A THEOLOGICAL CONVERSATION WITH TWO SEX EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR THE CHURCH

A Project

Presented to

the Faculty of the School of Theology
at Claremont, California

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Ministry

by
Joseph Benjamin Roe, Jr.
June 1975

This professional project, completed by

Joseph Benjamin Roe, Jr.

has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

Faculty Committee

May 22, 1975

Jungh O. Haryls, Jr.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank especially Dan D. Rhoades who gave me the encouragement and support I needed at a critical time. The dialog and mutual criticism with him enabled the sharpening of many parts of the project.

My "special friend" and wife, Maggie, has been a loving, constant and patient supporter and helpful gadfly.

Thanks to Ekkehard Muehlenberg for his support and creative challenging of my ideas, and to Allen J. Moore for the important encouragement to stretch my mind in the beginning of the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

:		Page
ACKNOWLI	EDGMENTS	ii
PREFACE		iv
Chapter		
I.	DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSES	1
3	Unitarian Universalist Association	1
	Background and Development	1
	Purpose and Methodology	3
	Description of Contents	6
	Theological Presuppositions	20
	Leadership Expectations	25
	United Methodist Church, Southern California .	26
	Background and Development	26
•	Purpose	27
	Description of Contents	29
	Theological Presuppositions	35
	Leadership Expectations	38
	headership Expectations	50
II.	THEOLOGICAL RESOURCES FOR RESPONSIBLE SEXUAL RELATING FROM THE THOUGHT OF REINHOLD NIEBUHR	41
		47
	Introduction	41
	The Human Self as a Unity	43
	Anxiety	45
	Sin as Pride and Sensuality	47
	Agape as Normative Principle	52
	The Provisional Norm of Mutuality	55
	The Provisional Norm of Justice	58
	Two Illustrative Issues: Touch and	
	Integration	62
III.	A DIALOG ON THE THEOLOGY OF SEX EDUCATION	66
	I BIIIIOO ON IIII IIIIODOCI OI BBII IBBOIIII I	
	Similarities and Differences of the Programs .	66
	The Dialog	71
	Conclusion	84
BIBLIOG	RAPHY	87
	• • •	
•	iii	

ABSTRACT

The two courses used for this work are the Unitarian (calderwood, 1971) and the Southern California United Methodist (Task Force, 1973). The first chapter describes the courses and highlights implicit and explicit theological presuppositions.

The second chapter applies Reinhold Niebuhr's ethical system to sexual behavior. Sexuality as incorporated into the unity of the human self participates in all the aspects of selfhood, and is an expression of it. As such it must not be separately considered as a special case of human behavior, but rather is under the same demand of agape as all other acts. Mutuality and justice are the provisional norms of agape for human life.

Chapter three discusses similarities and differences between the courses. A dialog is constructed among the positions of the courses and that of chapter two. Areas of agreement are integration of sexual behavior into the total personality, and the goodness of sexuality. Misuses and problems lack serious consideration in the courses, particularly the Unitarian. Specific expressions are acknowledged and dealt with in the Unitarian, much less in the Methodist course. Responsible decision-making must include more input than is indicated in either course. The issue of consequences of sexual behaviors is more complex than

acknowledged by either; some issues are illustrated. The best church sex education would be a combination of the best characteristics of both of these courses.

PREFACE

This work will analyze the sex education curriculum resources provided for two groups of churches: United Methodist, and Unitarian Universalist. Analysis will be concerned primarily with the theological presuppositions (explicit or implied) upon which the programs are based. The analysis will include an overview of the actual plans and supporting documents, with enough detail to indicate important consequences of, or contradictions to these presuppositions. My position will be developed from certain theological insights of Reinhold Niebuhr. The dialog of the final chapter will include important similarities and differences in the programs and consideration of the consistency of each program's approach with its purposes and presuppositions as I see them.

An interest in human sexuality has provided an interesting focal point for my theological training over the past few years. Several papers on sexual ethics, concepts of sexuality, and history of marriage ceremonies have been written. They have added color and present interest to sometimes dull and "academic" discussions. But they have also provided a very practical, timely point of view from which to investigate the implications of such subjects as soteriology, ethical decision-making, educational

methodology and the nature of human existence and selfhood. Obviously, these studies have informed my formulation of the questions asked of sex education and my approach to the following dialog. However, the positions studied and readings which have informed my thinking to this point will not be directly used or acknowledged.

When a Christian asks about the place of sex in the life of a believer, many questions can arise, ranging from the unnecessarily troubling to those so profound as to go to the very roots of the faith itself. For example, the former seems well-represented by, Are certain positions for coitus "Christian" (or "unnatural," "perverted")? Or, How many times can one make love and still be Christian? Examples of the latter category might include, Is the "wholeness" promised in the faith a present reality? If so, in what way: How is sexual behavior changed if one is made whole? Is indeed everything permitted? Or is coitus prohibited or limited by love of things of the spirit?

When a Christian is concerned about communicating to younger members of the community of faith not only the "facts" of sexuality but also its place in one's life, other kinds of questions arise. What is the purpose of sex education? How is the subject best explained and integrated into Christian education? What is the best way to enable meaningful exploration of the issues by those participating in sex education in the church?

A major purpose for this paper is to attempt to justify the use of a particular program or methodology based on values and ethical norms developed from a particular viewpoint. The purpose of the dialog is not to presume final or universal judgment, but to show to those who might share many of these values the relative merit of these two programs for their needs.