

Chapter VI

THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION

THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION

“Have you seen such a one as takes as his god his own vain desire? God has, knowing him (as such), left him astray, and sealed his hearing and his heart (understanding) and put a haze on his sight. Who then will guide him after God? Will you not then receive admonition? And they say: What is there but our life, we (some of us) die and we (some of us) live and nothing but time can destroy us. But of that they have no knowledge...they merely conjecture.” (45:23-24)

The sexual revolution as witnessed today, started earlier than many writers report. The Time Magazine (April 9, 1984 p 76) claims that the sexual revolution had been borne in the mid sixties, the product of affluence, demographics and the pill. In a society putting a great influence on individuality, self-fulfillment converted every sexual whim into a need and hence a right. Patterns of behaviour that had been condemned over history until the near past, were nicknamed “alternative life styles”... and as long as they entailed self fulfillment for those attracted to them, society had to accommodate them and they aquired legitimacy.

The origins of the sexual revolution started much earlier, and in close association with atheism and ‘microtheism’, a term we will shortly explain. As Destoevsky said ‘without God everything is permissible’. Nor was the sexual revolution a spontaneous autonomous change as the Time simplistically figures. As we analytically follow the events; since the turn of the century until now, one can see a logic sequence leading up to the present state. The early touches of the brush of the painter meant nothing to the onlooker and gave no clue as to the final product. Every successive stroke did not mean much to the casual passer by who glimpsed and went on his way. The few perhaps could make some projection as to what the colours and the lines would eventually be, but the majority never could. It is only in retrospect that they can have the story, and only if someone takes the trouble to tell them.

God always had His enemies. Most of the time they could justify for themselves their negative attitude towards him. They just missed one crucial fact: what they really confronted was not God, but someone claiming to speak on His behalf without necessarily reflecting His views. The major event in European history was the rebellion against the Church of the middle ages, a rebellion that had no difficulty in justifying its cause. After Christ the Christians lived under oppression and wronging, in the fashion of a secret movement that lived, worshipped and operated underground, communicating amongst themselves with ciphers and symbols. An accident of history reversed the situation. As a young man, Constantine was leading Roman armies in battle in north Europe. When his father died, it was his right to replace him in the seven man council that ruled over Rome, but he received news that the junta were plotting to exclude him. Returning with his army to fight for his right, he came across a Christian stone bearing the figure of a fish and the words "Under this you have victory". For the good omen, he pledged to support that religion if he won the battle, which he did. Constantine became Emperor and recognized Christianity as an acknowledged religion in 319 AD. Coming overground and enjoying safety and security, Christianity, however, suffered the revival of old doctrinal divisions and witnessed bitter disputes between various sects that were thought to have been settled a long time before. The Emperor, guided mainly by political expediency, sided with one group against the other, and the creed of 'Trinity' was decreed in the Congress of Nicea in 325 AD. The following episode of history saw a tremendous expansion of the authority of the Church, to have its wings spread over-practically-all aspects of human life. The overreaction to previous years of oppression entailed an upheaval of emotionalism that the Church fostered and utilized. Power is an intoxicant to which the Church was not immune. Healing the sick belonged in the realm of faith and not of medicine. Indeed medicine was branded as a godless science as it was alleged to interfere with the will of God. Father Gregory of Tours accused with heresy any patient who sought the physician's advice, and yet he prescribed a pinch of dust from the shrine of St. Martin as a cure for dysentery and licking its rails for inflammation of the tongue. The endorsement by the Church of healing by faith made the climate ready for the resort again to mystic methods of therapy such as hand-laying, the use of amulets and exorcism, and the field was fertile for charlatans to flourish to the exclusion of real doctors. Patron saints were declared as healers of organs that were traumatised during their martyrdom. St. Agatha's breasts had been amputated with huge tongs and so she was announced patron healer for women with breast

cancer. St. Erasmus was speared in the abdomen and was made faith-healer of abdominal conditions; and so on. When Servitus assumed the earlier writings of Ibn al-Nafis about the pulmonary circulation and published them under his name (long before William Harvey), he was burnt on the stake with his writings for the heresy of deviating from Galen's views one thousand years earlier, but whose teachings were protected by the Church for stating that the body was the vehicle of the Spirit, and that after death only the body perishes. The picture concerning medicine was no different from other disciplines of science, and the 'Trial of Galileo' is household knowledge.

It was the interaction with Islam that shook Europe out of the dark ages. The first word of the Quran to be revealed was "Read" . . . and Islam made the pursuit of knowledge a religious dictate.

"Say: Are they equal those who know and those who do not know?"
(39:9)

"Soon We will show them Our signs in the (furthest) regions (of earth) and in their own selves, until it becomes manifest to them that this is the truth."
(41:53)

"Those who truly fear God, amongst His servants, are those who have knowledge."
(35:28)

The prophet taught:

"The pursuit of knowledge is a (religious) duty on all Muslims."

"The ink of scholars is equal to the blood of martyrs."

What we know now as 'scientific research' was referred to as "the discovery of God's tradition in His creation" and was a chapter of worship. The West encountered—in war and peace—the expanding Islamic civilization, and received its earliest lesson in academic freedom, and—as there is no clergy in Islam—that no one is to censor thought or to intercede between Man and God. The earliest schools, libraries, universities and teaching staff relied entirely on Islamic sources. Students learned Arabic to seek education, and as the Islamic era started eclipsing a huge translation movement took place, and when the printing press was invented in Holland about eighty percent of its output was knowledge translated from Arabic. That was how Europe escaped the dark ages and started the renaissance. Justice and honesty should have dictated that the current civilization be appropriately called "The Islamo-Christian Civilization".

But during the process Europe had to liberate itself from the grip of the Church. It was inevitable that knowledge would overcome ignorance and light overcome darkness. Unfortunately Europe did not only depose the Church, but also what the Church stood for: God Himself! With the progress of science and the miraculous accomplishments of science and technology, and with the fading of the image of God, the stage was set in favour of a replacive ideology: science—worship and the deitification of the human mind. Microtheism was born...and still engulfs most of the West...the minimization of the role of God. He exists...and may be visited at church every sunday...but He should never step out into our world and interfere with our personal lives, social behaviour, individual freedoms, civil rights and indeed our economic, political or military affairs. This ideology reigned and still does...In 1966 the Time Magazine posed the question: ‘Is God dead’ and three years later reported: ‘The new ministry: Bringing God back to life’ (26 December 1969, p 40).

Whoever was planning for total chaos, took a deceptive detour around the unsuspecting masses who still clung to religious morals, and an ideology made its appearance between the two world wars under the slogan: ‘Morality without religion’. The very values religion endorsed were recommended, but not necessarily through religion, seeing that the different religious affiliations were over history the causes of prejudice and conflict. The hidden intent of course was to lure the masses—through respecting their values—into accepting another arbiter than their faith. Once the authority of religion was cast aside, tampering with the values then becomes an easy matter.

Religion was dealt another blow with the rise of communism in Russia. The extensive corruption of both church and throne leading to extensive misery and bitterness in the nation, paved the way to the communist take over and the dictatorship of an ideology that denies God altogether and hence religion, and hinged human destiny to a purely materialistic approach with hardly any room for values. Atheism is the official religion: and whereas communism per se meets with resistance in the West, atheism does not. An important product thereof is the movement of secular humanism, maintaining that human values should be made by humans, without heed or need of any supernatural reference.

One tactic of fighting against God is to put disobedience of His injunctions into more and wider application. With ‘mind’ acting God, human suggestibility was utilized to influence it. The sphere of sex is quite attractive and seductive, for sex is perhaps the most pleasurable human

physical experience. Old values become taboo, and when Freud warned against repressed sexual desires, sexual freedom appeared scientific (Time, April 9, 1984). Other scholars, philosophers, psychologists and psychiatrists carried on the flag, and the press, media, theatre, and movie industries caught up to spread the gospel.

The vehicle of the woman's emancipation movement was made to carry an extra passenger . . . and to the call to equalise women with men in political and economic rights, was added the call to justice and equality, for since man was free to practise sex without social stigmatization, woman should enjoy the same rights. Whereas male sexing was not inhibited with the fear of an unwanted pregnancy, the search for a reliable contraceptive was spurred up, and the discovery of the pill was supported by a substantial donation from Mary Sanger. Extramarital sex became more and more socially accepted. This would have not been that tragic if the values were kept intact but merely disobeyed. What was immoral a short while before became normal—and even commendable. Worse still, that time honoured bastion of religion, the Church, cracked down as many churches succumbed to the new ideas. A report on "Sex and Virtue" produced by a committee appointed by the British Council of Churches denounced sexual exploitation, blessed sex in marriage, but rejected the idea of continence before marriage or that of strict fidelity within it. It also refused to espouse the views of the Bible on adultery, declaring it permissible in certain cases between two consenting adults as a total encounter (Time, 28 October, 1966, p 38). The report urged the provision of young girls with contraceptives and called for more relaxation in abortion legislation, which was in fact forthcoming in one year's time.

Western democracy is great. Had the early Islamic nation escaped falling into the grips of dictatorship, it would have in all probability devised the same or a very similar formula for the choice of government and the transfer of authority from hand to hand by the free will of the nation and with neither coup nor blood shed. This would have been the perfectly Islamic formula. A vital difference from western democracy, however, would be the lack of a constant yardstick in the latter. Islamic democracy would operate within Islam. Western democracy operated without a frame, and whoever can muster enough following can outvote God himself . . . as is indeed happening.

With the compromise of many churches, the place of moral leadership became vacant or even occupied by the immoral. The Church became

follower and not leader, and whatever the people wanted was automatically sanctioned by the Church.

The fruits of sexual license in the West were quite discordant with the doctrine of justice and equality that justified it in the first place. In our view, a relation between two people the sequelae of which is not equally shared by both, cannot be regarded as just. As a gynaecologist with a history of practice in the West, I am in a position to see the other side of the coin, which spells a definite exploitation, injustice and discrimination against woman. If the outcome of an affair is just to desert her she is the loser. If she gets pregnant and secures abortion she is the loser. If she ends up with a fatherless baby she is the loser and if she gives her baby away for adoption she is the loser. In the clatter and glammer of the affluent western society, it is clear to my eyes that woman is being wronged on a scale far exceeding all the just and unjust criticisms directed at the status of woman in oriental communities. She is widely propagandized as a sex object on a large scale, and completely unrelated advertisements promoting the full gamut of products from soft drinks to motor cars rarely fail to expose the female body in nude or almost.

Besides this degradation of woman and tarnishing the beauty of "love" as a sacred value, the problem of venereal disease soon came in the wake of the increasing promiscuity. The estimated number of new cases of venereal disease every year in the U.S. was reported to be (Time, February 4, 1985, p 85):

Chlamydia	3-10 million
Gonorrhoea	2 million
Venereal warts	1 million
Genital herpes	0.2-0.5 million
Syphilis	90,000

Earlier in this century, with the discovery of chemotherapy and then antibiotics, medical circles thought that the problem of venereal disease was solved once and for all. Unfortunately resistant strains of bacteria emerged, a process that followed on the preparation of every new antibiotic, so that the micro-organisms have remained one step ahead of every new therapy. The coming back of venereal disease took a new and unwelcome epidemiologic pattern. The age incidence became much lower and the sex distribution almost equal. In old days it was the single prostitute infecting her many clientel, usually middle aged men. Now that free sex was declared allright, physiological, natural and even commendable so as to avoid the

complications of repression, the patients are ordinary boys and girls and men and women in all walks of (respectable) life.

To the hurdle of venereal disease was added carcinoma of the uterine cervix, also at lower age and high incidence. It seems as if it were a new form of the disease different in aetiology and biological features from the pattern hitherto known, the mean age incidence of which is 45-55 years. The venereal nature of this form of cervical malignancy that became a teen-age problem in some Central American countries has been established, and its aetiological association with early sexual exposure and multiplicity of sexual partners has been documented.

In spite of guaranteed widespread availability of contraceptive methods to young girls, the climate of carelessness and irresponsibility has led to an epidemic of teen-age pregnancy: 'children having children' as Time Magazine put it (December 9, 1985, p 84), reporting the following rates of pregnancy per 1000 teenage female population:

U.S.	10 (of whom 5 are aborted)
Britain	4.5 (of whom 1.75 are aborted)
Canada	4.5 (of whom 1.8 are aborted)
France	4.5 (of whom 1.8 are aborted)
Sweden	3.5 (of whom 2.1 are aborted)
Netherlands	1.5 (of whom 0.5 are aborted)

This category of pregnancy is a special hazard category associated with high perinatal and maternal mortality and morbidity. But it has its social sequelae also, for in the U.S. it is estimated that 80% of pregnant teenagers drop out of school; if they marry they face a 60% divorce rate within five years; and the repeat pregnancy rate is 40% within two years (Hardy J, Welcher D and Stanley J Clin Obstet Gynecol. 1978, 21, 1215-1232). The average age at first intercourse has been decreasing and the incidence of premarital sex has been increasing over the years, as are the abortion rate and the occurrence of gonorrhoea. Although female teenagers make up only 16% of the childbearing population in the United States, they account for one third of all abortions: 400,000 annually (Cates W Jr, J Adolesc Health Care, 1980 1:18-25). In 1978, 250,000 cases of gonorrhoea were reported in 15-19 year old teenagers in the United States, a quarter of all cases reported, and an increase of 216% over 1960 (Centers for Disease Control, STD fact sheet, ed 35, 1981). The sexual license is just a thread in a mesh. Teen-age drug abuse is rampant. For Americans 12-17 years old: 16.3 million have used cigarettes (71%) and 4.8 million are daily

smokers (21%), 21.4 million have used alcohol (93%) and 1.2 million are daily drinkers (5.5%), 13.1 million have used marijuana (57%) and 1.2 million use it daily (5.5%), 8 million have ever used stimulants (35%), and 3.7 million have ever used cocaine (16%) (Strasburger v, Paediatrics, Supplement vol 76, part 2, October 1985, p 660).

The weakened position of the family institution is both cause and effect of the sad state of affairs in the moral ecology in the U.S. Sexual gratification does not need the family any more, which until recently was one of nature's strongest devices to bring man and woman together to form a family. In an ideology of radical individualism the family ties tended to loosen as the capacity to give-and-take became shallow. The rate of divorce has been accelerating in the American society over the past two decades: 413,000 divorces in 1962, 845,000 in 1972, 1.2 million in 1981 (National Center for Health Statistics: Monthly Vital Statistics Report, vol 32 no 9, 1984). For every two marriages there is currently one divorce, and the trend is expected to continue through the next century (National Center for Health Statistics, reported in *The New Haven Register*, February 26, 1984, p 27). The effects on the children of divorced parents is naturally very negative (Lobowitz M L, Paediatrics vol 76, no 4, Supplement October, 1985).

In the absence of God-awareness and acceptance of His authority on people's lives, the interpretation of personal freedoms naturally stretches beyond any plausible or unplausible limit, just as malignant cells multiply and multiply unchecked by the normal growth regulating mechanisms of the healthy body. Freedom ceases to be the happy match between an individual's rights and those of other individuals or of the society at large. The reins that should have been in God's hands are taken by the most selfish, destructive and base whims and desires of a perfectly un-Godly creature, endowed with intelligence but lacking a moral compass. What follows is just a train of variable symptoms that regrettably are tackled both inefficiently and postphylactically (postphylaxis is a term we coined to refer to management of a problem after it happens, in contradistinction to the term prophylaxis ie preventive, anticipating and preventing the illness by preventing its causes). When *Time Magazine* shook an unsuspecting nation (April 23, 1984) with the news of a child molestation ring of teachers in a small children's school, regulations were tightened and some schools devised special courses to teach children how to recognize and combat sexual abuse (*Time*, November 12, 1984). It took the authorities two years to decide that two of the culprits should be referred to court for trial; the

charges being dropped against the others because of unsolid evidence upon the testimony of the too young victims. A radical approach entailing the revision of the life style of society and eradication of the moral pollution that engulfs it and the revival of the proper values was of course beyond the horizon.

Until the early eighties the large outcry in America was the fear of genital herpes, in view of its possibly fatal effect on the neonate of the affected mother, its intractability and its incrimination with cancer. But worse was yet to come, heralded in the summer of 1981 by the CDS (Center for Disease Control) commenting in their weekly news-letter on the unexpected occurrence in five young homosexual Los Angeles men of an unusual and often lethal type of protozoan infection of the lung (pneumocystis carinii pneumonia). Some also had an even rarer form of disseminated cancer, Kaposi's sarcoma. Reports of other serious infections and of Kaposi's sarcoma in homosexuals and in patients who had abused intravenous drugs soon followed in the same and following years, caused by a disease that suppressed the T_4 lymphocytes of the body and therefore undermined the immunologic defence of the body against infections considered minor and of no serious import under ordinary conditions. The disease was soon given its current name by the CDC: Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS), in recognition of the fact that it developed in subjects previously healthy and immunologically normal. Because it proved both lethal and transmissible, it was made a notifiable disease (Relman A S, Hastings Center Report, Special Supplement, August 1985). Thus was born a new epidemic of an entirely new disease, transmissible, always fatal, medically uncontrollable, plaguing the most advanced countries, with a mortality rate of about 50% but a case fatality rate of 100% (ie the likelihood that any given patient will die of AIDS is 100%), whose number of patients is growing exponentially (doubling every 9 months) and for which any effective therapy or vaccination remains out of sight for years to come (Krim M, Hastings Institute Report, August 1985). The sure thing about this new catastrophe is that it was raised and nurtured in the cradle of homosexuality.

Homosexuality is as old as history but in a few episodes it took epidemic proportions and was a widespread social phenomenon. Perhaps the earliest of these episodes involved the people of prophet Lut, whom God sent to reform them:

“The people of Lut rejected the apostles. Behold! Their brother Lut said to them: Will you not fear (God)? I am to you a messenger wor-

thy of trust, so fear God and obey me. No reward do I ask you for it, my reward is only from the Lord of the Worlds. Of all the creatures of the world will you approach males, and leave those whom God has created for you to be your mates? Nay: you are a people transgressing (all limits).

They said: If you desist not, O Lut, you will be assuredly cast out. He said: I do detest your doing. . . O my Lord! Deliver me and my family from such things as they do. So We delivered him and his family, all except an old woman who lingered behind. But the rest We destroyed utterly. We rained down on them a shower, and evil was the shower on those who were admonished (but heeded not). Verily in this is a sign: but most of them do not believe.” (26:160-174)

“We also (sent) Lut. He said to his people: do you commit lewdness such as no people (in creation) ever committed before you? . . . for you practise your lust on men in preference to women; you are indeed a people transgressing beyond bounds. And his people gave no answer but this: Drive them out of your city . . . they are indeed people who want to be clean and pure. But We saved him and his family except his wife; she was of those who lagged behind. And we rained down on them a shower, then sea what was the end of those who indulged in the crime.” (7:80-84)

“When Our messengers came to Lut, he was grieved on their account and felt powerless to protect them and he said: this is a distressful day. His people came rushing towards him and they had been long in the habit of practising abominations. He said: O my people . . . here are my daughters; they are purer for you (if you would marry). Now fear God and cover me not with shame about my guests . . . is there not amongst you a single right-minded man? They said: You well knew we have no need of your daughters, and you know quite well what we want. He said: I wish I had power to suppress you or that I could take to a powerful refuge. (The messengers) said: O Lut, we are messengers from your Lord . . . by no means shall they reach you. Now travel with your family while yet a part of the night remains, and let not any of you look back but your wife (will remain behind), to her will happen what happens to these people. Morning is their time appointed . . . is not morning soon (enough)? When Our decree issued, We turned (the city) upside down, and rained down on them brimstones hard as baked clay, spread layer on layer, marked as from your Lord,

now are they ever far from those who do wrong.” (11:77-83)

More references are made in the Quran to Lut and the deplorable sin of homosexuality rampant among his contemporaries. Warning and admonition were vigilantly given by Lut, but when obstinacy was the outcome they deserved God’s punishment. Islam utterly forbids homosexuality and considers it a grave sin as well as a legal crime if it fulfils the legal formal specifications. The prophet said:

“May God curse those who commit the deed of Lut’s people.” And he repeated this three times. (Nissa’i)

There is complete consensus of the various juristic schools that homosexuality is both sin and crime, although they had various views on the prescribed punishment, ranging from capital punishment to other punishments the court may seem suitable.

Lesbianism, that is sexual intercourse between woman and woman, is also prohibited in Islam, as evidenced by the saying of the prophet:

“Let man not look at the awra of man . . . nor woman at the awra of woman. And let man not ‘approach’ man under one cover, nor woman approach woman under one cover.”

(Ahmad—Muslim—Abu Dawood—Termizi)

‘To approach under one cover’ is a linguistic reference to sex. All juridical schools are unanimous that lesbianism is both sin and legal crime (if legal specifications hold), but the punishment is left to the judgement of the legislature.

Homosexuality, ever existing, has not become that horrendous wave except recently. It was only a personal affliction to hush-hush and shy about. It was considered an illness to be treated, until in 1971 the American Psychiatric Association declared it was no more an illness. Socially it was considered an inherent orientation, legally it became one of the personal freedoms, and religiously; the church wanted to prove that there was a place in the church for every one including homosexuals. The word homosexual was changed to ‘gay’ . . . hoping a nice name would make homosexuality nice. There are four gay churches in Los Angeles. And look at what a member of the clergy, Pastor Jim Lowder of the Dolores Street Baptist Church at San Francisco, said in defence of gays and lesbians: “My feeling is, scripture does not condemn all homosexual relationships. Jesus doesn’t even address the issue of sexuality . . .” Lowder appeared on a San Francisco television show in November 1985 and said

that he believes the Bible affirms relationships that are faithful, loving, life-enhancing and caring, even if they are gay (Star News, Saturday April 26, 1986 page 7, Pasadena, California). The gay became a cult, a political movement and a power. When the mayor of a city was murdered, and he was a homosexual, there were gay demonstrations demanding that the replacement should also be homosexual. The 'gay rights' has become a political slogan, and as a recognized minority they were always greedy for more rights and more power. During an election campaign, when one of the candidates—it must have taken him great courage—declared in a speech that the gays should straighten, the radio-commentator simply commented: 'he has burnt his chances'.

And now America faces the scourge of AIDS. The people know that 500,000 to one million Americans have been infected with the HTLV-III virus (up to mid 1985) and may develop AIDS. They know that AIDS cases are doubling every nine months, that no one has ever been cured of AIDS and that no cancer kills as surely and as rapidly as AIDS, and that transmission of the disease, originally by sexual intercourse, is possible through body fluids including blood, semen, tears and saliva, all of which were shown to contain HTLV III, as announced by the CDC (Medical Laboratory Observer, November 1985). This turned a lot of people against homosexuals, on several occasions they beat them and shouted at them: "You will kill us all" (Gay bashing: AIDS fear cited as attacks on male homosexuals grow—Los Angeles Times, April 10, 1986). And yet the homosexual lobby focus only on their rights—indeed wrongs—and ignore all the rights of the innocent majority who want to stay away from the spreading fire. Attempts at screening by blood testing are protested on grounds of discrimination and stigmatization. AIDS victims are sometimes portrayed in the media as heroes when they are ill and as martyrs when they die. Effective public health principles applicable to all contagious diseases including isolation and quarantine when necessary are played down as taboo. "The doctor should not moralize" is at the hub of American medicine and western medicine generally, even if this "moralizing" was the very essence of practising preventive medicine. Doctors may moralize against smoking, liquor, saccharine, cholesterol, obesity and what not. . . but when it comes to sexual license the matter becomes different irrespective of the sequelae. In dismay and disquiet, the scientist writer William Checks asks: "Where are the public health officials who should be taking aggressive action to maintain a correct perception of this disease's spread? And how long can this one sided presentation persist before people begin to think

of AIDS as a lethal version of the flue?' (Hasting's Center Report, August, 1985). As we write this, we are told that 25 percent of hospital admissions in San Francisco are AIDS patients . . . occupying beds without a hope of cure.

The writer is worried lest the reader may think that we have something against America . . . for this chapter may look as if it alludes only to America. We assure the reader that this is not the case, although America is the leading example. Besides, this whole book was written during my sabbatical leave that I spent in Los Angeles, California, during which my eyesight naturally fell on the American scene.

Contrary to what the reader might conclude, I honestly declare that there is much in America that is admirable. Some aspects of American life are more concordant with my Islamic concepts than is the case with many other countries; some of them Muslim. History tells us that it takes more than plentiful affluence and sophisticated technology to maintain a civilization, and it is pitiful to see the current civilization, at its epic, incubating in its body the germs of its own destruction. Besides, America plays a role of leadership over much of the world in various spheres, and whatever happens in America might reflect in a positive or a negative way, on other communities on our ever shrinking globe. It is no wonder therefore that one cannot feel detached or neutral over the goings-on in America, although some of these goings-on did cause my back to quiver. It was a surprise to get to know that 25% of children have a biological father different to their supposed-legal-father. It was painful to read that every sixth girl is subject to an incestuous relation at some time in her life (Diana Russel: *The Incest Legacy*, The Sciences—publ. The New York Academy of Sciences, March/April 1986, p 39) and of the dimensions of the problem of rape. Listening to the radio one evening I hit accross a programme on sex run by a lady doctor (a jewess of Rumanian ethnicity), who would receive questions live on the phone and offer immediate counseling. On the line was a wife married for one year. Before marriage she had lived with a man for three years, who apparently was much more an expert in sex techniques than her husband, so that she was missing those pleasures that her husband was seemingly ignorant about. The doctor advised her to buy some illustrated sex books that she would look up with her husband and suggest they try this and that etc. A homosexual complained that his lover, a fairly elderly man, was both jealous as well as lacking in the power of erection. The doctor reassured him that this was quite within normal for elderly men, and advised him to help his lover perhaps with

a bit of manual stimulation, which the gay confirmed gave his lover great delight. On a television show once appeared a lesbian and two homosexual men who decided in trinity to have a baby. She slept with both men in succession, so that the real father of the baby would remain unknown. The baby came and they were very proud about it and the audience gave a lot of applause. When one person among the audience expressed disapproval and defended the rights of the baby of legitimacy and knowledge of his father who should be responsible for raising him, it was as though the critic was sick of mind or just spoke another language. These are just samples. But I will never forget the woman who was reporting her obstetric history innumeration her children one by one, and commented on the penultimate baby: but that is not from my husband; it was from my boy friend. What surprised me was that the husband was calmly attending and listening.

This is the information passively acquired by a person like myself. . . living on the conservative fringe of life. But more is sure there for someone who cares to seek.

The following story was told by a teacher of mine some forty years ago, and seems to make an appropriate conclusion of this chapter.

Once upon a time there was a little village located at the top of a mountain. When the children played, they accidentally fell down and died. One elder suggested they should build a hospital at the foot of the mountain to immediately receive the casualties. Another suggested that the hospital should be built half way down, and perhaps the fallen children could then be caught before they hit the bottom. But it was the wise and sane who pointed out that the effective approach was to build a fence around the village to prevent the children from falling in the first instance.

Prevention is better than cure, and problems should be solved by preventing their cause. A good lesson for the world . . . and for America in particular: whether she is combating AIDS or combating terrorism.

“Never did sin spread in a people and they flagrantly perpetuated it even more, but God inflicted them with illnesses that were unknown to their ancestors.”

The Prophet
(Ibn Maja)