

Institute for Christian Teaching
Education Department
June 1994

**FALLING IN LOVE AND PREMARITAL SEXUAL MORALITY:
SOME SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVES**

by

Adrian Bocaneanu

Romanian Theological Seminary
Bucharest, Romania

189-94 Institute for Christian Teaching
12501 Old Columbia Pike
Silver Spring, MD 20904 USA

Prepared for the
International Faith and Learning Seminar
Newbold College
June 1994

**FALLING IN LOVE AND PREMARITAL SEXUAL MORALITY:
SOME SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVES**

Intimacy, romantic love, sexuality, continue to be main concerns for youth in these last years of the second millenium. Several decades of down-grading the relation between men and women didn't eliminate the emotion, the mystery and the seduction of love. Nor did they simplify the task of making decisions with vast consequences.

The old, popular approach to sexual morality argued for pre- and extramarital abstinence either in purely pragmatic terms, from the fear of conception, detection and infection, or in dogmatic ways, taking for granted that the Scriptures (or rather the way the Scriptures were read to youth) are accepted as the eternal source of moral principles.

It seems that today such deterrents are no more convincing or effective. In fact they were rejected in the euphoria of the sexual revolution, during the sixties.

Now, thirty years later, we have the results of the liberated attitude toward sex and they are disappointing. Ten years ago the cover story of Time magazine was titled "The sex revolution is over". And in seven pages of close-packed copy they managed *not* to mention AIDS. What they were saying was this:

Veterans of the revolution, some wounded, some merely bored, are re-inventing courtship and romance and discovering, often with astonishment, that they need not sleep together on the first or second date. Many individuals are even rediscovering the traditional values of fidelity, obligation and marriage. (Time, April 9, 1984)

It seems that the youth are in the mood for giving a second thought to commitment, intimacy and chastity. Of course,

research reveals a disparity between the professed new-idealism of youth with regard to relationships and the statistics as to actual practice. This is why they need support now: intellectual support to help them reach relevant decisions, social support to fight the still powerful peer and media pressure, and spiritual support to find stamina to live up to what they know is right.

This is, then, a critical time for educators: the stage is set, the audience is ready.

Unfortunately, comments Donald Joy, we have a tendency to give today's generation a technology for moral promiscuity, when they have looked to us for support during the painful years of restraint and self-control.¹

Within its recognized limits, the old realm of natural law can still supply solid reasons to choose a responsible attitude in the area of premarital morality. When we approach this topic from the perspective of natural law, we need to avoid the old fallacy of identifying it with the common morality developed in the course of history. It is important to distinguish what is essential in human nature, inherent in it, from what is culturally or historically relative, superimposed by a particular society or by individual differences.

The general concept of a moral law written into our nature as human beings is theologically attractive. This is an ordered Creation, and it is ordered with a view of God's purposes in creating as he did. What is created is good - good ends which we, as God's servants should pursue.

Paul in Romans 1 speaks of some human actions as contrary to nature: he echoes the Genesis record about man and woman created in God's image, their lives and heterosexuality protected therefore by the law of Creation. ... It would perhaps be too much to say that the Creation proves each ingredient in God's moral law. The biblical direction is rather that the Creation bears witness to the moral law, that creational indicators point to good ends

¹Donald M. Joy, Parents, Kids and Sexual Integrity. Waco, TX: Word, 1988, p. XVII.

God intended in making us as he did, and that God's law is the law of Creation.

Some understanding of pertinent science will help. Are there features of human sexuality which speak to its intended ends? or of human work? or of marriage and family? We must look for creational indicators of what is inherent and essential.²

Ellen White, while supporting the supremacy of the special revelation in matters of doctrine and practice, speaks very clearly about the laws of nature as pointing to the same Creator. She describes the process of creation as follows:

...man became a living, intelligent being. All parts of the human organism were set in action. The heart, the arteries, the veins, the tongue, the hands, the feet, the senses, the faculties of the mind, all began their work, and all were placed under law.³

Even more surprising is the following statement:

Yes, we are God's property, and the path of obedience to nature's laws is the direct path to heaven. ... Many, by practicing the laws of nature and by receiving the renovating grace of God into the soul, obtain a new lease of physical and spiritual life.⁴

This paper will explore several areas in which "the understanding of pertinent science will help", as suggested by Arthur Holmes.

From the huge amount of research data produced by scientists studying different areas of human behaviour I will select three aspects. They are meant to serve as an invitation to expand our understanding with fascinating insights into the functioning of the human being and society. As we integrate accurate information

²Arthur F. Holmes, Approaching Moral Decisions. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1984, pp.63-66.

³Ellen G. White, Ministry of Healing. Nampa, CA: Pacific Press, 1954, p.415.

⁴Ellen G. White, Counsels to Health. Nampa, CA: Pacific Press, 1962, p.222.

in the educational interaction with our students, they will feel encouraged to process it in their decision-making patterns, growing toward the consistent faith manifested in a fulfilling, redemptive love-life.

It was highly rewarding for me to be able, during the last four years, to speak to several thousands of students on their campuses in Romania. Most of them were secularized young men and women, taking for granted that the times of restrictions on sex are gone forever. As I exalted the values of commitment, responsible love, healthy premarital abstinence, at first they were shocked. But when they discovered that such attitudes and behaviours are germane to the human nature, corresponding to the inherent laws of our being, many of them were very pleased and declared they feel encouraged to fight the trends. So, my own experience with students - both Christians and secularized - gives me good reason to continue to use this approach.

Studies on the nature of attraction and love

Why do we like some people more than others? Basically, research has shown that we are attracted to people who bring us maximum rewards or gratifications at a minimum expense. For example, we are more attracted to people who are nearby than to those who are farther away. We like people who are already attracted to us, and who demonstrate their attraction by doing us favors and saying nice things about us. We like people who satisfy our needs and who have needs we can satisfy.

The most famous study of proximity and friendship choice was conducted in a housing building for married students called

Westgate West (Festinger, Schachter and Back, 1950, quoted by Zimbardo⁵). Residents of seventeen similar apartment buildings were asked to name their closest friends and the people they saw most often socially. Researchers found that residents most often chose other residents who lived on the same floor and in the same building as they did. The functional distance among residents also produced proximity effects. Presumably as the frequency of interaction between two or more people increases, the degree of liking for one another will increase.

Further, generally speaking, we like beautiful people more than we like plain or ugly ones. Such a statement may contradict our beliefs in equality and in the irrelevance of external appearance to personal relationships, but it has been demonstrated in a number of experiments. For example, in one study college students attended a dance in which they thought their dates had been assigned to them on the basis of computer analysis (actually, the dates were randomly assigned).

Interview data indicated that the physical attractiveness of the date was the only factor significantly related to liking and anticipation of future dates. Neither personality nor intelligence proved to be influential factors in determining interpersonal attraction (Walster, Aronson, Abrahams and Rottman, 1966, quoted by Zimbardo⁶).

Many other studies suggest that our society has internalized the premise that "what is beautiful is good". Thus we perceive

⁵Philip G. Zimbardo, Essentials of Psychology and Life. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1980, p. 450.

⁶Philip G. Zimbardo, Essentials of Psychology and Life. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1980, p. 451.

beautiful people as more intelligent, more successful, more pleasant, and happier than other people, even if there is no objective basis for these judgments.

Coming to the emotion of love, the two-component theory of emotion proposes that people's emotional experience is a function of the cognitive labels they attach to their feelings of physiological arousal (Schachter and Singer). This thesis has been used by Walster and Bersheid to explain the logical and sometimes illogical aspects of passionate love. Basically, they argue that any sort of physiological arousal can be interpreted as passionate love, given the presence of an appropriate cognition. For example, a person caught up in the excitement of a musical performance might interpret his or her arousal as romantic passion if an attractive date is close by. However, a person not accompanied by a date will probably interpret the arousal in other terms.

Other studies suggested that it is also possible that even negative sources of arousal could, under the right conditions, facilitate romantic passion, according to the fear-reduction model of love (Kenrick and Cialdini). We are more susceptible to become attached to persons who reduce our negative arousal by allaying our fears and calming our anger.

In the last years, anthropologists and psychobiologists doing research in famous universities are arguing that we are all scientifically fated to love - and to love preprogrammed types - by our genes and chemicals. Among them are Helen Fisher, author of Anatomy of Love: The Natural History of Monogamy, Adultery and Divorce and Anthony Walsh, author of The Science of Love:

Understanding Love and Its Effects on Mind and Body. Walsh gives details on the chemical pathways followed during the different phases of love: the sheer euphoria of falling in love, when the body is literally flooded by chemical cousins of amphetamines (dopamine, norepinephrine and especially phenylethylamine) and the attachment stage, when larger amounts of endorphins flow into the brain, leaving lovers with a sense of security, peace and calm.

What is the significance of such disturbing informations? They seem to reduce our most treasured attitudes and behaviours to mere heredity and chemistry. But, as a Christian, I catch a glimpse on the unfathomable wisdom and love of my Creator. Understanding a little bit more of the mysteries of human attachment and passion may help growing teens and young adults to be aware of what is happening to them, to enjoy their wholeness in experiencing the passion, the compassion and the secure peace of love and to be better prepared for the predictable road of their love-life. In spite of extensive damages produced by sin, powerful mechanisms are still at work; under proper discipline and well used, they elevate us beyond selfishness and hate to a life of caring, loving endeavours.

Within this perspective, young men and women will recognize their privilege to give mature and responsible expression to their love, avoiding the sheer exploitation of pleasure and the overestimation of their emotions. They will learn to value the whole personhood of their date and to interact in a mutually growing relationship.

The study of the human bonding process

Desmond Morris, using the research methods of a zoologist-anthropologist, and observing the bonding process across several cultures, concluded that

the progress from the first attraction to final trust is nearly always a long and complex sequence of gradually increasing intimacies. ... For convenience we can divide the human sequence up into twelve stages, and see what happens as each threshold is successfully passed¹.

The twelve stages are these:

1. Eye to body. A person sees the other one and interest in knowing more about him or her is aroused, desiring to develop this relationship further.

2. Eye to eye. While we view others, they view us. In order for the process of relationship formation to continue, the look of interest must be returned.

3. Voice to voice. The individuals start to communicate verbally and they look for opportunities to talk, to hear one another's voice.

4. Hand to hand. Caring human touch also plays an important role. This is more than formalized or helping hand contact. When the growing relationship has been openly declared the action of hand-holding or arm-holding becomes prolonged in duration and an undisguised intimacy.

5. Arm to shoulder. This first encircling gesture signifies a special relationship has developed and is going somewhere. This is the simplest introduction to trunk contact.

6. Arm to waist. This physical closeness signals a deepening

¹Desmond Morris, Intimate Behaviour. New York, NY: Random House, 1971, p. 74 ff.

investment in each other, a growing trust and confidence.

7. Face to face or mouth to mouth. The two now turn face to face and intense self-disclosure begins. By this time, the fork in the bonding pathway between friendship bonding and pair-bonding has taken place. For the first time there is a strong chance of physiological arousal, if the action is prolonged or repeated.

8. Hand to head. As an extension of the last stage, the hands begin to caress the partner's head. This represents deepening levels of trust and unconditional acceptance.

9. Hand to body (not sexually directed). One is increasingly comfortable giving and receiving touch. At this level we become more and more comfortable with revealing who we are inside. Further physiological arousal occurs.

10 to 12. Mouth to breast, Hands to genitals, Genitals to genitals. The last stages lead to the full intimacy of the sexual encounter, with irreversible biological, emotional, social and philosophical consequences.

Says Morris:

This irreversibility puts this concluding act in the sequence on to an entirely new plane. Each stage will have served to tighten the bond of attachment a little more, but, in a biological sense, this final action is clearly related to a phase where the earlier intimacies will already have done their job of cementing the bond, so that the pair will want to stay together, after the sex drive has been reduced by this consummation.⁸

The Christian writer Donald Joy considers that the twelve stages observed by Morris correspond, overall,

to the sequence laid down in the Judeo-Christian blueprint.

⁸Desmond Moris, Intimate Behaviour. New York, NY: Random House, 1971, p. 78.

In Genesis 2, which is quoted both by Jesus and Paul, there are three distinct movements:

1. Leave father and mother/Morris, steps 1-3.
2. Cleave: cling/hug spouse/Morris, steps 4-9.
3. Union, one flesh, naked, unashamed/Morris 10-12.⁹

So, Donald Joy puts these stages together three by three, considering that there are four sets of steps in the establishing of the pair bond: the first three are specifically "no touch" in character; the next three steps bring physical contact, but none of it is directly sexual; the third set of steps is named "Intimate Contact" - the couple is not yet engaged in direct sexual contact but prepares the way for it - while the final three steps belong only to the couple protected under the legal marriage.

Joy comments:

Morris, regrettably, sees no Creation mystery and he answers to no moral or spiritual summons, but his observations about how humans establish intimacy that can last a lifetime are helpful to us. ... Morris may help us keep faith with the young by showing the predictable path a relationship will take.¹⁰

What valuable lessons are to be learned from Morris?

a. Within human being we find inscribed a "script", a pattern for bonding. We may well consider this to be God's handiwork. Despite the presence of sin, the bonding mechanism is still evident.

b. We can learn this script. We can learn how it is enacted in our own lives. To learn it is to have healthier relationships with friends and in marriage.

c. The best possible bonds all along, with parents,

⁹Donald M. Joy, Bonding: Relationships in the Image of God. Waco, TX: Word, 1985, p. 43 ff.

¹⁰Ibid., pp.35.41.

siblings, same-sex friends and opposite-sex friends, prepare the best bonding surfaces for marriage.

d. Variations from the twelve steps tend to move people toward more violent sexual behaviour.

When steps are missed in the rush to genital intimacy, the bond tends to be deformed and to break. The first journey up the staircase tends to take the longest time. In that first sequence we tend to find ecstasy at each new marker. If a person leaves one relationship and goes quickly to another, the steps tend to be accelerated, with some even skipped. And a person who has reached genital intimacy in one relationship tends to move even a naïve partner quickly to genital intimacy almost immediately in any future relationships, just to find that sexual experience which is not well grounded in extended and shared life experience through light touching and long conversation is not the much-expected ultimate intimacy. Premature direct genital contact will foreclose completion of the bonding process for months or years to come. In addition, the unprotected intimacy tends to expose the relationship to high levels of anxiety and mistrust.¹¹

For these reasons marriage is essential to provide an adequate protection for the unique treasure of pair bonding in a relationship.

All these observations tend to suggest that humans may reach genuine intimacy as they are willing to act in a responsible way, while deviation leaves us scarred and weakened. Paul Pearsall, currently serving as director of professional education for the Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender and Reproduction, having studied one thousand couples with five-year follow-up, concludes that intimacy must be built on complete honesty between the marital couple. He takes the position that our unmarried young people should not be having sexual intercourse, and that they are damaging their future marriages. "Sex is not like

¹¹Donald M. Joy, Bonding: Relationships in the Image of God. Waco, TX: Word, 1985, pp. 41, 42, 48.

tennis", he notes. "Practice does not make perfect in sex, it only leads to more practice." It turns out that "more practice" in sex is practice in promiscuity or divorce.¹²

We should always keep in mind that that we don't have an inexhaustible reservoir of bonding energy to be spend endlessly in casual or inappropriate bonds. Some speak of two or maximum three attachments for the whole life.

As it is known, there are some animal species which, by design, are perfect bonding, monogamous species. Humans are not. Here lies the glory and the misery of human nature: indeed, we are not fatally programmed by our genes and hormones, but - in spite of certain biological constraints - we are free, responsible beings. We are attracted toward the life-time monogamous ideal, but in order to be actualized in our life, we need to choose it, to work toward it and to accept super-natural help. At the same time God provided us, in His grace, with power to repair our weakened bonding surfaces. "God redeems relationships and gives us on-going bonding opportunities."¹³

There is a risk in pointing to the good as the ideal. Some of the young listeners may experience pain. They may look at the vision of what is possible and experience it as "what might have been". Some would be tempted to go away and cry, other would label you as naïve or insensitive. For such people I have found extremely important to express in the most convincing way the

¹²Quoted by Donald M. Joy, Unfinished Business. Glendale, CA: Victor Books, 1989, p. 98.

¹³Karen and Ron Flowers, Invitation to Intimacy. Silver Spring, MD: Department of Church Ministries, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1991, p. 40.

caring, compassionate love and acceptance for those who mourn over their previous experiences and to renew their hope that there is life after mistakes. We know young men and women which, after a wrong beginning, took a firm decision to live chaste till marriage. With a new determination, they stood firm in spite of any pressure and even became active in promoting the ideals of responsible loving and pre-marital chastity, developing what it could be called a new, secondary virginity.

Studies on Parental Interference (the Romeo and Juliet effect)

A frequent source of negative feelings, which is then interpreted as romantic passion is the parental interference. Parents who openly oppose the romantic choice of their offspring may unwittingly defeat their own purpose. If opposition is perceived by couples as an infringement upon their personal freedom and a source of frustration, parental attempts to terminate such romantic involvements may backfire. This is popularly referred to as the Romeo and Juliet effect.

A team of researchers asked 140 couples to respond to a love scale. Their hypothesis was that feelings of romantic love between individuals would intensify if there was a threat to one's freedom of choice - in this case, parents who objected to the match. To test this, the 91 married couples and 49 pairs of dating couples were asked to complete, in addition to the love-scale questionnaire they had already filled out, a questionnaire concerning the degree on parental interference that had been experienced or perceived. Results showed a positive correlation between feelings of romantic love and degree of parental

interference experienced by the couples. That is, the greater the parental interference, the greater the feelings of romantic love shared by couples.

The passage of time did not change this situation. Some months later, responding to the questionnaire again, the couples reported no lessening of romantic love when parental objections persisted; if the interference had increased during the interim, feelings of romantic love intensified. Similarly, if the parents had reduced their interference, the couple's romantic feelings diminished (Driscoll, Davis and Lipetz, quoted by Zimbardo¹⁴).

Conclusion

There is an ever-growing wealth of reliable research data providing fascinating insights into the misteries of love, human bonding and sexuality. It is the privilege and the responsibility of the Christian teacher to integrate such solid knowledge in the way we teach and model moral values for our youth during the painful years of growth through restraint and self-control. Because "whoso shall offend one of these little ones, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck", but "they that turn many to righteousness [shall shine] as the stars for ever and ever" (Matthew 18:6; Daniel 12:3).

The remaining pages contain a poetical, philosophical perspective, taken from The Little Prince, by Antoine de Saint-Exupery. My young listeners have found in it both food for the mind and inspiration for the heart.

¹⁴Philip G. Zimbardo, *Essentials of Psychology and Life*, Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1980, p.463).

Appendix

But it happened that after walking for a long time through sand, and rocks, and snow, the little prince at last came upon a road. And all roads lead to the abodes of men.

"Good morning," he said.

He was standing before a garden, all a-bloom with roses.

"Good morning," said the roses.

The little prince gazed at them. They all looked like his flower.

"Who are you?" he demanded, thunderstruck.

"We are roses," the roses said.

And he was overcome with sadness. His flower had told him that she was the only one of her kind in all the universe. And here were five thousand of them, all alike, in one single garden!

"She would be very much annoyed," he said to himself, "if she could see that... She would cough most dreadfully, and she would pretend that she was dying, to avoid being laughed at. And I should be obliged to pretend that I was nursing her back to life, for if I did not do that, to humble myself also, she would really allow herself to die . . ."

Then he went on with his reflections: "I thought that I was rich, with a flower that was unique in all the world; and all I had was a common rose. A common rose, and three volcanoes that come up to my knees and one of them perhaps extinct forever . . . that doesn't make me a very great prince . . ."

And he lay down in the grass and cried.

XXI

It was then that the fox appeared.

"Good morning," said the fox.

"Good morning," the little prince responded politely, although when he turned around he saw nothing.

"I am right here," the voice said, "under the apple tree."

"Who are you?" asked the little prince, and added, "You are very pretty to look at."

"I am a fox," the fox said.

"Come and play with me," proposed the little prince. "I am so unhappy."

"I cannot play with you," the fox said. "I am not tamed."

"Ah! Please excuse me," said the little prince.

But, after some thought, he added:

"What does that mean--'tame'?"

"You do not live here," said the fox. "What is it that you are looking for?"

"I am looking for men," said the little prince. "What does that mean--'tame'?"

"Men," said the fox. "They have guns, and they hunt. It is very disturbing. They also raise chickens. These are their only interests. Are you looking for chickens?"

"No," said the little prince. "I am looking for friends. What does that mean--'tame'?"

"It is an act too often neglected," said the fox. "It means to establish ties."

"'To establish ties'?"

"Just that," said the fox. "To me, you are still nothing more than a little boy who is just like a hundred thousand other little boys. And I have no need of you. And you, on your part, have no need of me. To you, I am nothing more than a fox like a hundred thousand other foxes. But if you tame me, then we shall need each other. To me, you will be unique in all the world. To you, I shall be unique in all the world . . ."

"I am beginning to understand," said the little prince. "There is a flower . . . I think that she has tamed me . . ."

"It is possible," said the fox. "On the Earth one sees all sorts of things."

"On, but this is not on the Earth!" said the little prince. The fox seemed perplexed, and very curious.

"On another planet?"

"Yes."

"Are there hunters on that planet?"

"No."

"Ah, that is interesting! Are there chickens?"

"No."

"Nothing is perfect," sighed the fox.

But he came back to his idea.

"My life is very monotonous," he said. "I hunt chickens; men hunt me. All the chickens are just alike, and all men are just alike. And, in consequence, I am a little bored. But if you tame me, it will be as if the sun came to shine on my life. I shall know the sound of a step that will be different from all the others. Other steps send me hurrying back underneath the ground. Yours will call me, like music, out of my burrow. And then look: you see the grain-fields down yonder? I do not eat bread. Wheat is of no use to me. The wheat fields have nothing to say to me. And that is sad. But you have hair that is the colour of gold. Think how wonderful that will be when you have tamed me! The grain, which is also golden, will bring me back the thought of you. And I shall love to listen to the wind in the wheat . . ."

The fox gazed at the little prince, for a long time.

"Please--tame me!" he said.

"I want to, very much," little prince replied. "But I have not much time. I have friends to discover, and a great many things to understand."

"One only understands the things that one tames," said the fox. "Men have no more time to understand anything. They buy things all ready made at the shops. But there is no shop anywhere where one can buy friendship, and so men have no friends any more. If you want a friend, tame me . . ."

"What must I do, to tame you?" asked the little prince.

"You must be very patient," replied the fox. "First you will sit down at a little distance from me--like that--in the grass. I shall look at you out of the corner of my eye, and you will say nothing. Words are the source of misunderstandings. But you will sit a little closer to me, every day . . ."

The next day the little prince came back.

"It would have been better to come back at the same hour," said the fox. "If, for example, you came at four o'clock in the

afternoon, then at three o'clock I shall begin to be happy. I shall feel happier and happier as the hour advances. At four o'clock, I shall already be worrying and jumping about. I shall show you how happy I am! But if you come at just any time, I shall never know at what hour my heart is to be ready to greet you . . . One must observe the proper rites . . ."

"What is a rite?" asked the little prince.

"Those also are actions too often neglected," said the fox. "They are what make one day different from other days, one hour from other hours. There is a rite, for example, among the hunters. Every Thursday they dance with the village girls. So Thursday is a wonderful day for me! I can take a walk as far as the vineyards. But if the hunters danced at just any time, every day would be like every other day, and I should never have any vacation at all."

So the little prince tamed the fox. And when the hour of his departure drew near--

"Ah," said the fox, "I shall cry."

"It is your own fault," said the little prince. "I never wished you any sort of harm; but you wanted me to tame you . . ."

"Yes, that is so," said the fox.

"But now you are going to cry!" said the little prince.

"Yes, that is so," said the fox.

"Then it has done you no good at all!"

"It has done me good," said the fox, "because of the colour of the wheat fields." And then he added:

"Go and look again at the roses. You will understand now that yours is unique in all the world. Then come back to say goodbye to me, and I will make you a present of a secret."

The little prince went away, to look again at the roses.

"You are not at all like my rose," he said. "As yet you are nothing. No one has tamed you, and you have tamed no one. You are like my fox when I first knew him. He was only a fox like a hundred thousand other foxes. But I have made him my friend, and now he is unique in all the world."

And the roses were very much embarrassed.

"You are beautiful, but you are empty," he went on. "One could not die for you. To be sure, an ordinary passer-by would think that my rose looked just like you--the rose that belongs to me. But in herself alone she is more important than all the hundreds of you other roses: because it is she that I have watered; because it is she that I have put under the glass globe; because it is she that I have sheltered behind the screen; because it is for her that I have killed the caterpillars (except the two or three that we saved to become butterflies); because it is she that I have listened to, when she grumbled, or boasted, or even sometimes when she said nothing. Because she is my rose."

And he went back to meet the fox.

"Goodbye," he said.

"Goodbye," said the fox. "And now here is my secret, a very simple secret: it is only with the heart that one can see rightly; what is essential is invisible to the eye."

"What is essential is invisible to the eye," the little prince repeated, so that he would be sure to remember.

"It is the time you have wasted for your rose that makes your rose so important."

"It is the time I have wasted for my rose--" said the little prince, so that he would be sure to remember.

"Men have forgotten this truth," said the fox. "But you must not forget it. You become responsible, forever, for what you have tamed. You are responsible for your rose . . ."

"I am responsible for my rose," the little prince repeated, so that he would be sure to remember.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Holmes, Arthur F., Approaching Moral Decisions, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1984.
- Joy, Donald M., Bonding: Relationships in the Image of God, Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985.
- _____, Parents, Kids and Sexual Integrity, Waco, TX: Word Books, 1988.
- _____, Unfinished Business, Glendale, CA: Victor Books, 1989.
- Kubo, Sakae, Theology and Ethics of Sex, Nashville, TN: Review and Herald, 1980.
- Morris, Desmond, Intimate Behaviour, New York: Random House, 1971.
- Saint-Exupery, Antoine, The Little Prince, London: Mammoth, 1993. English translation by Katherine Woods.
- Zimbardo, Philip, Essentials of Psychology and Life, New York, NY: Scott and Foresman, 1987.
- White Ellen G., Ministry of Healing, Nampa, CA: Pacific Press, 1954.
- _____, Counsels on Health, Nampa, CA: Pacific Press, 1962.