

VII. LIVING IN SIN WITH THE PATERNAL PRINCIPLE

VII.0 Chapter overview and themes,

When challenged with “He who is without sin, may cast the first stone”¹ we put down our stones. Denouncing an act or practice as morally wrong is not throwing a stone. He added “Go and sin no more.” Can we do that?

The presence of the Paternal Principle in a culture offers standards for male sexual conduct and formation of manly character. There are side effects. It is a gift to prigs, prudes and hypocrites. It is a causal factor in millions of men for guilt, shame and self-loathing.

Nonetheless, it converts a pervasive feature of life into a task which gives meaning to life; albeit a life for sinners. I strongly recommend reflecting on the principle when afflicted with moral dissatisfaction and confusion about one's own sexual tendencies, acts or practices. It will shine a light in the darkness even if you are not ready to follow it.

Wide recognition of the principle does not make it the standard for a culture. After all, it is widely scorned. The point of the reminder about its widespread recognition is that we are not discussing application of some subtle thesis of distributive justice. Central cases of acts condemned by the principle are readily recognized by both holders of the principle and those who dismiss it. There may be borderline cases of these activities which require the casuistic task of judging whether or not the principle applies to them. This chapter offers little or no casuistry of sexual acts. In the final chapter, I point out how reasonable people may disagree on acts which lead towards violating the principle, e.g., acts of sexual harassment. The crucial problems in sexual morality from the parental stance are not knowing right from wrong. The problems are doing what we know to be right, avoiding what we know to be wrong and then reforming ourselves after we have done what is wrong. I am interested in evaluating sexual moral character

and showing how the struggle to attain a proper sexual moral character is an antidote to nihilism. Any subtlety about wrong doing occurs in discussing how features of character conflict with the principle. Of course, focusing on moral sexual character does not indicate any belief that avoiding morally improper sexual acts is unimportant. The struggle to have one's sexual acts morally correct is the struggle to have a morally correct sexual character. Of greatest importance for focusing on what needs correction is recognition that violations of the principle are typically twofold: a chosen act violating the principle and having an attitude or using a maxim in conflict with the proper way to build character. With each sexual misbehavior there is sexual moral double jeopardy: a wrong act and some failure to pursue proper character. Unfortunately, acts violating it are easy to commit while forming character in accordance with it the principle is difficult. In the long run, the goal is to be in perfect accord with the principle in our acts and attitudes. In the short run we have to live with partial compliance. So, a **topic of the chapter** is developing a notion of the morally tolerable for the short run while never forgetting the long run goal.

With focus on character building my emphasis is on condemning maxims in conflict with the Paternal Principle. For men's sexual morality, Kant's Universal Law version of the Categorical Imperative tells men: Exercise your sexuality only in accordance with maxims consistent with the Paternal Principle! Kant's notion of maxim is also adapted to express intentions to live morally while intentionally failing to do so! An unpleasant task is confronting an issue which is significant in the early twenty first century. A polemic is directed against promotion of male homosexuality as morally acceptable. **Promotion of homosexuality as morally legitimate** conflicts with how character should be formed in accordance with the Paternal Principle.

I intended to close this chapter with a few observations suggesting that so-called artificial birth control by married couples is morally problematic. However, a return to this issue which has haunted me since my early twenties requires a separate chapter. Instead I end the chapter with few suggestions on using the Paternal Principle in public policy discussion.

I now turn to condemnations and recommendations. The Paternal Principle is directed to all men. In fact, I restrict my condemnations and recommendations to Western culture.

VIII.1 Condemnation of adultery, womanizing, *et al.*

I detect a social pressure against strict moral principles such as the Paternal Principle because they seem to imply harsh judgments about people who have serious difficulties in living in accordance with them. For the Paternal Principle people with strong same-sex attraction and those unable to find suitable mates present such hard cases. Hard cases need to be confronted without abandoning the principle. The principle is directed primarily to the millions of men who without extraordinary effort can conform to it. It is especially directed to men who can set an example in their communities.

The Paternal Principle is a complex corollary of the Sixth Commandment. Primarily the Paternal Principle condemns adultery and fornication. “Thou shalt not commit adultery!” Womanizers are paradigm violators of the Paternal Principle. These men have a maxim that they may have sexual intercourse with any woman they can seduce. If other principles are invoked, the womanizer is, especially if married, morally far worse than habitual masturbators and homosexuals. Sometimes my “moral intuitions” indicate to me that acts of masturbation and homosexuality are naughty rather than seriously wrong. Womanizers should simply stop. Along with womanizers the principle condemns the sub cultural ideal of womanizers as “real men.” The “double standard” allowing men more sexual freedom than women is totally rejected. Another

main target is a male attitude of subservience to their sexuality. A maxim expressing this attitude alleges that male sexual inclinations are so strong that if any woman indicates a willingness to have sexual intercourse with him, he cannot be blamed for doing so. It is not a myth, it is a fact, that male sexuality is so strong that if a normal man reaches a certain point in a relationship with a woman he will choose to have sexual intercourse. However, men can avoid reaching such a point.

Of course, enjoying the services of practioners of the world's oldest profession is condemned. This observation reminds us of a need for a "reality check" on what I can hope to accomplish with the principle. People with more ability and influence than I **have** may accomplish much more with their support of the principle.

VII.2 Confronting sexual reality

Is not the Paternal Principle suitable only for some idealized community, some moral ghetto? Perhaps it could effectively guide the conduct of a small community of conservative Catholics who home schooled their children and minimized social contacts with the larger community. In the larger communities in which most of us live it is *de facto* ignored. In my work as an income tax preparer and in my Society of St. Vincent dePaul "hands on" work with the urban poor, I am well aware of the chaotic condition of families, if they can be called families. When you help people apply for Earned Income Credit and other public services you rarely find the two parent nuclear family which would be predicted if there was anything approaching conformity to the Paternal Principle. Perhaps amongst the poor there is not total heterosexual chaos. The authors of *Bridges Out of Poverty*² find some structure in the relations between biological parents and their progenies. It certainly is not the traditional family. We in the business and professional classes can no longer, if we ever could, look down with contempt on

the chaotic families of the poor. Our compliance with the Paternal Principle is no cause for pride. Significant acts towards destruction of traditional families are fornication and adultery. From my anecdotal evidence, the “breakdown of marriage” is a fact. What are the facts?

VII.2.1 Reforming actual sexual behavior

Should we look to sociology to find out whether or not the situation is as bad, from the perspective of the parental stance, as it seems? It would be interesting and quite likely distressing. It is not necessary. If the goal were to bring the sexual behavior of society into closer conformity to the Paternal Principle, we should use the resources of sociology to determine what the sexual behavior actually is and then draw upon sociological results to determine whether or not there are effective policies for bringing this behavior into closer conformity to the Paternal Principle. Then there would have to be arguments on prudential or moral grounds that the changes should be implemented. I am not making a case for the Paternal Principle to change society’s sexual behavior. I hope that societal behavior would come into closer conformity to the principle. I would be pleased if my work were even a small causal factor in such a societal change. I will try to work effectively in supporting adherence to the Paternal Principle within the sphere of my personal influence. Still, I am not writing to advocate policies to change behavior of society at large. I am writing to justify setting or at least keeping as an option the Paternal Principle as a standard for male sexual behavior. I have anxiety about the principle becoming a quaint relic honored only by a few in the societies about which I care. We need to keep it as an orientating star to give us direction and dignity in our chaotic sexual condition. It guides us to how we ought to be and having such a guiding star gives us dignity. We realize that we are animals who can strive to be that way. If all that we have is the progressive program for increasing opportunities for sexual satisfaction by trying to reduce the undesirable physical and

psychological consequences of mating (copulating), we drift down to the spiritual emptiness of Pinker's incestuous children in the chapter on sexual trivialization. In the chapter on sexual demonization, we noted that novelists could show us the harsh truth about sexuality. Perhaps the model of the high sexual standards proposed by principles such as the Paternal Principle are necessary for fiction to show us the truth about the sexuality of our lives.

On two levels I advocate the principle: its rightness and its existential value. I have made a case that it is a reasonable moral principle. Throughout I am motivating acceptance of the principle by presenting the stance supporting it as an antidote to nihilism. By having this standard we have a lifelong task for making ourselves into proper sexual beings. Having this task gives meaning to life. Let us return to finding meaning by reforming our individual sexual characters.

VII.2.2 Reforming actual sexual character

The principle condemns adultery and fornication. However, it does not tell us how to rectify what obviously occurs so frequently. Married men entangled in an affair should stop but may have to continue some relationship because obligations have arisen. For instance, male/female bonding which as strong as in any official marriage is a marriage. So a man can involve himself *de facto* in a bigamous moral conflict. He has acted immorally to be married to two women. Maintaining two wives is immoral. But there may be no way to default to one or no wives without acting immorally. In this situation it is reasonable to ask: What is the way out of this situation without further immorality? The answer may be "There is no way." This "no way" answer may still be correct even if the question is weakened to: Is there one way out which does the least medical or moral harm? A theoretical possibility is that all alternatives may be equally harmful. However, with our limited knowledge we have to keep "plugging along" on the alert for

what seems the best way out. Sometimes when there seems no best alternative, the next best might be arbitrarily choosing one alternative and moving on from there with a burden of guilt.

“Out of the depths, I cry to you.”

We have to use judgment to determine how to rectify situations in which there have been violations. What should guide our judgments? We should try to avoid acts in violation of the principle, work at getting our maxims for sexual acts in conformity the principle, and try to minimize moral and medical harm to others involved. Avoiding moral harm requires more than not violating the principle. It requires not having other people violate the principle along with us as well as not violating other moral principles. For the bigamous case the maxim might be formulated as follows. I will be alert to extricating myself from this bigamous situation with doing, to the best of my knowledge, the alternative with the least moral and medical harm.

Sexual misbehavior is here to stay. Wisdom is required to guide us how to live with immorality in our communities, our families and in our selves without losing sight of the moral truths which protect us from moral nihilism. I am not wise. However, I introduce concepts, such as compensating for vices and tolerable immoralities. I hope wise people can extend and adapt such concepts to guide us on how to cope with sexual immoralities while still trying to correct them and bring us to proper sexual character.

Since the focus is on character rectification and development, there is need to comment on concepts or terminology I use to discuss character.

VII.3 Concepts for character evaluation

Acts are episodes which can be dated and counted. Acts are behaviors chosen at a place and a time. It is much easier to discuss acts than features of character. It is difficult to diagnose

how we have failed to pursue proper sexual character. But pursuit of clarity is no excuse for avoiding discussion of messy topics.

My terms for character evaluation come primarily from my own efforts to evaluate my character. I have not had definite terms throughout my life to use in my character evaluation. I continually seek for suitable terms. The test for terminological correctness is not clarity of definition but a sense of utility in understanding and improving my character. Unfortunately, this sense of insight has not been stable. The result of trying out different terms might be idiosyncratic use of terms. I hope, though, that comments and examples bring recognition of what I am talking about even if there is disagreement about the value I place on what is talked about.

VII.3.1 Sexual motives too shallow for character analysis

A distinction between an act chosen and the motive for choosing the act is a helpful terminological distinction for moving from act evaluation to character evaluation. Consider some examples.

Recall Kant's assessment of the moral worth of the act of a shopkeeper who gave correct change to a small boy. The shopkeeper's right of act giving correct change lacked moral worth because it was motivated by a desire for a reputation of honesty and not the motive of doing what was right. "Your apology was not really the right act because you were not really sorry but only wanted to avoid punishment." Here the defective motive is wanting to avoid punishment. "He showed that he is really a faithful husband. He avoided the opportunity (temptation) to spend the night in her room on a business trip because he respects his marriage vows. He wasn't merely afraid of his wife finding out." Here the motive is respect for his marriage vows. "His motive for helping her get the promotion shows how rotten he really is. He helped her only to seduce her."

In general, examination of motives may lead to useful examination of character. However, when the acts in question are attainment of orgasms the motives are too simple to provide a basis for exploration of character. The immediate motive is to get the pleasure or relieve the tension of a sexual urge. To probe into character let us look behind the motive into the disposition towards satisfying sexual urges.

VII.3.2 Attitudes toward sexual satisfaction expressed as maxims

The terminological development begins with classifying dispositions toward satisfying sexual inclinations with attitudes. I am using “attitude” in a way in which it is often used to discuss the behavior of employees and students.

John’s got a bad attitude. He never does more than his job requires. Jill’s got a great attitude. She’s always looking for ways to teach more effectively. Tim has an attitude that nobody can tell him what to do. Attitude evaluation extends to sexuality. He has an attitude that he can do whatever he can get away with if the woman is willing. His attitude is that he can have any sexual enjoyment if it doesn’t hurt anyone. For me a paradigm of using “attitude” to label a person’s principles and feelings about acting is in some translations of Paul’s letter to the Philippians. “Have among yourselves the same attitude that is also yours in Christ Jesus, who though he was in the form of God, did not deem equality with God something to be grasped. Rather he emptied himself,…”

Note that when we evaluate an attitude we talk of the attitude as an expression of a person’s policy for doing certain acts. Maxims are identified as expressions of attitudes. But maxims are not separable from the attitude they express. Maxims are not “pure” thoughts with no motive power. They have the power of an attitude.

Since we are restricting attention to male sexual morality under assumption of the Paternal Principle, morally acceptable maxims are maxims consistent with the Paternal Principle. To aim at having a morally acceptable sexual character is to aim at having all one's sexual maxims consistent with the Paternal Principle plus the strength to choose only acts consistent with those maxims. Aiming at a morally acceptable sexual character requires having a overriding maxim to hold and obey only maxims consistent with the Paternal Principle. Having a morally acceptable sexual character is to attain what is aimed at in aiming at a morally acceptable sexual character. As long as a man is still capable of acting at all a morally acceptable character is not attained.

What is the place of virtue in good character? As I use "virtue," virtue is a goal of good character but virtues are not necessary for good character. Striving for virtues is necessary and sufficient for good character.

VII.3.3 Traits & virtue

I use "trait" in the rather imprecise way in which it is commonly used. Traits characterize a person. Character traits can be looked at as long lasting attitudes in a person which provide fairly good predictions about how a person behaves. A man who regularly seeks erotic stimulation in books, films and on the internet has a lustful trait. A man who does not regularly seek erotic stimulation but is cajoled into viewing a "stag movie" at a party most likely lacks such a trait. Traits with attitudes contrary to moral principles are morally bad. Morally bad traits are vices. Womanizing is a vice. A man who does not care about his vice can, in an old-fashion sense, be labeled "vicious." A self-satisfied aggressive womanizer is vicious. People who regret having a vice and would like to overcome it are morally weak. My use of the term "vice" is not unusual. My use of "virtue" might be somewhat non-standard.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church*³ offers a standard definition of “virtue.”

“*Human virtues* are firm attitudes, stable dispositions, habitual perfections of intellect and will that govern our actions, order our passions, and guide our conduct according to reason and faith. They make possible ease, self-mastery, and joy in leading a morally good life. The virtuous man is he who freely practices the good.”

Section 1804: *Catechism of the Catholic Church*

I do not regard virtues as habits, perfections promising ease and joy.

Traits with attitudes consciously in conformity to moral principles are morally good character traits. In character morality, a virtue is the ability consciously to form and maintain a morally good character trait. The maintain clause is important. In character morality there needs to be regular, if only “background,” monitoring of attitudes to ensure that they still are in conformity with moral principles and that we are not letting down our guard against temptations. The need for monitoring tells that we cannot let our dealing with a morally significant part of life become habitual. Habitual behavior left to itself leads to complacency and deteriorating performance. The need to be alert to temptations tells us that developing our character is never complete – traits are never perfected. In character morality, there is and ought to be at least a low grade anxiety that we will succumb to temptation. With this anxiety there cannot be a promise of ease and joy in our struggle for self-mastery.

This is not to say that we should not try to approximate virtues in the standard sense. If there are areas of life in which you are not greatly tempted to violate moral norms, let decent behavior for that area become habitual with only occasional “oversight.” Focus on areas in which you are likely to fail. For instance, I think that I am properly forgiving by natural inclination. I get mad but quickly lose interest in getting even. I find it easy to “make up and get along.”

Nonetheless, I need to examine myself every now-and-then to check on whether or not I am harboring secret grudges and subtly getting back at people. I think that virtues in the Catechism's sense have to be some sort of inborn gift of nature or grace of God.

However, discussion of having virtue is a digression when discussing problems of men forming a sexually proper character. Inclinations and temptations to violate the Paternal Principle are so prevalent and powerful that on-going struggles to avoid violations as well as constant efforts to uncover and revise contrary attitudes is the fate of most men. Indeed I would not assume that many, if any, men have good traits with respect to sexual morality although bad traits are no surprise. Wives are well-advised not to trust even the most faithful husband to resist a serious temptation. The good sexual character trait men can have is accepting the Paternal Principle as the guide for their actions and attitudes. Genuine acceptance of the Paternal Principle can characterize a man. From this trait we can make predictions about ourselves and other men. We cannot predict that we will never fail. But we can predict efforts to avoid sin along with sorrow and repentance when sins are committed. I call this trait being sexually proper. Men have a duty to aim at making the trait of being sexually proper into a virtue in the character morality sense of "virtue." Let us label this virtue "being sexually proper" rather than "chastity"

VII.3.4 Duties to oneself

As already noted the Paternal Principle is not only violated by the wrong acts chosen. The Paternal Principle is also violated by choices not to be in accordance with it or failure to choose to be in accordance with it. Violations of the principle by wrong acts are publicly recognizable. Others may blame us for these violations. Violations of failing to become the proper kind of sexual man are not so clearly recognized even by the actor himself. These violations can be

violations of a duty to have the virtue of being sexually moral. Duties to develop virtues are duties to oneself. So the proper person to cast blame for failures to develop the virtue of being sexually proper is oneself. Other people, though, are indispensable for helping us diagnose those failures and guide us to the judgment we ought to make. A serious failure to build character is failing to condemn ourselves when there is good evidence that we have violated the principle.

This obligation to pass judgment on ourselves explains an oddity in some people's moral thinking. The mere admission of a fault seems to diminish the fault. For instance, someone saying "I know that I am a liar" seems to make him less than the worse liar. The admission clears him of the charge that he fails to pass proper judgment on his character. Similarly, a man who says "I'm not a kid, I know I'm sleazy by hitting on my brother's wife" may be taken as having said something to mitigate blame for his reprehensible conduct.

Judgments of a choice not to be in accordance with the principle can be straightforward. This occurs when a person to himself or others explicitly reject a principle. For instance, expressing "gay pride" by posting a rainbow banner on the front porch is strong evidence of rejecting the Paternal Principle. Judging failures to choose to be in accordance with the principle become complicated. Expressions of guilt indicate that even living a gay life-style is not strong evidence for rejection of the Paternal Principle. I have anxiety that my tolerance for much sexual morality indicates less than a firm commitment to the Paternal Principle. This complication of judging choices against having proper sexual character is one reason I needed a second chapter on artificial birth control.

VII.4 Damaging sexual character

Beyond failure to pass judgment on our sexual failings there are at least five overlapping ways we can fail to perform duties to ourselves to be sexually proper. One way is to fail to make

any efforts to become sexually proper. This is sexual amorality and might, but need not be, acted out in sexual wantonness. A second way is to choose, or allow oneself, to become the kind of person who disregards the Paternal Principle. An example would be a young man adopting the immoral sexual conduct of a peer group when away at the university or during military service. This is sexual corruption. Actually, a young man need not leave home to become sexually corrupt. A rotten macho sub-culture can take root in a Catholic high school. A third way is to excuse oneself too readily, easily and frequently after succumbing to temptations. This is weakening of the will. A fourth way is to tolerate in oneself a practice of violating some selected violations of the Paternal Principle. This way is discussed below in remarks on tolerable immoralities. This could be called moral compromising. I locate Augustine's notorious prayer⁴ "Grant me chastity and continence, but not yet" as this type of choice contrary to building proper sexual character. From the perspective of this book, Augustine's prayer is respected as a sincere struggle against nihilism. A fifth way is to accept a pattern of action, harbor a maxim, which is in accord with a principle contrary to fundamental principles of the parental stance. This is the type of character fault I diagnose in the acceptance of a homosexual life-style and in the practice of artificial birth control. I call it sexual moral subversion.

However, an act violating the Paternal Principle is not conclusive evidence of violating a obligation to build character. The man who falls may have on his moral agenda becoming sexually proper and really does work at it. For instance, he avoids pornography, lustfully looking at women, and tries to suppress sexual fantasies. When he falls he resolves to try even harder to avoid falling. Here there is sexual moral weakness. Weakness of the will is a character flaw but acting as a result of it is not a choice to ignore character building. Of course, failing to choose to work at strengthening the will is wrong. We can work at strengthening our will by practicing self

denial of impulses and inclinations. Self denial is not guaranteed to work. Anecdotal evidence about practicing it along with avoiding temptations supports endorsing it as a way to strengthen the will to choose in accordance with a principle accepted by the person. Of course, the principle has to be a good principle for strength of will in adhering to be good.

For the character stance, having a proper sexual character is not the only virtue. If you lack it you have a moral weakness or even the vice of sexual wantonness. However, even if you are far advanced in sexual character you may still be weak or vicious with respect to control of predominantly non-sexual inclinations. A devious, hard-hearted man may engage in commercial activities which damage public health and even cause death while being a perfect practitioner of the Paternal Principle.

VII.4.1 Acts damaging character

Do acts violating the principle produce any damage over and above the moral harm derived from their being contrary to the principle? The moral harm has psychological reality. The psychological correlates of moral harm can cause other states correlated with moral harm. So it is not improbable that moral harms lead to further moral harm. That is a rationale for classing as corruption violations of the obligation to be sexually proper. I think that violations of the Paternal Principle do much non-moral harm; especially those of aggressive womanizers. However, I am not arguing that principles are right because they reduce non-moral harm. In the case of moral harm, we can definitely say “It is not wrong because it does harm; it does harm because it is wrong.”

VII.4.2 Compensating for character flaws

There is value for character development in a “fuzzy” way of thinking about compensating for weakness or vice in one area by vigorously and successfully pursuing virtue in

another area. Guilt, shame and self-loathing about sexual failures **can** lead to heroic efforts in performance of the corporeal works of mercy. The corporal works of mercy are: Feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, clothe the naked, shelter the homeless, visit the sick, visit prisoners, bury the dead. Guilt and shame may and should remain but a proper sense of self worth and a legitimate good reputation as a fairly decent person can be gained. I adapt the term ‘compensate’ to call character compensation a practice of trying to develop a proper character by developing very strong character in some areas to keep character formation high on our priorities while temporarily tolerating vice in other areas. However, character compensation requires careful deliberation. A man who has an affair may do much damage by confessing to his wife under an assumption that he is compensating for his sexual infidelity by being honest. Another warning is that compensating for sexual vices by practicing the corporeal works of mercy may insidiously corrupt character by inducing a “holier than thou” attitude towards those who are sexually well behaved but for various reasons do less for the poor and needy. And we need to be aware that practicing corporeal works of mercy is typically far easier than controlling wayward sexual inclinations. It can be fun for a married man to work on the serving line of a homeless shelter with his current girl friend.

Even though this book is written to advocate sexually proper male character, I do not recommend developing proper sexual character as a compensation for vices in areas where the vices inflict public harm. In my judgment there is a moral asymmetry between compensating for sexual vices and other vices. Compensating for sexual vices by performance of corporal works of mercy is morally safer than compensating for other vices by maintaining sexual rectitude. Of course, the compensation requires keeping on one’s agenda elimination of the sexual failings.

VII.5 Condemnation of masturbation, male homosexuality

Moral condemnations of “Standard” acts of masturbation and homosexuality are immediate consequences of the Paternal Principle.

Typically acts of male masturbation are immoral. A male, due to age or mental defect, who is unaware of human sexual reproduction may be innocent of any moral wrong. In general a masturbator clearly realizes that a satisfaction crucial for the reproductive process is obtained when fertilization is impossible.

My not focusing on the details of the sex acts for moral norms precludes me from condemning masturbation acts performed to obtain sperm for *in vitro* fertilization. If the act is performed with cooperation of husband and wife it is manifestly open to conception. I do not think that a condemnation of *in vitro* fertilization can come from sexual thinking alone. There needs to be consideration of creation of excess conceptions which must be destroyed or neglected. My focus, though, is not on acts but on character.

The main harm of masturbation is that a practice of male masturbation damages moral character.⁵ A morally corrupting practice is one in which wrong acts are performed, a habit of performing them develops and there is a likelihood that the person will come to think that the acts are not morally wrong. A typical masturbator’s maxim is: *In fantasy I can have any sexual satisfaction I can imagine*. It is a sexually corrupting practice.

The condemnation of masturbation, of course, includes more than adolescent masturbation. Male masturbation stimulated by pornography is immoral. That is an immediate consequence of the Paternal Principle. A practice of using pornography to stimulate sexual fantasies for masturbation is definitely morally corrupting.

VII.5.2 Keeping male homosexuality “in the closet”

Cultural movements in the early decades of our twenty first century make male homosexuality a special case. In Western societies public opinions are forming that male homosexual acts, at least in “nice” versions, are not morally different from sexual acts of a married heterosexual couple. Absent these movements to promote acceptance of homosexuality, I would note that the Paternal Principle implies that male homosexual acts are immoral in principle. How to deal with violations of the Paternal Principle is a dimension of a stance on sexual morality. A dimension is a variable component of a stance. Along this dimension on homosexuality, my stance is “keep it in the closet.”

My keeping it in the closet maxim is a modification of Kant’s views on dealing with homosexuality. Kant proposed harsh treatment for pederasts and those having sex with non-human animals: castration or exile.⁶ I modify Kant’s proposals to say that we should make such expressions of sexuality “invisible.” Kant did not, mistakenly in my opinion, characterize the castration as punishment. It would certainly hurt.

A major reason for taking this “keep it in the closet” point along this dimension is the “Golden Rule.” Invisibility of the affliction of same-sex attraction is what I would want if I suffered from it. I strongly support efforts to decriminalize homosexuality. An image of security officers lurking about in “Men’s Rooms” to capture homosexuals disgusts me. This may reveal my lack of social responsibility. In general, I do not approve of mandatory reporting of suspected illegal sexual activity. I am thankful not to be employed where such reporting is required. In line, with the “keep it in the closet” attitude, I would recommend discreet efforts to avoid the orientation as it emerges during the teen years. I am somewhat opposed to anti-discrimination laws concerning sexual orientation because application of the laws requires setting people with same-sex attraction apart. The “keep it in the closet” policy is not solely discriminatory against

homosexuals. Masturbators as masturbators should be “invisible” in society. So should adulterers, fornicators and users of pornography. Marginalization of activities is a useful social tool for condemning activities and attitudes without creating social outcasts. Marginalization leaves places of refuge in the community for our moral weaknesses from which we may return to ordinary or “straight” society.

Because of growing popular endorsement of homosexuality more attention has to be given to public opinions about homosexuality; especially those of people who are not homosexuals. My attention is more a confrontation with pro-homosexual opinions than critique of homosexual behavior. The sections following *“Polemical asides on popular Gay issues”* present this polemic.

VII.5.2 Male homosexuality and masturbation

With respect to attaining orgasms known to be totally independent of conception it may seem that there is no moral difference between acts of masturbation and male homosexual acts; except that, in the homosexual case, there are two or more immoral acts rather than one. One might be tempted to use, what I think is the oxymoronic phrase, “mutual masturbation.” I concede, though, that so-called phone sex might be labeled mutual masturbation.

It is interesting to note that in his *Book of Gomorrah*,⁷ about 1050AD, St. Peter Damien distinguished degrees of homosexual acts. Anal intercourse was the worst: “the complete act against nature.” Peter wrote to persuade Pope Leo IX that overt homosexual clergy should, especially if bishops, be removed from high office and laicized. Peter was especially disgusted by priests giving each other sacramental absolution after engaging in homosexual acts together. Pope Leo’s reply, printed as an appendix, is temperate. He morally condemns the acts and

practices but thinks the problem needs to be addressed case-by-case taking into consideration the willingness of the men to do penance and amend their lives.

In general, claims of *moral equivalence* misleads us away from specific features of acts and types of character. However, a principle is clarified by noting that different types of acts are morally equivalent relative to that principle. The moral equivalence between homosexuality and masturbation is relative to the Paternal Principle with its focus on orgasm attainment. I will not talk of moral equivalence henceforth.

If moral courtship principles were considered, masturbation and homosexuality would be morally distinguished although both would still be immoral because of conflict with the Paternal Principle and the obligation to work at being a sexually proper male. I am not arguing for any moral courtship principles here. If I were to argue for courtship principles, I would claim that if we were to recreate courting, which is now controlled by free will, subject to natural causal law it would focus on neither the same sex, erotic imagery or fantasy people.

Allow me to engage in a bit of socio-biological speculation. Take it for what it is worth. I think it could be tested with longitudinal studies. A conjecture about persistence of male homosexuality is that many men are genetically disposed to court “boyish” looking girls. Since such athletic girls can be very healthy they have many healthy baby boys who inherit attraction to such “boyish” looking girls. Unfortunately, since transmission of traits is a rather “hit and miss” business, some of the boys miss the mark and court real boys.

It is easier for the heterosexual masturbator to have overcoming the practice of masturbation on his moral agenda by courting, mating and bonding with a woman. The main moral failing of a homosexual would be to remove conforming to the Paternal Principle from his moral agenda and to adopt a maxim either trivializing or demonizing sexuality. This occurs by

accepting his homosexuality where “accepting” does not mean recognizing the dysfunction of his courting and mating inclinations. It means accepting as morally permissible homosexual acts.

Tolerating homosexuality in oneself or others is not accepting it.

VII.6 Tolerating immorality

In this section, I promote another concept which I think would be despised by many moral philosophers as evidence of sloppy thinking. Roughly the concept is “right for me.” As I propose the concept “right for me” does not entail “right.” This fuzzy concept along with such others as “moral harm,” “character compensation” noted above and “tolerable immoralities” noted below can be used in serious conversation to make important distinctions. In the context of careful conversation the fuzziness can be removed. It is not the task of philosophers to analyze concepts so that there are precise necessary and sufficient conditions for their application in all contexts. The very effort to provide such analyses reveals an arrogant interest in “micro-managing” all intelligent conversations.

Because of the complexity of human sexuality, strength of sexual inclinations and the length of life there is some need to accommodate, at least in the short run, what is right, in some sense, for the individual but not morally right. How can a person continue to pursue being a moral person while tolerating his own performance of immoral acts? What kind of “saving” maxim is available? In this study with the focus on the role of character building as an antidote to nihilism, maxims have greater significance than particular acts. However, to be clear about the notion of the morally tolerable it is helpful to write about morally tolerable acts and morally tolerable intentions or maxims. At first we will be considering primarily morally tolerable acts. Discussion of the morally tolerable needs far more development than I offer. “Tolerable” is a relative term: X is tolerable in Y. For instance, different considerations need to be raised to

evaluate “Prostitution is tolerable in towns adjacent to military bases” as opposed to “Prostitution is tolerable in towns adjacent to government seats where legislative bodies assemble.”

Nonetheless, I write a bit on the morally tolerable in hopes that others continue to develop it.

As we discuss applying the Paternal Principle we find that there are sexual acts morally condemned by the Paternal Principle which do not in any clear way disrupt social order. The damage lies solely in the misuse of sexuality and the corruption of sexual moral character. Some individuals have strong inclinations to perform these acts and suffer considerable stress by not performing them. This is of course the case in men afflicted with the sexual dysfunction of same-sex attraction. Womanizing can also be a dysfunctional affliction of many incorrigible “womanizers.” All holders of the Paternal Principle, including homosexuals who have internalized the Paternal Principle, morally condemn homosexual acts.

But holders of the principle may disagree on the severity with which to condemn homosexual acts. Finding a place for such disagreement requires something like a notion of dimension of a stance, mentioned above. In this case the dimension is severity of condemnation. Severity of condemnation provides a nice paradigm of a stance dimension since severity comes in degrees. Some may think that civil authorities should search out men committing homosexual acts and punish them with imprisonment or worse. Others, such as me, may appear so lenient that we accept homosexual acts as morally permissible. But we do not. We hold that the acts should be legally permissible within limits of modesty for maintaining good order. Closets are good for that.

VII.6.1 Personal and public moral toleration

Let us focus primarily on finding a place for toleration of immoralities in personal life while trying to pursue being a moral person. Societies frequently tolerate immorality, which they

may hope ultimately to eliminate. This reminder of social toleration of immorality shows that the notion of personal moral toleration I am working out is not eccentric. At times and in places, there is slavery, exploitive prostitution, pay-offs, etc. Consider toleration of mistresses in the court of Louis XV of France⁸. The King had several mistresses. But he never accepted his behavior as morally correct. There is even a cliché accepting tolerable immoralities. It goes “You can’t legislate morality.” Readers can make their own lists of tolerated immoralities in historical and contemporary legally constituted societies as well as those constituted less formally.

Toleration of immorality in societies is a serious issue for social and political philosophy. What an individual holds about social control of morality is a dimension of the individual’s moral stance. Toleration of immoralities in a society does not require individuals nor the society to become morally blind about moral issues. Even if they hold that all immoralities which produce only moral harm should be tolerated, they still recognize what is morally harmful, i.e., in conflict with morality.

From now on, unless otherwise stated, we are discussing tolerating immorality in one’s personal life.

VII.6.2 Excuses for the morally tolerable

The term “excuse” may be used at least three different ways. One way to use “excuse” is to cite factors justifying toleration of a fault. This use of “excuse” includes the morally tolerable. It is the main concern here. Another way of using “excuse” is to cite factors which show that an act which is typically regarded as wrong is not under certain circumstances wrong. A person is excused from an obligation. As noted above it is *prima facie* wrong to lie but under certain circumstances a person is excused from the obligation to tell the truth. An act having this second type of excuse does not need to be morally tolerated because it is not immoral. As we will see

below excusing sexual violations as only *prima facie* wrong can lead to corruption. A third way of using “excuse” is to cite factors showing that a person is not to be blamed for an immoral act. Factors such as insanity or uncontrollable urge may be cited to show a person had no choice. Typically acts excused as uncontrollable are not to be tolerated in the future. Steps are to be taken to introduce causal factors such as incarceration or psychotropic drugs to prevent the behavior.

While on the topic of excuses we can dismiss attempts to excuse oneself by formulating a neutral maxim to describe immoral choices. For instance, a womanizer may say that his maxim is to provide pleasure to unsatisfied women. When the emphasis is on character formation, expressing such maxims is like cheating in a game of solitaire.

VII.6.3 Moral corruption via, notion of *prima facie* wrong

Consider a proposed working definition that if an act is morally tolerable then its only harm is moral harm. Only rules are broken. These “victimless crimes” could be called “venial moral sins.” A secular term for this in sexual matters might be "naughty." However, a thoughtful person who is prepared to tolerate immoral acts in his behavior has the intention to do what he ought not to do. He has a maxim to do what he ought not to do! From a moral point of view, this is serious. Similarly religious people who hold that sin is a violation of God’s will but still intend to commit even a venial sin are choosing to offend God. If you really believe in God you should take having an intention to offend God very seriously. So, even this apparently lenient definition of ‘morally tolerable’ brings out that the morally tolerable is still immoral. I do not use this proposed working definition because I think it is too narrow. We may have to tolerate immorality which does medical harm such as torture. The important point is to have a concept which tolerates activities and attitudes without ignoring their immorality. Working definitions can be

developed *ad hoc* as situations arise. The concept of *prima facie* wrong leads us to ignore the immorality.

Tolerating immoralities in oneself tempts you to excuse the immorality as only *prima facie* immoral. All things considered the act is morally permissible because the only harm is the conflict with the *prima facie* rule. This tempts us further, in sexual matters, to shift to a stance that the acts are morally neutral and ultimately only non-moral consequences are relevant to evaluating our acts. Such a temptation to shift to a progressive stance is, as we shall see, an existential threat to holders of the parental stance, practicing so-called artificial birth control. The threat is existential because it moves them from a moral stance having an antidote to nihilism to a stance vulnerable to nihilism.

VII.6.4 Reasonable disagreements about the morally tolerable

A significant difference between the morally tolerable and the morally permissible is that reasonable people need not agree about the morally tolerable. In my judgment the behavior of the seducer of young girls is morally intolerable while that of the struggling homosexual is morally tolerable⁹. But you may reasonably disagree with me for principled reasons or on the basis of your moral intuitions about the morally tolerability.

VII.6.5 The morally tolerable in utilitarianism

I emphasize that “alright” designates morally tolerable *immoralities*. What is merely morally tolerable is not morally permissible. I think a workable sexually morality needs such a category. Holders of utilitarian moral theories, when challenged by Peter Singer¹⁰, might accept that theoretically they ought to give far more to charities and not show preference for their own children. However, they tolerate or excuse these moral deviations from utilitarianism without denying that utilitarianism forbids them. I do not accept the ruthless compassion of Peter Singer’s

utilitarianism. Yet I think Singer and I both believe character development as most important in morality. I have taught his essays urging students to trying “giving until it hurts.” Many students agreed with Singer but admitted that they were not going to change their donation behavior. They rejected his challenge to develop character without disagreeing with his utilitarianism. Of course, character development is not required by utilitarianism. We returned to this topic in the chapter on alternative stances where I argue that a character morality for progressivism is not a well founded antidote to nihilism.

VIII.7 Polemical asides on popular “Gay” issues

Here I issue polemics against currently popular views promoting homosexuality. The rewriting of this book before submission for publication was Winter 2013. In my judgment, they are views which follow from a progressive stance on sexual morality along with some elements of romanticism.

VII.7.1 “Don’t ask, don’t tell”

I think the military policy of “Don’t ask, Don’t tell” had been correct. I would add that if a man slips a bit about his orientation, an extra rule is “Don’t listen.” The “Don’t tell” should have been taken very seriously so that anyone who “Told” or “outed” a fellow soldier should be punished with perhaps a reduction in rank. I think that for centuries “Don’t ask, Don’t tell” has been the policy of well civilized men. I still have a vivid memory from the early fifties of a midday formation suddenly called by the First Sergeant of my unit in the 11th Airborne. Some guys had been harassing his favorite cook about effeminate mannerisms. Loudly and clearly he commanded an immediate stop to the bullying. He pointed out that those who disobeyed would be invited to go off post to settle the issue as paratroopers in those days might settle issues. As a Christian, Jn 8, about the woman taken in adultery, indicates to me that not asking or telling is

what Jesus would do. Officially allowing expressions of homosexuality is very close to endorsing its legitimacy. Where free expression of homosexuality is allowed, stating moral disapproval might become contrary to policies of various organizations.

The U.S. military has abandoned the “Don’t ask, don’t tell policy.” Nonetheless I recommend such a policy for most areas of life and most sexual failings.

VII.7.2 Gay marriage

In my judgment coming out to endorse “gay marriage” is something like being converted to a religious doctrine and practicing a ritual to declare the belief. Declaration of acceptance is like an offering of incense to a god of the Durkheimian religion of Western societies. (See Mary Douglas’s *Purity and Danger*,¹¹ for an account of how a society’s civil religion makes sacred the basic structure of the society.) Anecdotal evidence indicates that switching to support of gay marriage is similar to having a conversion experience. My interpretation is that heterosexuals who come out for gay marriage are switching to a progressive stance on sexuality. A progressive stance changes significant boundaries between males and females. Endorsing gay marriage sacralizes this new social structure.

In the Durkheimian sense of religion, a new religious outlook is emerging. This new religious outlook does not fit well with religions of the Judeo-Christian tradition. We can be told that nothing much will change if there are same-sex marriages. So, why not accept them? Indeed, offering incense to the emperor did little or nothing except corrupt early Christians who succumbed to threats. Fidelity and honesty requires holders of the Paternal Principle to speak against and to vote against same-sex marriage if they have an opportunity to do so. If same-sex marriage is not made a public issue, it is best to keep silence and hope the silliness passes away. I suggest regarding gay weddings as outrageous “camp.” The seriousness with which some

heterosexuals discuss homosexual marriage is comic. They include the president of the United States whom I otherwise take seriously.

To gain some understanding of camp in the gay life style, see David Hailperin's *How To Be Gay*.¹² Participating in camp is a way of compensating for a homosexual's sense of being marginalized. Dramatic mockery of structures, practices and institutions taken seriously in the larger society helps in some way to expose the boundaries of structures marginalizing homosexuals as ultimately not serious. Basically it is all role-playing in a tragic comedy.

Today there are many ways of forming households. There is need for serious debate over the privileges, rights and duties of the members of the various types of households. We do not, though, live by bread alone. We guide our lives by words, symbols, concepts. Words can hurt words. When our valuable words are hurt we are hurt. "Marriage" is still a valuable word. Thus pro-homosexuals are grasping for it. If they get it, what the word conveys won't be worth wanting. All of us will live on with the loss of a valuable ideal for guiding the important and demanding roles of male-female bonding.

Progressives promoting same-sex marriage have standards for moral evaluation of homosexual acts. They use standards such as coercion and age of the participants. What is a likely effect of extending marriage to cover homosexual relations? An effect could be having marital status for moral evaluation of homosexual acts. In general, pre-marital and extra-marital sexual acts have been morally condemned. So same-sex marriage might provide a standard for moral condemnation of most male homosexual behavior. However, in these times it is unlikely that there will be an increase in moral condemnation of most homosexual behavior? Would not a more likely result be that use of marital status as a moral standard for sexual behavior is weakened even more than it is now. It is not improbable that in our mainline society marital

status becomes morally irrelevant for judging sexual behavior. Of course, being morally irrelevant to evaluation of sexual behavior does not make marriage totally irrelevant to sexuality. However, marriage would be far less significant than at present. A slogan promoting same-sex marriage is “Marriage Equality.” Marriage equality equals marriage trivialization.

The sexual dysfunction of same-sex attraction is an affliction. The possibility of some of the most rewarding of human relations is lost. The loss is not recovered by stealing the name “marriage.” Friendship is a consolation. Marriage is more and less than friendship. Married people frequently love one another and sometimes become friends. But “bottom line” marriage is duty. Friendship between men is rare. It is to be envied and respected. But to call it marriage is to make both the friendship and marriage comic.

VII.7.3 Judeo-Christian clergy who endorse homosexuality

Members of the clergy endorse homosexuality by promoting the ordination of openly active homosexuals and advocating gay marriage. Not all who are afflicted with homosexual attraction are satisfied with their plight. At least early in sexual development, they may struggle against such inclinations. The anxiety is that if the homosexual inclinations prevail, my sexuality will never be as it ought to be. Some may have had success. In any event, it is not unknown that young men have turned to traditional religions to find strength to overcome their inclinations. Perhaps some have found strength in a church. For clergy of these religions to endorse homosexuality could be seen as a cruel betrayal by those seeking strength in a church for controlling those inclinations. They “turn off the light.”

VII.8 Maxim for coping with homosexuality

A homosexual could have a maxim that specifies that given his circumstances homosexual acts are *alright for him* although not morally right. With phrases such as “alright for

me” and “alright for him” I designate tolerance of victimless but sexually immoral acts when the mental anguish from celibacy is considerable, the sexual wrong is recognized and there is the ultimate goal of living without performance of those acts. If I were afflicted with very strong same-sex attraction I would try to formulate and live in accordance with a maxim for “living in sin” with the ultimate goal of living free from sin.

To subdue my sexual urges in hope of ultimately being able to master them I will discreetly live a homosexual life style recognizing that these acts are morally wrong, never tell others that they are morally permissible, especially not by seducing young boys, and try to disengage myself from this life style and these acts.

Yes, this maxim expresses an intent to do what is morally wrong!

VII.8.1 Cartoon of a homosexual honoring the Paternal Principle

Most people who know thirty-nine-year-old Paul are unaware of his homosexual inclinations and activities. They know him as a biochemistry Ph.D. who is developing a very successful lawn service. He keeps it “in the closet” as the saying goes. Paul lives in dread that someone out of a perverted sense of honesty will “out him” as another saying goes. That dread of exposing behavior for which he feels shame is nothing compared to the dread of his homosexuality Paul recognized in his midteens. He is slowly recovering from periods of wild sexual delight followed by deep self-loathing. For awhile he even thought death from AIDS would bring a few final months of relief from sexuality. But Paul is too proud to have his survivors think he was too stupid to practice “safe-sex.” Now Paul hopes that he will eventually be able to overcome all temptations to be sexually active; let alone occasionally succumbing to temptations. His recovery is mediated by his rationalization that his homosexuality is a defect based on both genetic and environmental conditions.

To Paul it is as much a genuine defect as cerebral palsy or very low intelligence which would make a man incapable of being an effective husband and father. Indeed, Paul rationalizes, homosexuality **is** a defect similar to that of a man whose sexual inclinations lead him to be an incorrigible “womanizer.” Some combination of genetic and environmental factors render “womanizers” incapable of being an effective husbands and fathers. His homosexuality is a defect because it prevents him from using his sexuality for what male sexuality is supposed to be. It is supposed to be used for being a husband and father. Paul believes *that there is a morally right and wrong way to exercise sexuality and those morally right and wrong expressions of sexuality are set by human sexuality*. He tells himself that he must learn to live with his defect which prevents him from proper exercise of his sexuality. His goal in his sexual life, which is inseparable from his life, is to live without physical courting, mating and sexual bonding. He intends to encourage and support those who can do so. He hopes to find support and consolation in friendships. He has heard of the Catholic support groups for people with same-sex attractions called Courage. He is not Catholic but is interested. However, he has not yet the courage to try to make a complete break. His attitude is still that of Augustine who prayed for chastity but not yet.

Paul is not a happy man but he is a good man who, like all of us, is not yet good enough. He has the consolation of a sense of the significance of his life because he has the serious and daunting task of making himself the right kind of man.

Anti-nihilistic consolation in the homosexual cartoon

Here the Paternal Principle provides life orientation for the man afflicted with homosexual orientation. His homosexuality does not doom him to unproductive frivolity, i.e., being gay. His sexuality is not for nothing. He, as all men, has the very important task of making himself a proper sexual man. The difficulty of the task increases rather than diminishes the life

long work. As we shall see a major consideration in favor of the Paternal Principle is that it provides orientation for a fundamental feature of our humanity. Since we are all sexual it gives all of us a purpose in life, viz., becoming proper sexually. This is how we confront nihilism with the Paternal Principle.

VII.8.2 Tolerating homosexuality and co-habitation

To diminish some shock about tolerance, not acceptance, of homosexuality, consider the economic conditions in the U.S.A and other Western countries. Marriages are long delayed. Celibacy into the late twenties or early thirties is possible but probably not too healthy or likely for young adults living and working in our contemporary societies. Thousands of Catholic parents tolerate their adult children living together. We accept the arrangements with hope that they will finally “make it right” with marriage. We look to the Paternal Principle as an orientating star far off from our “messy” lives.

VII.9 The Paternal Principle and sex education

We now shift from maxims back to the general principle. How can the principle as a general principle be used? Both men and women can use the general principle. First consider education. Mothers and fathers can use the principle for guidance of their sons. It may also be used for guidance in education of children of a community. Next consider public policy. The principle can guide both men and women on how customs and statues should be formulated and applied to help men conform to the principle. The principle sets a standard. A plea for departures from the standard bear the burden of proof. In general many other assumptions and statements of fact are needed to use the principle as a guideline.

For instance, what about developing a program of sex education of children between twelve and fifteen? Should “abstinence only” be the only acceptable program? Holders of the

paternalistic principle may differ on this issue. They need agree on only one point. No behavior which leads to male orgasms may be presented as morally permissible. This non-negotiable demand is basically that it could not be taught that premarital intercourse, male homosexuality or courtship behavior resulting in male orgasms is morally permissible. Of course, holders of the principle would, and ought to be, reluctant to concede that a school situation is so dismal that they can require only this bare minimum. If the social situation in the school is so grim that if more than physiology of sexuality is taught, morally impermissible sexual behavior will be promoted, one should try to have sex education reduced to physiology. Personally, I think that the physiology of sexuality is so fascinating that it alone suffices as sex education for anyone with enough intelligence and reflection to realize the function of this elegant system.

Unfortunately, the natural elegance of human sexuality does not prevent it from being the source of immense confusion, anxiety, sadness and indeed disgust with ourselves. It is a darkness. However, despite condemning us, principles of “traditional sexual morality” such as the Paternal Principle bring light to this darkness. They show us that we ourselves have set goals

to show us a way out of the darkness. The darkness, though, overshadows what seems to be the safe harbor for sexuality, namely married life. Unrestricted marital sexuality produces far more children than those for whom we can properly care.

¹ The famous words of Jesus from John 8 when he dissuaded men from stoning the woman caught in the act of adultery.

² Ruby Payne, Philip DeVol, Terie Smith, aha! Process Inc. Highland TX, 2001, 2005, 2006.

³ Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1994

⁴ Confessions, Bk VI, ch. xv, Trans. F.J. Sheed, Sheed and Ward, 1942 Bk VIII, ch. vii

⁵ Charles F. Kielkopf, “Masturbation: A Kantian Condemnation,” *Philosophia* 25(1997) 223-246

⁶ See *Theory of Justice Appendix AA* 363ff.

⁷ *Book of Gomorrah, An Eleventh-Century Treatise against Clerical Homosexual Practices*, translated with an Introduction and Notes by, Pierre J. Payer, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Canada, 1982

provides a paradigm in his *Diary of a Seducer*.

⁸ Nancy Mitford, *Madame de Pompadour*, New York 1953, New York Review of Books edition,

⁹ Kierkegaard provides a paradigm in his *Diary of a Seducer*.

¹⁰ *The Life You Can Save: Acting Now to Save Lives*, Peter Singer, Random House, New York 2009,

¹¹ Routledge and Kegan Paul London, 1966

¹² Belknap/Harvard U. Press, Cambridge MA, 2012. Reviewed by Edmund White, *New York Review of Books*, Oct. 25, 2012