Byne, W., et al. (2000). The interstitial nuclei of the human anterior hypothalamus: Assessment for sexual variation in volume and neuronal size, density, and number. *Brain Research*, 856, 254-258.

Cado, S., & Leitenberg, H. (1990). Guilt reactions to sexual fantasies during intercourse. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 19, 49-64.

Carnes, P. (2001). *Out of the shadows: Understanding sexual addiction*. Center City, MN: Hazelden Publishing.

Cochran, S., Sullivan, J. G., & Mays, V. (2003). Prevalence of mental disorders, psychological distress, and mental health service use among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 53-61.

Davison, G. C. (1991). Constructionism and morality in therapy for homosexuality. In J. C. Gonsiorek & J. D. Weinrich (Eds.), *Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy* (pp. 137-148). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Deshotel, C. (2006). Personal communication.

Dodson, B. (1987). *Sex for one: The joy of self-loving*. New York: Harmony Books (Crown).

Ford, J. G. (2001). Healing homosexuals: A psychologist's journey through the ex-gay movement and the pseudoscience of reparative therapy. In Shidlo et al. (Eds.), *Sexual conversion therapy: Ethical, clinical, and research perspectives* (pp. 69-86). New York: Haworth.

Freud, S. (1905/1953). "Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality." In James Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), Vol. 7 of the *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth.

Freud, S. (1920/1957). "Beyond the Pleasure Principle." In James Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), Vol. 18 of the *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth.

Frey, K. (2006). Toward a Unification Psychology. *Journal of Unification Thought*, 4, 423-451.

Frey, K., & Hojjat, M. (1998). Are love styles related to sexual styles? *Journal of Sex Research*, 35, 265-271.

Furnish, V. R. (1994). The Bible and homosexuality: Reading the texts in context. In J. S. Siker (Ed.), *Homosexuality in the church* (pp. 18-35). Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Fyfe, B. (1983). "Homophobia" or homosexual bias reconsidered. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 12, 549-554.

Gagnon, J. H. (1973). Scripts and the coordination of sexual conduct. In M. R. Jones (Ed.) *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 27-59). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Gagnon, J. H., & Simon, W. (1987). The sexual scripting of oral-genital contacts. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 16, 1-26.

Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1992). Justifications for extramarital relationship: The association between attitudes, behaviors, and gender. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 29, 406-413.

Gonsiorek, J. C. (1996). Mental health and sexual orientation. In R. C. Savin-Williams & K. M. Cohen (Eds.), *The lives of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals* (pp. 462-478). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Green, R. (1985). Gender identity in childhood and later sexual orientation: Follow-up of seventy-eight males. *The Journal of American Psychiatry*, 142, 339-341.

Greenspoon, J., & Lamal, P. A. (1987). A behavioristic approach. In L. Diamant (Ed.), *Male and female homosexuality: Psychological approaches* (pp. 109-128). New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.

Haldeman, D. C. (1994). The practice and ethics of sexual orientation conversion therapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62, 221-227.

Haldeman, D. C. (2001). Therapeutic antidotes: Helping gay and bisexual men recover from conversion therapies. In A. Shildk et al. (Eds.), *Sexual conversion therapy: Ethical, clinical, and research perspectives* (pp. 117-130). New York: Haworth.

Hamer, D. H., Hu, S., Magnuson, V. L., Hu, N., & Pattatucci, A. M. L. (1993, July 16). A linkage between DNA markers on the X chromosome and male sexual orientation. *Science*, 261, 321-327.

Haynes, J. D. (1995). A critique of the possibility of genetic inheritance of homosexual orientation. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 28, 91-113.

Heiman, J. R., & LoPiccolo, J. (1988). *Becoming orgasmic*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Helminiak, D. A. (2000). *What the Bible really says about homosexuality* (Millennium ed.). New Mexico: Alamo Square Press.

Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 392-402.

Herek, G. M. (1984). Beyond "homophobia": A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10, 1-21.

Herek, G. M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 19-22.

HSA-UWC. (1973). *Divine Principle*. New York: Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity.

Hudson, W. W., & Ricketts, W. A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5, 357-372.

Hyde, J. S., & DeLamater, J. D. (2006). *Understanding Human Sexuality* (9th Ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Janus, S. S., & Janus, C. L. (1993). *The Janus report on sexual behavior*. New York: John Wiley.

Jemail, J. A., & Geer, J. (1977). Sexual Scripts. In R. Gemme & C. C. Wheeler (Eds.), *Progress in sexology*. New York: Plenum.

Kauth, M. R., & Kalichman, S. C. (1995). Sexual orientation and development: An interactive approach. In L. Diamant & R. D. McAnulty (Eds.), *The psychology of sexual orientation, behavior, and identity: A handbook* (pp. 81-103). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Kendler, K. S., et al. (2000). Sexual orientation in a U.S. sample of twin and nontwin sibling pairs. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 157, 1843-1846.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co.

Klayman, J. S. (1994). Sexual involvement: The match between scenes and scripts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Laumann, E., et al. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lee, S. H. (1998). *Life in the spirit world and on earth*. New York: Family Federation for World Peace.

Leitenberg, H., & Henning, K. (1995). Sexual fantasy. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 469-496.

Leshner, A. I. (2003). Don't let ideology trump science. *Science*, 302, 1479.

LeVay, S. (1991). A difference in hypothalamic structure between heterosexual and homosexual men. *Science*, 253, 1034-1037.

McNeil, J. J. (1987). Homosexuality: Challenging the Church to grow. *Christian Century*, 104, 242-246.

Mead, M. (1975, January). Bisexuality: What's it all about? *Redbook*, 6-7.

Meyer-Bahlburg, H. F. L. (1984). Psychoendocrine research on sexual orientation: Current status and future options. *Progressive Brain Research*, 61, 375-398.

Money, J. (1988). *Gay, straight, and in-between: The sexology of erotic orientation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moon, S. M. (1997a). "View of the Principle of the Providential History of Salvation," in *True Love and True Family* (pp. 1-18). New York: Family Federation for World Peace and Unification.

Moon, S. M. (1997b). "In Search of the Origin of the Universe," in *True Love and True Family* (pp. 19-36). New York: Family Federation for World Peace and Unification.

Moon, S. M. (1997c). "True Family and True Universe Centering on True Love," in *True Love and True Family* (pp. 37-51). New York: Family Federation for World Peace and Unification.

Mosher, D. L. (1980). Three dimensions of depth of involvement in human sexual response. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 16, 1-42.

Murray, S. O. (2000). *Homosexualities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

National Opinion Research Center. (2004). General social survey.

Peterson, K. (2004). Fifty-state rundown on gay marriage laws. www.stateline.org.

Pillard, R. C., & Weinrich, J. D. (1986). Evidence for a familial nature of male homosexuality. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 43, 808-812.

Pittman, F. III. (1993, May-June). Beyond betrayal: Life after infidelity. *Psychology Today*, 32-38, ff.

Reibstein, J., & Richards, M. (1993). *Sexual arrangements*. New York: Scribners.

Reiss, I. L. (1964). The scaling of premarital sexual permissiveness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 26, 188-195.

Roper Center, The. (2004). U.S. public opinion on homosexual marriages. www.ropercenter.uconn.edu.

Ross, M. N., Paulsen, J. A., & Stalstrom, O. W. (1988). Homosexuality and mental health: A cross-cultural review. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 15, 131-152.

Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 15, 97-120.

Sirken, M. I. (1985). Sexual involvement theory, sexual trance, and hypnotizability: The experimental use of guided imagery. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Sprecher, S., Barbee, A., & Schwartz, P. (1995). "Was it good for you, too?": Gender differences in first sexual intercourse experiences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 32, 3-15.

Sprecher, S., & McKinney, K. (1993). *Sexuality*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93, 119-135.

Storms, M. D. (1981). A theory of erotic orientation development. *Psychological Review*, 88, 340-353.

Strickland, B. R. (1995). Research on sexual orientation and human development. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 137-140.

Swaab, D. F., Gooren, L. J. G., & Hoffman, M. A. (1995). Brain research, gender, and sexual orientation. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 28, 283-301.

Thompson, A. (1983). Extramarital sex: A review of the research literature. *Journal of Sex Research*, 19, 1-22.

Tomkins, S. S. (1987). Script theory. In J. Aronoff, A. J. Rodin, & R. A. Zucker (Eds.), *The emergence of personality*. New York: Springer Publishing.

Unification Thought Institute. (2005). *New Essentials of Unification Thought: Head-Wing Thought*. Tokyo: Unification Thought Institute.

Universal Peace Federation. (2006). *God's Ideal Family and Peace Kingdom*.

USDHHS. (1999). *A National Strategy to Prevent Teen pregnancy: Annual Report 1998-1999*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department

of Health and Human Services.

Ward, T. J., & Swarts, F. A. (1993, October). The mainstreaming of homosexuality. *World and I.*

Wilson, E. O. (1980). *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

C·O·M·M·E·N·T

Toward a Unification Theory of Sexuality

Dr. Yoshihiko Masuda,
Choengshim Graduate School of Theology, Korea

As professor of Unification Ethics in the Program of True Parents Studies at Choengshim Graduate School of Theology in Korea, I specialize in the area of Unification sexual ethics and would like to present a brief comment from the viewpoint of a Unification ethicist who has studied Christian sexual ethics.

Frankly speaking, I have acquired many negative opinions against psychologists on sexual issues. I deeply admire, however, Dr. Frey's attempt to systematize Unification Theory of Sexuality largely on the basis of Rev. Moon's speeches. First of all, I fully agree with Dr. Frey "Sexuality is a topic of vital significance." Reportedly, Rev. Moon recently said that "if we want to attain happiness in this new 'Age after the Coming of Heaven,' we must clearly understand three major topics: 1) God, 2) the spirit world, and 3) **the sexual organ**." I am increasingly convinced that it is very important for us to understand the significance of our sexual organ and how to use it in a correct way.

Dr. Frey's paper attempts to formulate Unification Theory of Sexuality by addressing four major topics: 1) love and sex, 2) the purposes of sex, 3) sexual scripts, and 4) false sex. He humbly states, "This paper is merely an exploratory extrapolation of Unification Thought to the topic of sexuality." Although I published a textbook on the Unification sexual ethics in Japanese in 2003, as far as I know, there has been no publication on this topic in English. Therefore, Dr. Frey's paper is a pioneering work on the topic of Unification sexuality in English, and I greatly appreciate his efforts. He states, "The main goal of the present paper is to provoke and encourage further scholarly writing and dialogue on this topic [of theory of sexuality] from a Unification Thought perspective." In my view, he admirably