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In an effort to remain relevant and a moral authority during the 1960s, the Methodist Boards of Education and of Social Concerns adapted a popular situational ethic, “the new morality,” as a tool for the Methodist Church to address the ongoing sexual revolution. At its most basic, the new morality was a situational ethic that allowed well-informed persons to make their own determination of what sexual acts were good or bad. However, instead of providing Methodists with a new model for moral decision making, the new morality encouraged self-proclaimed evangelical Methodists to reinforce a rules-based ethic. What began as an innovative lens through which to examine sex education and Christian morality ended up sparking the debate on sexuality that has plagued Methodists ever since.

The New Morality

A product of the mid-twentieth century, “the new morality” has a complicated history for a variety of ethical frameworks have claimed the label or its definition. According to John G. Milhaven and David J. Casey, a new “trend of ethical thought” often called “situationism,” “situation ethics,” “contextualism,” [or] “the new morality,” stressed “the concrete situation and the one absolute Christian value of love, while de-emphasizing the importance of absolute laws in discerning what a Christian ought to do.” The topic of Christian ethicists such as John A. T. Robinson and Joseph Fletcher, the new morality was “a radical ‘ethic of the situation,’ with nothing prescribed—except love.”

This “new look” of Christian ethics was first written about by Joseph Fletcher in 1959, and by 1963, Bishop Robinson proclaimed “the new morality” as a Christian moral framework. Its theological roots lie in the work of liberal theologians of the early-twentieth century who, like Methodist theologian Borden Parker Bowne, began “to see the essence of Christianity, the significance of the original gospel, as something human, as simply a summit of human thought and experience, from which other human thought and experience differs only in degree.”

For these theologians and ethicists, God’s command to love was primary and called each person to serve the world around them. In order to properly

3 Milhaven and Casey, “Introduction to the Theological Background,” 219.
serve the world, the person had to understand the context of the world around them which “requires human experience and reflection on what makes up the situation as well as requiring the light of faith.” Later ethicists, such as Joseph Fletcher, took this basic idea and emphasized the love of God and of neighbor. When applied as an ethical framework, “the situationist . . . holds that whatever is the most loving thing in the situation is the right and good thing.” Social reform or acts oriented towards “justice” are “nothing other than love working out its problems” for “love and justice are the same, for justice is love distributed.”

When applied to sexual ethics, however, the new morality faced staunch criticism as “nothing but a philosophy of sexual libertinism.” Ethicist Elwyn A. Smith argues against this perception of the new morality. He believes that “The new morality is the most demanding ethical concept in the market places of ideas” for “[o]nly the most mature persons are capable of practicing it.” Only a truly mature person can place love of God and love of others above themselves. Only a truly mature person can fully understand a situation and prioritize love. Only a truly mature person can transform love into social reform. He states it best when he says, “Rules are for the weak; emancipation is for the mature.”

The above can easily be applied to Wesleyan theology and social ethics. John Wesley believed the mark of a Methodist to be a desire to do good works and to live into the commandment to love God with all of one’s heart, soul, and mind and to love neighbor as oneself. Thus, the new morality, defined as an ethical framework which prioritizes actions of love for God and others as the determining ethical factor, is an appropriate framework for Methodists to discern ethical situations. Methodist theologian Leon O. Hyson argues that

Love is the central Christian virtue which Wesleyan ethics elaborates. It is a composite principle which incorporates the personal and social dimensions . . . . The whole heart, mind, and soul committed to God in a loving relationship, and the same intensity of love or quality of love which is bound up in self-love is to be expressed toward the neighbor.

Across the twentieth-century, Methodists wrestled with how to construct a sexual ethic that was biblical, Wesleyan, and applicable to changing society. The new morality offered them such an ethic for it was grounded in acts of love.

Methodists Advocate the New Morality

The exact meaning of the new morality was open to interpretation during the 1960s. One of Methodism’s greatest advocates of the new morality was Dr. Allen Moore, professor of church and society at Claremont School of
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Theology whose specialty was young persons and urbanization. Dr. Moore was a self-proclaimed “social theologian” which he defined as someone who is “concerned with the events in society and the cultural forums which we have today.” As a social theologian, it was his job to “reflect on these cultural forums to see what is being asked or what clarification is needed from the church in terms of its message.” As a social observer who worked with the institutional church to help it respond to changes in society, Dr. Moore’s words should be understood as trying to expand The Methodist Church’s sexual ethic beyond heterosexuality and beyond the confines of Christian marriage.

Dr. Moore argued for a Methodist embrace of the new morality. While a guest on the radio show Night Call, produced by the Television, Radio, and Film Commission of the Methodist Church, Dr. Moore discussed the new morality and its various definitions. The episode asked whether or not Playboy magazine offered a religious alternative via its philosophy of life. Russ Gibbs, the host, asked Dr. Moore whether or not Playboy’s philosophy was a branch of the new morality. Dr. Moore responded, “The new morality means many different things.” Hugh Hefner, Playboy’s founder, has his own sense of new morality based in a “greater sense of sexual freedom.” Dr. Moore contrasts this with the new morality as seen on college campuses where “[Sex] is generally thought of in terms of love makes it right.” Opposed to this, theologians discuss the new morality “meaning we need to think through what is right today and certainly think through the things we’ve said have been wrong.” Some Methodists in the wake of the sexual revolution realized the limits of a sexual ethic which supported a biblically-grounded and rules-based ethic.

For Dr. Moore, the new morality embodied race, divorce, and the sexual revolution. It was a culmination of situational ethics, of sexual freedom, of pre-marital sex, and of the churches response to those. He recognized that the mid-1960s was “an age of transition, between the old and new world” when traditional mores had been “broken down” and young persons were “trying to find some new answers for this new world.” To do this they turned to many avenues—peers, television, movies, music, the church, and, yes, Playboy. The particular appeal of Playboy was that “Hefner gives these answers much clearer and with more frankness than we tend to do in the church sometimes.” Dr. Moore added that young adulthood was a time to search for one’s true identity and Playboy offered a packaged identity, one branded as “the good life.” If the church wanted to remain relevant in these changing times, it, too, had to offer a packaged sexual ethic that could embrace all the varieties of sexuality in the 1960s and do so from a unique, Christian perspective. For Dr. Moore, such an ethic was the new morality.
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SEICUS and Sex and the Whole Person

In 1961, the National Council of Churches and the Canadian Council of Churches gathered for the Green Lakes conference of the Christian family. It “convened ministers, counselors, and medical experts in human sexuality for a discussion focused on the ‘stresses and strains’ facing modern families.” Discussion included the problems of “unmarried pregnancy, masturbation, homosexuality, infidelity, abortion, and sin.” Historian Heather R. White argues that out of this conference, which concluded that science and religion were both necessary to “illumine the troubling challenge that confronted families,” the “most notable offshoot” was SEICUS, or Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States.⁹

Officially created in 1964, SEICUS was the brain-child of Dr. Mary Calderone, medical director of Planned Parenthood and advocate for family planning and abortion rights, as the nation’s first comprehensive sex education program.¹⁰ Its goal was “to give students a scientifically accurate perspective on sex that avoided moralizing and helped students draw on their personal values to make informed choices about sexual behavior.”¹¹ The conference developed an ethic for sex education which promoted “authentic selfhood” instead of scriptural commandments. Since social and sexual norms were challenged by the sexual revolutions, the “churches needed to develop ways to talk about sex and sexual decision making that would empower youth and young adults—as well as their parents—to make choices that expressed their own moral commitments.” The application of the new morality in sex education was the first time Methodists, and other Protestants, employed the radical, and quite controversial, ethic. The “only ethical norm that Christians should follow” was “love.”¹²

Leon Smith, a SEICUS board member and Director of Educational Ministries in Marriage for The UMC, wrote an article entitled “Religion’s Response to the New Sexuality.” Its goal was to establish that “sexuality is a good gift of God” and to “discover and affirm positive healthy ways of functioning as sexual beings.”¹³ Smith argued for twelve trends in how Protestant denominations in the U.S. and Canada responded to the new sexuality. First, he witnessed “a great increase in sex education in the churches for persons of all ages” and “for ministers themselves.” Second, churches were supporting “sex education in the public schools.” Third, churches were supporting sex research in general. Fourth, churches were moving away from “rigid rules
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for sexual conduct” and towards “broad ethical principles which individuals might use in specific situations as guidelines in their sexual decisions,” also known as the new morality. Fifth, churches were beginning to affirm “personal freedom and responsibility in sexual behavior” and were “beginning to support efforts to abolish legal restrictions on private sexual activities.” This included overturning anti-sodomy laws, legal access to contraception for all persons, and legal access to safe abortions. Sixth, churches were “making efforts to understand” different sexual practices and “provide special ministries” for those persons. Seventh, churches were understanding marriage “as a vital, growing relationship which enhances the personal development of both partners with a strong emphasis on sexual enrichment.” Eighth, churches were “affirming the equal status of men and women” and attempting to “overcome sex stereotyping and discrimination.” Ninth, intercourse was being affirmed as a source of pleasure for both men and women and as a primary way to enrich the relationship between the two. Tenth, churches were re-defining pornography “toward a reverent appreciation of the body and a joyful celebration of the erotic.” Eleventh, churches were beginning to understand masturbation as a healthy form of sexual exploration.

Finally, many church leaders were beginning to understand homosexuality not as a “deviant” form of sexuality but as a “variant” of sexuality. Smith understands that the above twelve were trends that were emerging within the major Protestant denominations, and that none of them had come to full fruition within the denominations. He viewed the above twelve as rooted in a “deeper understanding of the Bible” and as “an effort to spell out the implications of ethical principles derived from faith.” Written in 1975, Smith’s article was written alongside the increase in an evangelical voice and perspective on sexuality which would increasingly take issue with many of the above statements. As such, Smith’s twelve trends represented an overly optimistic point of view, one that would remain part of the extreme progressive faction of United Methodism.

Methodists who worked with SEICUS and attended its groundbreaking conference took the new morality and created *Sex and the Whole Person*, a sex education curriculum designed to provide persons with the adequate information necessary to empower individuals with the ability to make their own moral and sexual decisions. The basic purpose of this course was to encourage a frank discussion about sexuality between teachers, parents, and youth. In order to be apt for the revolutionary age, sex had to have fewer boundaries, fewer rules. The authors of *Sex and the Whole Person* combined “biblical, psychological, and physiological information on sexuality” into a “new morality.”[^14] They used the previous ethic’s basis that God created all persons in God’s image, and a vital part of this image was sexuality. Thus, sexuality was good because sexuality was of God. They removed the previous ethic’s rules-based framework which deemed certain acts good or moral and others bad or immoral. In its place, they advocated giving persons the

full moral authority to decide for themselves what to do in a given situation that would best honor their sexual selves. They believed, in honoring one’s sexual self, one, in turn, honored God. This new ethic did not forbid sexual expression in any situation, although it did still encourage waiting until marriage to engage in sexual intercourse. Most importantly, it placed the decision to be sexual in the hands of a well-informed individual.

An advertisement for the experimental course stated its goal as “(1) that you may understand what it means to be male or female; (2) that you may rejoice wholeheartedly in being such a person; (3) that you may express this joy, in relationship to persons, in appropriate and productive ways.”

Sex and the Whole Person was a course created by the Board of Education in 1962 to live into the General Conference mandate of creating “courses of study for young people regarding Christian attitudes toward sex and personality growth.” As a ten-week course, senior high teenagers and parents were to be taught “biblical, psychological, and physiological information” with the goal of developing “Christian standards concerning sex.” During the course, “no one is told, nor is the impression given, that a specific action is right or wrong.” Instead, “guidelines are set up by giving all the facts concerning all of the facets of sexual relationships, from definitions of terms, all the way through psychological and emotional actions and reactions to all forms of sexual stimuli.” The goal was to allow each person to “make his own decision about his sex life” using the Christian attitude learned during the course.

This course was the first of its kind to teach parents and teens together, to make them more comfortable discussing sex in small groups, and to teach both at the same time the realities of sex in the 1960s. Its willingness to allow for individual moral authority and not mandate rules was radical for the time and, as this book argues, formed the basis for the denomination’s new sexual ethic, “the new morality.”

The first installment of Sex and the Whole Person was held in 1962 in Fayetteville, Arkansas. After the course, one attendee, Lee Vance, recalled:

Until now, the church has done little except to put out some Pharisee-like rules and regulations that say only one thing to a teen-ager—Don’t. It seems to me that Christ, with understanding and love, would consider all of the facts and circumstances involved, to decide what was right in any particular situation. Now, at least, The Methodist Church is trying precisely that approach—a sensible, practical, and realistic approach to sex.

Another, Phillip Royal stated that

The Methodist Church has taken a small step, but an important one, in the right direction. For many years, we have preached, taught, and discussed the matter of making men whole. We have proclaimed that the gospel makes men whole; yet
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we have neglected one important phase of the wholeness—sex. Now, however, a small voice can be heard saying, “Sex is an important part of life. We must learn to approach it with a Christian attitude if we are to be ‘whole persons.’”

Those in attendance witnessed the benefit of an open and honest conversation on sex and sexuality. It was a breath of fresh air to them that the church was finally willing to discuss sex outside of a “do” and “don’t” framework. They understood *Sex and the Whole Person* as not only innovative and refreshing but as biblically-grounded because it encompassed the *whole* person, sexuality and all.

These types of courses and books continued to be produced into the early 1970s. In *Youth Views Sexuality*, author Anne C. Blanchard explained that the new morality was “an approach to decision-making that consists of trying to discover what is the most loving thing to do in each situation.” She connected this idea to the teachings of Jesus, who “placed the value of persons above slavery to the law.” She understood the new morality not as an “advocacy of sexual license” but as a reinterpretation of love. In order to better understand love, Blanchard encouraged persons to consult the Bible as well as their own “life plans.” Another resource published in 1971 was *God and Human Sexuality*. As a guide for adults, the author openly addressed homosexuality and encouraged the reader to re-examine their preconceived notions that heterosexuality was the only morally correct lifestyle to lead.

### The New Morality Divides the Church

However, not everyone believed that *Sex and the Whole Person* nor the new morality were moral to teach. Self-proclaimed evangelical Methodists were (and continue to be) critical of the new morality. Evangelical Methodists are best defined, for the purposes of this article, as those persons who believe that the only authority on sexuality is Scripture. Thus, they tend to uphold a rules-based and rigid sexual ethic. They believed the new morality was a “lackadaisical approach to sexual integrity.” Karen Booth, director of Transforming Congregations (an organization which advocates sex-conversation therapy and believes that faith in Jesus Christ is only consistent with a heterosexual lifestyle), wrote *Forgetting How to Blush: United Methodism’s Compromise with the Sexual Revolution*.

Booth argued that “deliberate curriculum and program choices made in the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s and 1970s laid the foundation for . . . moral revisionism,” a move that “began with the then Methodist Church’s development of sex education material.” Booth concludes that these new programs were detrimental and counter to “God’s will, purpose and plan for human sexuality.” According to her, evangelical Methodists viewed courses like *Sex and the Whole Person* and publications such as *Youth Views*...
Sexuality and God and Human Sexuality as works of “moral ambiguity” where “Scripture was tacked on as an afterthought.” Instead of prioritizing “God’s revealed will for human sexuality and behavior” as revealed in Scripture, these works and their accompanying ethic of the new morality “exalt[ed] human intellectual reasoning as the ultimate guide to making moral decisions.” These works, according to evangelical Methodists, were full of “psychological jargon,” their “Scripture lessons were sketchy and superficial,” and their ethical lessons often provided “loopholes to justify [any] behavior.”

Evangelicals tended to uphold Scripture as the sole authority; thus any inference that human reasoning, without scriptural guidance, was sound enough to make moral and sexual decisions was a direct threat to their understanding of the world.

As the evangelical Methodist voice grew louder in the 1970s through the founding of Charles Keysor’s Good News Movement, the new morality was increasingly challenged. According to Keysor, church school curriculum “repress[ed] and stifl[ed]” evangelicals each week with the liberal Protestant theology of official United Methodism. Good News’ followers’ main problem was that the only sanctioned materials, including Sunday school literature, audio visual materials, music, and hymnbooks, that could be used in a United Methodist Church were those produced by the United Methodist Board of Education, as sanctioned by General Conference.

Keysor and his followers argued that the problem with United Methodism was multi-fold. First, the Board of Education was, like other administrative ranks of the denomination, controlled by “white male liberals,” with seven clergy, thirteen professors, and the remaining nineteen were bishops. Second, they argued that the “whole educational system was under attack” from both the left and the right making Sunday school “irrelevant.” Third, “the new cultural ferment” brought with it “a new philosophy of Youth Ministry . . . in which youth were to be given not answers, but rather tools so they could find answers for themselves,” a direct attack on the new morality and Sex and the Whole Person. When viewed in light of sex education and the philosophy behind Sex and the Whole Person, which sought to provide senior high teenagers with guidelines to help them figure out their own sexual selves, it becomes apparent that one of the things Good News was fighting against was the sex education.

Keysor offered the evangelical understanding of proper sex education in the January-March, 1970, issue of Good News. Written by Mrs. Philip E. Worth, the article offered the point of view of a pastor’s wife. She described 1969 as the year that sex education in public schools became a “controversy.” Mrs. Worth believed that the best place for sex education was in the home where parents could ground sex education in “the authority of the word of God.” Her article portrayed a reading of Genesis 1:27 which reads, “God created man in His own image . . . male and female;” of Genesis 2:18
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which reads, “It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet;” of Genesis 2:24 which reads, “Therefore shall a man cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh;” and of Genesis 1:28 which reads, “God blessed them and said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth’ as sufficient for sex education. She argued that “sex is plainly set forth in the Word of God as God’s method for continuing society” and “the sanctity of sex and the wholesome relationship of marriage is sufficiently repeated throughout the New Testament.”

She understood that the climate of 1970 was sexually explicit, but if parents followed the mandate in Proverbs 22:6 to “Train up a child in the way he should go” then that child was guaranteed to “not depart from it.” Worth placed primary responsibility with parents but her wording was peculiar: “the primary responsibility in sex education rests with parents who by their own example demonstrate the joy of the marriage relationship.” Were parents simply supposed to be an example of a healthy sexual relationship or were they supposed to talk with their children about sex? It was unclear. She believed that the churches “should supplement the work of the home by presenting to parents the Biblical plan of sex and marriage,” with the Biblical plan being the above quoted Scripture. Finally, she acknowledged that some public schools taught sex education and encouraged parents to “concern” themselves “with who does the teaching and what is taught” and ensured that “moral restraint” was taught. On the surface, this does not seem an unreasonable request, but given her argument for only the Biblical view of sex and marriage to be discussed, it is plausible that any other instruction, including scientific, was unacceptable. Worth, thus not only denied the new morality, but arguably denied the fact that sex could be enjoyed for non-procreative means.

As a result of these conflicting constructions, over the 1970s and 1980s, The UM Church stopped promoting a radically open understanding of sex and sexuality. Instead, it advocated a sexually gray area that both endorsed the new morality and understood sexuality as a God-given good, and then tried to restrict what sexual acts were moral based on Scripture. This dual sexual framework which sought to appease all Methodists only led to confusion as to where The UM Church stood in terms of sexual ethics. The administrative branches of Methodism were aware of the disjuncture within Methodism. They recognized that “In the last few years The Methodist Church has made notable strides in helping its teenage members face creatively their capacity for sex and their calling to love,” and yet “These programs have not always been received gratefully by all segments of the church.”

Donald Kuhn, editor of Concern magazine which was the periodical of the General Board of Christian Social Concerns, argued that while Methodism was a “pluralistic” denomination, not everyone recognized that it was okay
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for Methodists to disagree on some aspects of life. The Methodists, he argued, that preferred the “old way of doing things” was “strain[ed]” by diversity, especially when it came to sex. To him, “Methodists do not have to look far to notice marked differences in attitudes toward marriage, use of contraceptives, divorce, abortion, homosexuality, and premarital and extramarital intercourse.” While diverse attitudes necessitated reevaluation, Kuhn argued that “universal standards . . . may not be the best way to encourage individual moral responsibility that will withstand the strains of passing time and changing location.” He critiqued the church for focusing too greatly in the past on certain standards without evaluating or explaining the “context of the struggle.” Too often, teenagers were told that certain behaviors were morally wrong, but were not given an explanation as to why or recognition that acting a certain way may require struggle.

Kuhn proposed five “goals for sex life.” First, laws and statements on human sexuality needed to “strengthen the individual’s social responsibility in the midst of diversity.” Second, individuals needed to understand “sex-related activities” as a way “to communicate love and/or to make babies.” Third, individuals who participated in “sex-related activities” needed “to bring to an end the possibility of unwanted and/or unintended babies.” Fourth, society needed to allow “physicians the possibility to perform abortions on the basis of their professional values and judgment without special laws related to abortion.” Fifth, society needed to better understand “how to prevent conception.” To Kuhn, a contemporary understanding of healthy sexuality needed to account for all five of these goals. He believed that “the key concept is love.” Kuhn presented step-by-step goals for the new morality as “each [goal] provides a perspective for evaluating personal thoughts, interests, ambitions, and outward behavior.”

His goals necessitated cooperation among individuals who dedicated themselves to acting out of love and in a contraceptively-responsible manner, society who agreed to allow for abortion and education on contraception, and the church (or the law makers) who agreed to account for individual responsibility and social diversity. Kuhn’s article upheld the new morality, based all actions in love, and accounted for diverse opinions on matters of sex.

Overall, The Methodist Church and The United Methodist Church sought to provide sex education to senior high teenagers and their parents. They supported sex education in public schools as early as 1954, and continued to support sex education in public schools throughout the controversy in the 1960s. They produced dozens of pamphlets across the two decades to guide parents in discussions with their children, to inform children about their own bodies, and to recommend other non-religious resources for both parents and children. The administrative ranks of the denominations made great strides in trying to correct the errors of their past when they ignored sex as a vital part of our whole being. The UMC encouraged proper sex education as a
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guide to help teenagers decide for themselves how to approach their own sex lives. While this attitude was not an endorsement of premarital sex, it did not demean it. This rather candid and modern attitude was in direct contrast with the evangelical notion of a healthy sex life which promoted strict celibacy outside of marriage and upheld the authority of Scripture.

The above has shown that sex education was included in the Good News’s frustration over church school curriculum. The philosophy of the Board of Education, through courses like *Sex and the Whole Person*, was radical for a denomination in the early 1960s. It was radical to teach psychology and physiology alongside Christian morality, and it was radical to hope that by using these guidelines “each individual” would “weigh all of the facts involved and make his own decision about his sex.” With parents involved in the courses, parents rediscovered their sexual selves, some of whom may have come to accept a latent homosexuality as their natural selves. The administrative levels of the denomination witnessed cultural change, and the church was impotent in stopping it. The best Methodist clergy could do was to be a guide and provide a small positive influence in the way sexuality was approached. The dichotomy between the new morality, as advocated by some Methodists, and the sexual ethic of Good News, which argued that the Bible was the only true guide, could not be starker.

With the debate over sex education and the new morality, the disjuncture between Methodists was established. Was it okay for the Christian to be autonomous over their own sexuality or was the Bible the only source for answers about one’s sexual self? The answer to this question is grounded in theology. Progressive Methodists tend to use the Bible as a guide, as one of many sources of authority that could provide adequate answers, but one that was always to be considered as part of a specific historical context. They believe that the best way to know God is to know one’s self, and this included one’s sexual self, and the best way to better society is by breaking down barriers that prevent others from truly knowing and expressing themselves. Evangelical-leaning Methodists tend to use the Bible as the answer, an infallible resource that could provide an answer to any question. They believe that the best way to know God is to turn to the Scriptures, and the best way to better society is to the spread the word of God to others. The different answers to this question created the United Methodist fissure that led to the formation of the Good News Movement and its increasing popularity across the last third of the twentieth-century.

In turn, the creation of the Good News Movement led to the creation of other political caucus groups which formed to combat the narrow definition of sex, sexuality, and morality that Good News promoted. The politicization of The United Methodist Church began with debates on sex education. Since the 1960s when these different approaches to understanding sex and sexuality emerged, the denomination has only become more divided as to what is the proper authority and understanding of our sexuality.
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