

Why Laws Restricting Sodomy will Benefit Families, America, and especially Sodomites

Contents:

Explaining “Gay Marriage” to Children

Why Does God Hate Sodomy So Much?

1. Sodomite practices are unsanitary, spreading terrible disease.
2. Sodomy is unnatural.
3. Sodomites reject the Word of God.
4. Sodomite cultures become extremely violent.

But how does Adam and Steve’s “marriage” hurt my marriage?

Sodomy is All a Big Misunderstanding.

Understanding Desires

Desires Betray Us

“Gay Marriage”

Part Two: Adultery

Heartbreak Facts

The Direct Connection between Promiscuity and Heartbreak

Sexual Union: More than Physical

Understanding the difference between “looking” and “lusting”

Dehumanization: Dark Delights

Explaining “Gay Marriage” to Children

Of all the issues that make Americans shout at one another, Gay Marriage gets the shouting about as loud as anything.

Do you know what Gay Marriage is?

(Answer: That’s where instead of daddies marrying mommies, daddies marry daddies and mommies marry mommies. Now, it takes both a daddy and a mommy to make a baby. And without a baby, you are neither a daddy or a mommy. So it gets kind of confusing.)

A similar issue is discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Do you know what that means?

Do you know what discrimination means?

(“Discrimination” means hating some group of people so much that you hate anyone in that group. Laws against discrimination mean landlords have to rent their homes to everybody, and employers have to hire anybody. In public schools, it means children aren’t allowed to be disrespectful of anybody in some group. That’s what its supposed to mean. But

in practice, Bible believing Christian students who proclaim that evolution is a lie and sodomy is a perversion are persecuted by teachers and students both, motivating many parents to home school their children, while students who proclaim their love of perversions which they shouldn't even know exist, are protected and encouraged.)

Do you know what "orientation" means?

("Orientation" means how something is facing. If your living room window is oriented towards the street, that means when you are in your living room you can see the street. If your solar collector is oriented towards the sun, that means it is facing the sun for as much of the day as possible. If you are "oriented" towards a behavior, that means you like that behavior.)

Now here is my most difficult question. I hope you don't know the answer, but I am afraid you will. And if you don't know, I don't want to tell you. But I know our society is telling you all about this, in a way that will make you want to do things that will destroy you. So I have a strong desire that you, and other children, know just enough about this thing to turn away in horror when society recommends this thing to you. And yet I do not want to be the one to tell you enough about what this thing is to start imagining how good this thing might be, before it is the right time for you to know. I also know that adults watching me ask this question of a child your age will feel embarrassed just because I am asking, and some will blame me for embarrassing them and you, even though some of these same adults have voted for politicians who have made sure that public schools teach this junk all the way down to Kindergarten. So I want to challenge you embarrassed adults watching this, to direct your shame logically: towards the education policies which your votes have allowed, if not required. I hope you will be so ashamed that you will vote differently, and persuade your fellow Americans to vote differently, so that innocent children may safely remain innocent.

But newspapers are full of this phrase, "discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation". So if this discussion is allowed to proceed, if you are ever to know what the newspapers are talking about so much, I have to ask, do you know what "sex" means?

(There are three things it will help you to know: first, sex is something people do when they are naked, which explains why it is so important to dress modestly, because the more you show everyone your body, the more danger you are in that this thing will happen at the wrong time and place, which will destroy you. Second, the diseases which sex can give you, if you do it at the wrong time and place, are hideous, and can last your whole life long, and make your life short. Third, God created sex to create babies. That's why sex between a man and a woman who have committed themselves to obey God and to love each other as long as they live, and to love the babies they create, is wonderful, even though sex anywhere else, by anyone else, is perverse and hideous.)

Why Does God Hate Sodomy So Much?

The Bible gives only four clues that I can find *why* God is so down on Gays, as they call themselves, or Sodomites, as American law called them until I was a teenager, and as the Bible calls them. (Sodomites say the Bible doesn't call them that. See my Bible study about that, at www.Saltshaker.US, click on "Sodomy".)

As I ponder God's reasons, during my run for Iowa Senate in 2010 against Matt McCoy, Iowa's first out-of-the-closet sodomite lawmaker, whose "eloquent advocacy" is credited by sodomite magazines with killing the Republicans' Marriage Amendment when Republicans controlled the Iowa Senate, I can't help but agree with the Iowa Supreme Court.

I don't mean today's Iowa Supreme Court, which decided the Constitution requires

county clerks to license sodomite marriages, but the 1854 Iowa Supreme Court, which said in *Hunt v. Hunt*, “man’s laws cannot be very far out of the way, when they are in accord with the laws of God.”

God’s reasons for laws against sodomy are bold – He gives the kinds of facts which it takes courage to publicly even acknowledge today – as I ponder His reasons, they make sense. I have decided that God isn’t stupid, after all.

1. Sodomite practices are unsanitary, spreading terrible disease.

Romans 1:24 Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: 27...men with men working that which is unseemly [Gr: indecent], and receiving in themselves [in their bodies] that recompence [consequence] of their error which was meet [Gr: inevitable].

See Appendix for explanation of this verse by Albert Barnes’ Bible commentary. I’ll mention this concern later, but the facts are widely known. The only contribution I offer to the subject is concern for them.

2. Sodomy is unnatural.

Romans 1:26 For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: 27 And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another...

Newspaper scientists today insist sodomy is perfectly “natural”, as observable in the animal kingdom. I’ll respond to this later.

3. Sodomites reject the Word of God.

Romans 1:25 Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

Articles and entire books are authored by sodomite theologians to justify their behavior from the Bible. I respond to their principal points at www.Saltshaker.US, click on “sodomy” or “Bible studies”. I have tested this study through lengthy, comprehensive debates with sodomites. In all their studies that I have seen, I find ingenious spins on Scripture which are enough to convince them that most of the verses against them really are not, or are inconsequential since they are in the “Old Testament” which doesn’t matter any more, with all its wars, mixed textiles, and stoned children. But several verses written by Paul in the New Testament are too much for them. They make a brave attempt to spin the verses their way, and when their ball just won’t quite fit in the basket, they finish Paul off with “well, he was just influenced by his culture” and therefore was not really speaking for God.

The bottom line is that I have never seen any sodomite reconcile his behavior with a belief that every word of the Bible is the Word of God; as Jesus put it, “the Scripture cannot be broken [Gr: loosened]”, John 10:35. (Jesus said this to nail down an argument for an extremely controversial theology, premised on every word of Scripture being authored by God.)

One cannot reject God just a little, without stepping on a bottomless slippery slope.

This slope is described in Romans, below, as inescapable, once stepped upon. As if rejection of evidence of God invokes the slope, and after that one slides all the way to the bottom, with sodomy but one bump along the way. This obviously does not mean every single sodomite, since 1 Corinthians 6:11 addresses a group of Christians who were delivered from sodomy. But it describes a culture which, as a whole, in its laws and role models, rejects God

Romans 1:18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; 19 Because that which

may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. 20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: 21 Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. 22 Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, 23 And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. 24 Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: 25 Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. 26 For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: ...28 And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; 29 Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, 30 Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, 31 Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: 32 Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.

4. Sodomite cultures become extremely violent.

At the bottom of the “slippery slope” just described is the kind of violence the Bible reports in Sodom, Genesis 19, and in the tribe of Benjamin, Judges 19. One hesitates to associate such ruthless violence with sodomites in America today, who at least do not yet roam streets in rampaging mobs seeking immigrants to gang rape.

But have you watched sodomite parades? I have film of one in San Francisco showing a naked man with only a small cardboard cone covering his frontal privates. I have film I took in Des Moines with a man operating a puppet of a Catholic nun who would lean forward and its disproportionately large breasts would flop out. Shameless, brazen, are words that come to mind.

Or sodomite protesters? Have you seen them get right up to the faces of their ideological opponents and blow police whistles as loud and as constantly as they can, their faces full of all the fury of Hell?

God describes them this way: *Isaiah 3:9 The shew of their countenance [expressions on their faces] doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not. Woe unto their soul! for they have rewarded evil unto themselves.*

But how does Adam and Steve’s “marriage” hurt *my* marriage?

Sodomite marriages undermine Biblical marriages in many ways.

Perhaps the most direct way is that our culture (radio, TV, movies, magazines, books) in order to get in step with sodomite civil rights and marriage laws, glorifies “discovering” that you are “gay”, thus encouraging and tempting mothers and fathers to divorce their spouses for being the wrong sex. That is what my opponent, Matt McCoy, did to his wife and children. Marriage is under assault enough from temptation to fornicate with half the population, without doubling the assault with temptation to fornicate with the other half too.

Another threat to families is through sodomy-promoting public education which forces small children to consider choices they should not even know exist, encouraging them to

become promiscuous before they are even physically able, and to experience all the health threats that go with that. Confused children often grow into confused adults with confused marriage-displacing “relationships” breeding more confused children.

Sodomite men are particularly attracted to children. How many? Enough to fill the pages of Kinsey, the membership rolls of NAMBLA (North American Man-Boy Association), and the court dockets against Catholic priests. Innocent children are seduced, abducted, and murdered by these men, and this perversion is generally tolerated among all sodomites to the extent that I hear no public renunciations of this perversion, other than when observations like mine are made all sodomites will angrily denounce any implied association with it.

Marriage is challenging enough under ideal circumstances. Ideal circumstances would be where a whole culture honors lifetime, monogamous marriage and regards every alternative sexual relationship unthinkable. Living in a culture which justifies, if not glorifies, every other perverse sexual relationship *but* lifetime, monogamous marriage, is the most difficult environment for any marriage. Glorification of sodomy is about the farthest a culture can go from affirming lifetime, monogamous marriage.

Glorification of sodomy is about the farthest a culture can go, because:

1. Physically, at least [heterosexual] adultery sticks to bedroom uses of our bodies. Sodomy mixes bedroom and bathroom uses. (I’m trying to find a clean way to allude to the orifices chosen.) This is the direct cause of sodomite men being 44 times as likely to have HIV, and of the shortening of their lives by a quarter century, and not even that discourages them. There are even men who seek HIV positive men because they want HIV! That is as far down into self destructive behavior as any element of our culture has fallen so far, but there is still farther to fall.

2. Adulterers at least acknowledge that lifetime monogamous marriage is the ideal relationship, through their efforts to hide what they are doing, and from the shame they feel upon exposure. Sodomites are proud of their perversions, flaunting them in whatever media they can get in, and in public parades.

3. National obsession with sex, mushrooming with glorification of publicly proud sodomites, fills human imaginations with images of every other alternative to one’s own spouse.

The threat to Biblical marriages is not the only reason to outlaw sodomite marriage, if not sodomy itself. Sodomy destroys family bonds, children, social conscience, and nations. Obsession with sex is not good for any nation’s economy. Every broken home struggles financially, only counting the fact that two adults now have two homes rather than one to pay for; add to that lawyer fees, career-debilitating hatred and despair, and children’s loyalty torn between two warring parents.

But the greatest reason to outlaw sodomy, is for the sake of sodomites.

Sodomy is All a Big Misunderstanding.

Sodomites say they can’t help their desires; it’s in their genes. They produce studies to prove it. The usual procedure is that a study like this is published in some obscure journal, and makes page one of the newspapers. A few days or weeks later critics arise who have thoroughly analyzed the study and by normal scientific standards the study either fails to make the case alleged in the newspapers, or never even pretended to make such a case, but those criticisms don’t even make the obituary pages, but they flood the alternative news

sources; email lists, blogs, talk radio.

One such early study alleged that brain scans looked different in sodomites. Added to the doubts whether that finding was valid, was the question whether the brain looking different caused the desire, or did the desire make the brain look different?

It is alleged of the Bible that “you can prove anything you want from it”, a claim ridiculous to scholars of it, and disproved by the failure of sodomites to justify their “orientation” from it without at some point throwing up their hands and conceding that although they have successfully dodged almost all the damning verses, here’s one or two left that they must dispose of by questioning whether Paul was really inspired by God or “influenced by his culture”, and besides look at all the genocide, stoning of rebellious children, silly food laws etc. which no respectable God could have ever actually supported!

But the fickleness charge which cannot stick to the Bible, sticks like glue to “scientific studies” of desires and genes. It is like the studies of whether a little wine will make you healthy. If you don’t like one study, just wait a bit for the next. Post them on a graph, and someone looking over your shoulder will think you’re following the stock market.

However, I want to acknowledge that the desire for physical union with someone can be overwhelming. Although the channeling of this desire towards either the opposite or the same sex has nothing to do with genes, it is very real, and it is very important that we understand what causes it, and what it takes to control it.

Understanding Desires

When desire engulfs you, you may think you cannot be happy until you satisfy it. You may assume your desire is a sure guide to what will satisfy you and give your life meaning. Usually not.

An adult who still believes that, when engulfed by sexual desires for activities, some of which are prosecutable under American law, and others of which are condemned by the Laws of God, shows the same immaturity as a child who sees a toy and begins crying if he can’t immediately have what he never before knew existed.

Parents well understand the fickleness of their children’s desires. It is their own desires whose fickleness they do not understand.

Desires have no will of their own. They are the servant of your will. To the extent they are undirected, their mission is to report possibilities to your will. Possible actions, possible rationales, possible justifications. Have you noticed that when a new possibility for pleasure occurs to you which you never before heard of, and therefore which you never previously felt the slightest twinge of desire for, that the longer you consider it, the stronger desire wells up in your heart for it?

God gave you the capacity for desires, to inform your choices. God doesn’t want robots in Heaven whose only movements are to raise their hands to praise Him and to put money in offering plates. God wants every detail of your personality to be your choice. That’s why human children need so much longer to mature than animals. So with each new possibility, whether a pastry, a partner, or a career, God provides us an imagination capable of what no animal can do: visualize possibilities of things which do not yet exist, and visualize whatever potential they have for pleasure, alongside visualizing the consequences of that choice, so that our choices can be informed.

The only reason our will delays rejecting a potential desire is because the consequences are not determined to be unthinkable yet. When we shudder at the thought of a choice, we

have reached the point where it is unthinkable, and any desire we once felt for it simply vanishes without a trace. Whether the choice was to murder an enemy, smoke weed, have another doughnut, or fornicate.

As long as your will delays making its decision, your desires will grow, demanding to be addressed. But as soon as your will decides, your desires fall into line in proportion to your will's resolve.

For animals, desires are overwhelming because that is all they have to guide them. They don't have "greater goals" for the sake of which they need to discipline desires in their way. A goat doesn't reason "those roses really look delicious, but if I eat the whole bush I'm going to regret it tomorrow." In fact, cows or goats, let loose in a corn field, will eat until they bloat, and they will die unless the farmer pokes a hole in their bellies to relieve the gas. A cat doesn't reason "Rover may have an aggressive smile, but inside I'll bet he is a pussy cat, if I can just appeal to his better nature. So I am going to set aside my desire to run, or hiss, and I am going to set my sights on success."

Humans can choose to behave like animals, which behave like tantrum-throwing children. But humans are capable of a thing we call "success" - the reaching of a goal that requires discipline of conflicting desires, acquisition of skills, hard work and commitment.

Overcoming desire for sex with another of your sex, after you have learned that it is not your most wholesome choice, is really no different than overcoming your desire to sleep in when it is time to go to work, or overcoming your desire to kill somebody who makes you mad.

The fact that we have desires which conflict with our higher goals is the mark of the nature of human consciousness. Our temptation to accuse our higher goals for interrupting our desires is the mark of immaturity.

When we are children we imagine exciting careers ahead. Fireman. Astronaut. Lawyer. Musician. Garbage collector. As we grow our choices become better informed. We learn that we can only pursue one at a time. At the most, two. We look forward to our first day on the job, and we find that the fervent desires of our childhood for all other careers have vanished without a trace. It turns out they were not sure guides to what will most satisfy us, after all. We only smile at their memory. If we still allow ourselves to yearn for them, that will diminish our attention to the career we are in.

So it is with marriage.

So it is with sticking to a healthier diet.

So it is with sex.

Desires can Betray Us

It is really very common for the things we strongly desire to give us no happiness when we get them. It is really very common for human beings to choose to desire really terrible things.

It is possible for a child to choose to live in a mess, and to complain when mother makes him clean his room, and even complain when mother cleans it herself.

It is possible for a drunk to blaspheme the "holier than thou do-gooders" trying to help him off the street, off alcohol dependency, and into responsible work.

It was possible for German voters to give Adolph Hitler a strong enough second place showing for prime minister, that he could kill the prime minister and assume the lead himself

without raising too many alarm bells. (Have American voters ever supported tyrants?)

It was possible for ancient Israel to stone Joshua and Caleb for encouraging them to march into the Promised Land, when they would rather return to slavery in Egypt.

It was possible for Adam and Eve to be dissatisfied with Paradise.

It is possible for a man today to be dissatisfied with his wife whom he had chosen as the easiest to love of any he had found on the planet.

It is possible for human beings today to reject God, good, peace, contentment, truth, Love, light, evidence, and Life itself.

Revelation says it will be possible for people to curse God even knowing He Is.

Apparently it will be possible, after death, for people, shown Heaven where scheming lies, torture, wars, and hatred are not possible, to run screaming the other direction.

No, there is nothing inherently reliable about desires. Desires are wonderful tools, used as they were created to be used. In the hands of an immature child, any tool can destroy.

“Gay Marriage”

I think the whole “Sexual Orientation” mess that divides America is all a big misunderstanding of how desires work.

Whether we are talking about Gay Marriage, or losing weight, or breaking addictions, or learning a musical instrument, we are not dealing with something physical.

We are dealing with the nature of consciousness.

We are dealing with a power which, properly harnessed, can move mountains. But which, unbridled, allowed to wander without fences, has destroyed better men than I.

Let me explain how it works, by telling you how much I love my wife.

Over our 25 years of growing beautiful together, I have fallen in love with her more and more. And not just with her mind.

The strange part is that I am *more* attracted to her appearance now, than when we were both 25 years younger, *which was at a time, by the way, when neither of us were particularly young, although neither of us looked this old. Now I spend less time cutting the hair on my head, than in my ears.*

When I was young, I worried about how this would work. I saw how much my grandparents loved each other, who were then the age that I am now. I wanted that happiness in my old age. But I could not imagine, then, remaining physically attracted to a woman as old as my wife and I are now.

I want to emphasize that I am not merely *pretending* to be content, while forcing my desire for young women into a dark unhappy corner, because I have resigned myself to less than I really want.

I have what I want. My attraction to my wife is not pretense. I do not want to be younger, or to have a younger wife.

So why are the worst fears of my puberty now vapor? Because of my genes? Did my eyes used to have a gene that made them look at young women, which, somewhere along the way, evolved into a gene that made them look at old women?

Amazing, that my gene should be so affected, when it is not so with an embarrassing number of other old men. Maybe I got the gene from one of my grandfathers; my other grandfather didn't have it, I don't think.

But if a gene explains all this, explain why I don't feel this attraction to *other* old

women? Or *any* other woman? Just my wife. What physical cause can explain it? Shall scientists search for a Love Your Wife gene? **I could be persuaded to contribute to genetic research for the right price.**

The explanation is simple. I followed Solomon's advice to "rejoice in the wife of thy youth". I delighted in the gold on my own property, and decided that it was unthinkable to dig for gold on somebody else's.

I learned that desires, as cool as they are when you steer them, can't be trusted to lead you to happiness if you let them steer you. If you let your desires wander without fences, they will lead you anywhere you let them. We see people who follow their lusts become cruel and cold, deceiving others in order to play with their bodies, breaking the hearts of their victims, and suffering shame themselves, when their lies are finally exposed. Where there is opportunity to follow lusts without consequences, such as in countries where torturing Christians is legal, horrifying orgies mix murder with pleasure.

I used to think, "well, if that is what gives them pleasure, who am I to say it's wrong? Especially if they are consenting adults. Maybe they *like* deceiving each other."

But I could no longer rationalize such behavior after I read about a thing called masochism. That's where it supposedly gives you pleasure to be tortured by someone! Doesn't there come a point where it's time to stop rationalizing perversion, and start feeling sorry for these people?

I learned from observing others, from reading the Bible, and from struggling with my own mind, that the human imagination will lead your desires wherever you allow it. Unfenced lusts will not only lead you to all these places, but will justify going there. Like the snake in the Garden of Eden, they will create the most persuasive arguments for how delightful this thing will be, how much you crave it, and how little you can live without it.

That is, until your will rises up and says, firmly, "No. That is unthinkable. I must not even think about such a horrible thing again." At that point, all desire for this thing, all arguments for it, all rationales justifying whatever cruelty towards others is required of you to acquire it, vanish like morning mists under the rising sun.

When your will reaches this point regarding overeating, you will lose weight.

When your will reaches this point regarding adultery, your marriage will become joyful.

When your will reaches this point regarding skipping practice on your musical instrument, your talent will soar.

When your will reaches this point regarding an addiction, you will quit, with few if any withdrawal symptoms.

If your will reaches this point regarding same-sex attraction, your homosexual gene will instantly evolve into a heterosexual gene.

But why should you?

What was on God's Mind when He put homosexuality in the same category with adultery? Meaning, God's recommended penalty for both is the same.

As long as we have to fence in our desires at some point, why not put it around the safest, most wholesome pasture? God explains why He fences off homosexuality in Romans 1. Because of the hideous disease that goes with it, and because it is unnatural.

How can hideous disease not be the consequence of putting mouths on toilet ports, mixing up bedroom and bathroom functions?

Who can call it “natural”? Animals in nature don’t do it. News reporters say they do, but all you see is animals *starting* with the same sex. That’s because, being animals, they are sometimes too dumb to figure out what sex the other animal is. In fact, they probably don’t even know what sex they themselves are. So once they figure out that the other animal doesn’t have the expected equipment, they dismount, blush, and say “Oh, pardon my boo-boo. I thought you were a woman.”

I mean, if even humans have to look closely to tell which is which, can you really expect every animal to be that much smarter?

Notice also the obsession with fantasy in the culture of sodomy and adultery. Perhaps you have to buy pornography, like I did decades ago, to see the depth of this obsession. Doesn't it strike you as dehumanizing to enter relations with someone who is pretending you are someone or something else, whose pleasure is only disrupted by any reminder that the person he is with is actually YOU? Besides the dehumanization, doesn't this strike you as a clue that no matter how far men run from God, they struggle to act or feel natural in what God has declared unnatural? Do you know how intensely you must concentrate to tell yourself you are with someone other than who you are with?

I wasn’t always this happy. In my past, which I am happy to say is distant, I lusted for things which today make me shudder. Fortunately, they made me shudder then, too, in time to avoid more ruin than I have experienced.

If you have never had even a momentary desire for anything the least bit wrong, it is not because your mind was unwilling or incapable. It is because you, in your integrity, stopped your mind in its tracks and ordered, “Mind, don’t even *think* about going there! I see how steep that cliff is, and I am determined not to let you drag me over!”

I learned that when we do that while far from the cliff, desire to jump off remains as weak as distilled water. But the closer we allow our minds to wander, and peek over, the more powerful and irresistible desire becomes.

It is very important to understand that I am not talking about *suppressing* desires which we still believe to be good. Freud had no understanding of the nature of desires, when he theorized about the futility of suppressing evil desires. To the extent we “suppress” our desires, in combination with recognizing their destructiveness, they do not just build up like dammed up waters, until the inevitable eventual breaking point of the dam, and then come crashing down on the unsuspecting countryside, the way Freud imagined.

To the extent we “suppress” our desires, in combination with acknowledging their incompatibility with goals more important to us, they simply cease to exist.

To the extent we make any desire, addiction, or perversion “unthinkable” in our hearts – to the extent we choose to remember the associated consequences and shudder at the harm that would cause others and ourselves, that former desire leaves and does not return. I have heard many testimonies of people who came to such a point in their lives regarding substance abuse, who went “cold turkey” without even any withdrawal symptoms.

Conversely, to the extent we allow our imaginations to wander without fences, they will go *anywhere. Anywhere.*

When you start with your mouth on a toilet part, you are already on a “slippery slope”. You have already had to deaden your conscience to its complaints that this simply isn’t good hygiene. You have already had to pretend that something you know is not wholesome, really has nothing wrong with it.

Remember, there is nothing inherently desirable about any desire. All desires are subject to our will, informed by our intelligence and our choices to accept higher goals than our animal impulses. Therefore we live best when we draw our fences around the most pure, the most successful. Once we decide to include a little filth within our boundaries, there is no magical limit to how much more filth we will embrace.

Human consciousness has the capacity to be “in denial” of reality. Animals can’t do that. We call it “visualization”, or “fantasy”, or “fetish”. The problem is that once your pleasure must be founded on replacement of the reality before you with some alternate reality, you can’t just go imagining the same alternative over and over for the rest of your life. Your imagination gets bored, and demands more and more.

Thus sodomy has led, and logically leads, to urinating on one another, eating one another’s feces, “fisting”, gerbils in the anus, and on to sadism (wanting to torture others), masochism (wanting to be tortured), rape, incest, pedophilia or child molestation, snuff films (where people are actually killed while making a sex movie), necrophilia or sex with corpses, bestiality or sex with animals, and on to a scene once described by Richard Wurmbrand of Voice of the Martyrs where communist torturers had a drunken orgy, torturing, violating, and murdering their prisoners, and leaving body parts all over the room.

Ephesians 5:12 For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.

Conclusion:

Remember, desire will go anywhere it is not restrained, and yet is as content as a horse to go where it is bridled. Therefore the desire for one of the opposite sex is an illusion. It is simply *unbridled desire*. We must bridle our desires *somewhere*, or they will go *anywhere*. So why not pick the safest, healthiest, most natural pasture?

We have no innate desire to eat unclean things, or to have unclean sex. So why not bridle our desires before they take us there?

The desire of God for our health and happiness is illustrated by His chart of clean and unclean meats. What God calls unclean, modern science affirms are laced with deadly diseases and thus must be cooked with care; yet even with careful cooking, they are less healthy.

Obviously many sodomites linger at the lips of normalcy, with one foot on the slippery slope but one hand on the safety rope at the top. They may never sink into the depths which many sodomite cultures have. Thus they may suffer only a few of the horrible consequences of sodomy. But why play with fire? Why not choose Full Life? If you blaspheme God’s best for you, here, perhaps you do not need to fear being thrown into Hell. Perhaps you need, more, to fear that your heart will be so hard, when God shows you Heaven, that you will run away from it.

Pornography Witnesses Against Sodomy

First I had better explain what I was doing on a sodomite pornography site.

In 2010 I was a candidate for State Senate against Matt McCoy, Iowa’s only out-of-the-closet sodomite, who was given a cash award by the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund for using his “eloquent advocacy” to kill a Marriage Amendment to the Iowa Constitution in 2005 (when Republicans controlled the Iowa Senate). Had McCoy allowed that Amendment to pass, the 2009 ruling of the Iowa Supreme Court forcing county clerks to accept sodomite marriage

applications would have been impossible. Because of that ruling, Iowans had to focus on removing the three of the justices from office who faced a retention vote in 2010. (We removed them.)

My campaign against him explains why the sodomite pornography site would use my name as a search term for his site. I have Google Alerts set to notify me of anything that shows up on the web with my name, so one unsuspecting morning I found my name sandwiched between two photos I pray God will remove from my memory.

Except for the faces. I want to remember the faces.

The mention of me was just a phrase about me and my campaign. In order to discover what was said about me, I needed to read the context, but the other text in the whole page likewise consisted of scattered, unrelated phrases, sandwiched between photos. After all that reading of “context”, I found nothing else that said anything about me. I don’t know much about search engines, but apparently popular search phrases were jumbled together in order to draw unsuspecting people, who are actually interested only in those subjects, to their filthy site.

The faces were haunting.

Before I describe them, a word about the objectivity of describing facial expressions. I can’t cite the source, and I’m too lazy to look it up, it not being central to my point here; but you can find research showing facial expressions are universally correlated with emotions. Not only across all human cultures and languages, but even among animals (to the extent animals have the capacity for facial movement; for example, fish don’t have much capacity. But cats and dogs do.)

Tenderness, devotion, love, romance – these were farthest from any of the facial expressions I saw of the 20 or so images on the sodomite porn site. Road rage – extreme anger and irritation – was the expression on two men in one photo. A woman had an expression like she was suffering a terrible, terrible headache. There was a glimpse of a facial expression seen in movies depicting demon possession – too much whites of the eyes showing, as in fear, except that there is no fear, but rather a willingness to hurt.

I won’t pretend that what I saw was representative of the whole range of sodomite pornography, and I have no plans for further “research”. I present these observations only to suggest that if you already go to such places, or have such relationships, notice the emotions. See for yourself whether what I saw is what you see. If so, is that really what you want in your life? Is that the “love” for which you long?

I know what heterosexual pornography was like several decades ago, before I was married. Then, the faces were all lovely smiles, in most of what I saw. It was different in a few images I saw that showed everything: I saw demonic expressions.

Then, musicians smiled. You could not get a job as a musician unless you smiled. Unless you played classical music. Today if a musician smiles he has to stick to country music, and he has to cry when he isn’t smiling. Rock music is not happy music. One does not listen to rock music to be put in a good mood, or to feel joy, gratitude, or self sacrificial love. It is a world of blaming others, anger, resentment, despair, undisciplined passion, life without meaning – and pornography.

I have no interest in double checking my suspicion that printed pornography is different now, in the same way rock music is different because it has become progressively more pornographic. There is no romance. No tenderness. No commitment. No purpose. Is that what you want?

Adultery

Why is God so down on adultery?

Could it be the spiritual confusion that attends adultery?

The children for whom adult responsibility becomes so arguable it is argued in court.

The financial collapse because the same two parents have to support an additional residence because they are no longer willing to share the same one.

The deception of adultery, to get the other person to surrender their body for your use.

The dehumanization of the other, that treats their body as so much property, or as a toy for one's own pleasure.

The heartbreak of the one deceived, and the shame of the deceiver, when the deception is inevitably exposed.

We may surmise that such considerations are on God's mind as He counsels us to flee fornication and adultery. These things apply twofold to sodomy.

What I am about to say about a big mistake has not come to my knowledge second hand. It is not just something I have read about. It is not just something I have heard that God "judges" people for. I have suffered judgment. My motive in warning you is not to gloat over how free I am of the "sins" I see in you. I waited too late for that. My motive is my love for you. I shudder at the thought you may suffer what I have suffered, when it is so unnecessary. I want to spare you, by sharing my experience and my observation.

The fact that God warns us about this big mistake falls on deaf ears in this generation, since this generation does not trust God. And why not? Primarily, I believe, because of what God says about this one big mistake. "Why would a God of Love threaten lovers with Hell?" sounded like compelling reasoning to me, when I was young and foolish.

Because I questioned His advice, unwilling to learn by instruction, I was left to learn by experience. I learned well. I learned about heartbreak deeper than I could ever have imagined. Debilitating heartbreak that darkened my world for many years.

At least one good thing came out of it: it restored my faith in God. I learned the bitter lesson that this one thing God warned me about, which made no sense to me at the time, turned out to be pretty sound advice after all. I learned that this one "issue" I had with God was, after all, such immensely practical advice, that my trust in Him became very deep.

I believe God's warnings have the same motivation as mine, except that God has not experienced sin. He doesn't need to, to understand the nature of what He created. When you create something, you have a pretty good idea of what it needs. If God exists at all, reason suggests (1) He is smart enough to know how to talk to us, and (2) He understands what we need.

I believe God loves us even more than I love you, longs for our love, and grieves at the very thought of us mistaking for "love" something so far from genuine love that it has the power to plant our hearts in Hell itself. Not from Him throwing us there; but from our hearts

creating it so thoroughly that Hell is what we would feel even if God tried to drag us into Heaven.

My goal in writing is to equip you with answers I searched for, but could not find, 35 years ago. I don't know if these answers are available elsewhere. I don't even know if these answers correspond to your questions.

I would like to know. I would like to know more than I know. I am not satisfied with what I know. But if I wait until I know everything, it will be too late to tell you anything. I hope you will communicate what you know to me, to add to what I know.

It is human to want to know *why* something is wrong. It is so natural that "why?" is the one question a parent can always count on his child asking, when the parent gives a commandment.

The child does not necessarily mean, by the question, "I would sincerely love to understand your reasoning and experience which lead you to enact this rule for my benefit. I want to understand so much that I am willing to concentrate as hard as I can on your answer, for as long as it takes you to explain it."

Parents learn that the child really means "justify yourself, in 50 words or less, because that's about how long I am willing to wait before I do it anyway."

When I was a young man, I asked God the same "why" which my children later continually asked of me. Had I been offered a thorough answer back then, sufficient to completely satisfy my curiosity, would I have used that information to save myself? Would I have concentrated through it? I wish I could justify myself by answering "of course", but I'm not certain.

Adam and Eve were told what not to do. Satan suggested they question God's motives, because what God prohibited was actually very good. Perhaps they would like to have asked God "Why? Can you give us some *reason* you have prohibited this food, to counterbalance our suspicion that there is no good reason?" Apparently they never got around to asking. But God gave them their answer: the hard way. From experience.

God's approach is simple. He tells us what to do, or not do, if we want full, happy lives, without necessarily satisfying our curiosity "why". Why? Perhaps because the answer is usually obvious, if we do not let our desire blind our common sense, and if we *are* blinded by desire, our "logic" will find its way around any reason.

One advantage of God's approach is that it only takes 5 words. "Thou shalt not commit adultery." As a consequence, almost everyone in the world knows what God says, according to the Bible, about adultery.

You may never know what I say, because you may never slog through it. "Why" takes a lot longer to explain than "what".

But in case your obedience to "what" has been waiting for "why", here is the best I can come up with. I only wish I could make my explanation of my experience as vivid as my experience.

I am not anxious to share details about my own experience – what I have done, and what consequences I have suffered. They embarrass me, although by today's standards I have lived a fairly clean life. But Matthew 5 explains that even adulterous thoughts can be as destructive as adultery itself, and I have found that to be true. Even our thoughts can have heartbreaking consequences. In any case, whatever you have done, I have come close enough to it, in my thoughts, to relate to the temptation you experience.

Hebrews 4:15 Our High Priest is not one who cannot feel sympathy for our

weaknesses. On the contrary, we have a High Priest who was tempted in every way that we are, but did not sin. (GNB)

Heartbreak Facts

Hollywood loves to chronicle the trail of broken hearts which adultery leaves behind. Literally more broken hearts than left by murder itself!

Why, then, doesn't adultery seem like a sin to Hollywood?

Why does almost every Hollywood star, as they *enter* a "sexual relationship" outside marriage, treat it as normal, and as their natural right; but then as they *leave* such a relationship, the tabloids and "personality" magazines fill their headlines with verbiage like "jilted", "heartbreak", and "betrayed", as courtrooms fill with their bitter trials?

If adultery and fornication are just "love", what gets them tangled up with so much seething hatred? Why is it that when you hear people talk about who they hate the most in the world, it is usually someone with whom they have had sex? Why are so many murders tangled up with sex, such as the infamous O. J. Simpson trial?

If "living with someone" or "seeing someone" (euphemisms for promiscuity outside marriage) has no commitments, why do soap operas seem so true to life when they portray betrayal, revenge, and murder about equally when "affairs" end, as when marriages end?

Why is there such an expectation of a commitment, and of trustworthiness, just from having sex, that when commitment and trustworthiness are breached, people are so enraged that they are tempted to justify murder itself? Why so much, for a sexual relationship, when the exact same lack of commitment and trustworthiness would barely be disappointing in a friendship without sex?

What is it about unsanctified sex that makes "partners" lie to each other in order to get what they want? How can Hollywood, or anyone, call such heartbreak "love"?

If sex is "love", why are unmarried "lovers" the least likely, of all human relationships, to be trustworthy?

Why is promiscuity so inseparable from the lies, the "lines", the fantasies, the deliberate infection of another with terrible disease, in the name of "love"?

Indeed, why do people routinely enter sexual relationships fully aware that their new "partner" might knowingly infect them with a lifelong, life-shortening sexual disease, and never tell them because then they might not "get what they want"? No one would ask a new "partner", "Are you about to infect me with a lifelong, life-shortening sexual disease, without warning me?" Because if the partner were infected but caring, he would stop being promiscuous! But if he were infected and cared not, he would answer with a lie! So it makes no sense to even ask. There is a question whose answer is less clear: what drives people to enter such a risky relationship and yet expect love?

I could ask myself, I suppose. I could ask my heedless younger self of 35 years ago. But I don't think I will. I don't want to embarrass him by making him listen to his own foolishness. He would probably say something stupid like "it won't happen to me."

Nor will I trouble him by then asking, "can you accept the risk that you might infect others?" He would probably just hang his head and never speak to me again.

If you line up all the STD's, and count how many people receive each one, it is about the same number as the number of people who are promiscuous. 100%. That doesn't mean 100% of those who are promiscuous get diseased. That figure is about 50%, with many getting several diseases.

How are those odds acceptable? Especially for you young health-conscious yuppies out there?

You won't eat butter, eggs, or hardly any meat, and you will exercise faithfully so you will look great and live a couple of years longer, and then you go out and engage in an activity that gives you a high risk of dying young with ugly warts or lesions covering your once beautiful body!

You hate smoking and smokers because 57% of male smoker's deaths, and 50% of female smoker's deaths, are attributable to their smoking. (www.worthit.org/pdfs/healthharmstobacco.pdf+smoking+%22cancer+rates%22+risk+%22percentage+of+smokers%22&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=24&gl=us) And then you rush passionately into an activity that gives you a 50% chance of becoming permanently sick!?

LifeSite News reports: ...after 40 years of sex-education in the US, sexual promiscuity has skyrocketed, leaving approximately 1 in every 4 Americans currently with an STD. ...infection rates [for a new disease] were "4 times higher among those who used condoms during their last vaginal intercourse."

(www.lifesitenews.com/ldn/2007/jun/07061205.html)

TheBody.com reports: "By 12th grade, 65% of American youth are sexually active." "Young Americans between the ages of 13 and 24 are still contracting HIV at the rate of two per hour.... 20,000...every year." "An estimated 250,000 Americans do not know that they are HIV infected." (www.thebody.com/content/art38.html)

I guess I am answering your "why" with a few "why"s of my own.

Why do the promiscuous "use" each other routinely enough to insert the term "use" into everyday vocabulary, shoving aside every spiritual aspect of their relationship that hinders their stampede for mere physical titillation?

Why is there often such a difference in behavior from just before, to just after sex, especially if there is little expectation of future sex? Is that because the deception serves no further purpose?

Before trying to understand "why", let's first at least acknowledge that these things are so. It is such common knowledge that comedians base their routines on it, confident that their audience will understand without needing their jokes explained.

It is such common knowledge that "Romance" magazines and books, which regurgitate these themes on an hourly basis, are almost the best selling of all literature after the Bible.

It is such common knowledge that when you tell friends about your "relationship", you and they talk about indications whether it is "real love" or whether you are just "being used" – concerns that would barely occur to you in an ordinary friendship without sex; or indeed even in an engagement to be married in which there is no sex.

Indeed, why is it that in an engagement to be married in which there is nothing approaching sex, no one questions whether "he is using you" (unless you are very rich), yet that question is prominent where two are "living together"?

Why?

If God explains "why", listing reasons in a logical order, I haven't found it in the Bible yet. There is plenty of "don't", but little "why". There is also plenty of "what". There are many examples of how humans behave when they want sex enough to kill, hate, or dehumanize for it.

Samson so expected his wife to be faithful to him more than to her very own family,

that when she was not, he went on a destructive rampage and then left home for awhile.

Abraham was fearful of traveling near barbarous kings who would take his life in order to add his wife to their harems.

King David murdered for “love”.

David’s son Amnon raped his own half sister Tamar (2 Samuel 13) and afterwards refused to marry her because he suddenly began hating her.

King Solomon wrote some pretty practical, everyday advice about romance and heartbreak. He spoke from experience, having a thousand wives of his own to teach him.

But we still wonder “why”.

There are people who reason that “just because heartbreak follows so much promiscuity, doesn’t prove it will follow mine. I’ve met lots of promiscuous people who seem very happy, at least so far, as far as I can tell. There may be a risk of disease and a pregnancy I don’t want, but other than that, if those things don’t hit me, I don’t see any other harm on the horizon. Since sex is essentially love, it seems to me that to the extent promiscuity is dangerous, God is the one to blame, for making such a wonderful gift fraught with such hazards.” I have seen this logic in movies, on TV, in blogs, books, and once, in my own thoughts.

You know the risk of disease and pregnancy. Before we move on to the dangers you do not see, may I just ask you, if you conceive, and wish you hadn’t, will you please let your baby live, and bring him to me if you still don’t want him (or her)? My wife conceived, but lost our baby before birth, and now is too old to bear. I would *love* your baby, if you won’t. I may be old, but at least I’m still good looking.

All these hazards of unsanctified sex are general dangers. Maybe you won’t get an STD. Maybe you won’t get breast cancer, whose risk is several times higher for women who use The Pill or who get an abortion. Maybe you won’t even get your heart broken. Maybe you won’t have a baby before you find a good father, leaving your work schedule and finances in a mess. Maybe you will never have a “partner” who will lie to you or “use” you.

So I want to tell you about the hazards of unsanctified sex which I have painfully experienced, which pursue each and every promiscuous person.

If I guess badly, about the real reason God warns us not to do it, keep in mind the following is only my guess. What no one need guess is the facts above. There is no controversy that unsanctified sex is enmeshed with the severest heartbreak within human experience. That fact will not be diminished no matter how badly I guess.

The Direct Connection between Promiscuity and Heartbreak

Human relationships are difficult. You know how hard it is to get along with just yourself! That is, even during those times you have almost everything you want – almost everything you thought would make you happy – that is no guarantee you will feel consistently satisfied! Sometimes a bad mood, depression, anger, etc. bubbles up when you aren’t even sure what accounts for it, and you don’t know how to stop it!

Now multiply all those problems by two, and you see what a challenge marriage is!

But its very difficulty is the source of its great rewards.

For example, it is very frustrating to share with another in need, only to be rejected, and even hated for helping.

Even God can relate. *Psalms 109:4 For my love they are my adversaries: but I give myself unto prayer. 5 And they have rewarded me evil for good, and hatred for my love.*

Not only do we hate to be falsely accused of hating, when our motive is love, but it makes us doubt our own judgment about whether the next person we meet needs our help. But the very commonness of human resistance to help makes it so gratifying and fulfilling when our help is received, put to good use, and even appreciated.

I am even grateful when someone who thinks my help is a nuisance puts up with me anyway. Whether or not my help has all the purity of Heaven doesn't matter; if they don't think it does, then their willingness to put up with me anyway shows their love, which I appreciate. If I am right, but they don't know I am right, I appreciate the love for me they had to muster to put up with someone they believe is wrong.

Outside marriage, relationships seldom last long enough to overcome this normal human resistance. We find ourselves flitting from human to human, simply walking away from heavy resistance, to struggle a little bit with the next human down life's road. We don't hang around our whole lives where we are resisted – we don't have enough time – so we don't very much have the experience of overcoming this resistance. We just keep our relationships superficial enough that we don't encounter the sludge of resistance which intimacy stirs up. We limit our interaction to what others *think* they want – “serving”, often for money – daring not to offer what they *need*.

But through lifelong marriage, we hang around each other long enough to overcome this resistance – helping and receiving help – even the sludge clear at the bottom, until we experience the joy of unresisted intimacy. Even then, we find it takes years. The last remnants of resistance take decades.

But overcoming this resistance is the heart of fellowship. It is how we function well with each other, like the members of a body enable the body to do so much more than the individual members could accomplish separated from each other. It is the essence of civilization itself.

If you can believe there is a Heaven, you will see that its existence requires the determination of its residents to overcome this kind of resistance. 1 Corinthians 13 indeed describes Love as a skill which we will need as much in Heaven as here.

It is for these reasons, I believe, that God created this amazing laboratory of relationship skills called Lifetime Monogamous Marriage. We don't have time to master every wall of resistance we see, but we do have enough time to master many walls, in one human being. So the project is to get us to pick one, and work on it our whole lives.

God knew we needed something to motivate us to pick that one, and then to stay with it through all the normal frustrations. Although there is nothing more gratifying than successfully helping another, the wait can be long enough that we need more immediate gratification to keep us faithful to that one single human.

So God invented sex. The greatest of all physical pleasures.

God also invented children, who give parents such joy largely because their wall of resistance is unsophisticated: parents can overcome them with simple punishments. Part of the reason childish resistance is weak is that children are so vulnerable, so dependent upon parental help for their very lives. Not only is it gratifying to have children so appreciate our help, but it is pretty obvious that without our help (when they are young) they will die. That gives us a sense of mission, of purpose. Responsibility.

Nothing is so gratifying, so rewarding as seeing another human being prosper as a result of our help. The more it cost us, the more our love flowered. To realize they could not have done it without us makes us feel our lives have not been in vain. We feel useful. That is

one of the great blessings of children.

Another is the intimate fellowship with another human being, which we experience so deeply with our own children, compared to others besides our spouse. Our children know our love for them, by our sacrifices for them.

Therefore, though they may still resist us somewhat for our ceaseless vision of how their lives may be better, and though they may briefly give greater heed to strangers whose motives are less benevolent, we parents, over the whole course of our children's lives, probably have as much influence over them as anybody; and are listened to by them probably more than they listen to anybody else.

Back to our spouses.

Our incentives to develop relationship skills were rather ingenious in their creation by God, if you think about it.

Our immediate motivation to commit to each other is sex.

Not just sex as Hollywood films it, but sex so pure that you don't even need to fantasize about someone other than who is before you, to experience it.

Sex so available that married couples get it more often than unmarried people who were too impatient to wait for the real deal. Or who didn't understand the whole reason for marriage.

After a year of sex, then come the babies, to carry through your commitment for many more years, even after sex wanes, if it does.

"So", you ask, "if sex is that great for bonding people together, why not take advantage of its power to bond me to several people? Isn't some bonding to many, *in addition* to special bonding to one, better than just special bonding to one?"

Sexual Union: More than Physical

There are two problems with that logic.

First, sex is not just physical. As much as many would actually like to pretend it is, we are not animals without souls. Sex makes something happen between two souls. The result can be wonderful or terrible, or in between, depending on the commitment of the souls to each other.

Let's look at one characteristic of sex that is such common knowledge that it is testified to by movies, songs, jokes, books, and experience: *not everyone automatically wants it with everybody. Most, in fact, resist it, at least initially.*

Even promiscuous people who never worry about disease or pregnancy (the kinds of people depicted in movies, books, etc.) will not automatically jump in bed with every good looking stranger. Some will, but for most, a condition must be met first. A condition which shows sex is not just physical, but is also very spiritual.

The condition: the parties to sex must be assured that there is some love. At least some minimum amount of respect.

We know this is not just concern for physical safety, since this is a condition required even by promiscuous people who ignore the threat of disease or physical abuse. For most, this is an inescapable requirement before people can really enjoy sex.

Even sex with someone who looks fabulous isn't enjoyable, if the person physically bonding with you hates you, despises you, dehumanizes you, or is visualizing someone else

being there instead of you.

This is proved by a familiar feature of romance stories in our media: what is called “the line”: assurance that you “love” your “partner”.

The very name, “the line”, announces that this persuasion is often deceitful. The fact that the term is in almost everyone’s vocabulary proves that it is common knowledge that the assurances needed to overcome resistance to sex are often deceitful. Often enough that all who engage in sex are warned not to be deceived.

Even on the threshold of marriage, couples must watch out for a pretense during the engagement which drops away after the vows, revealing cruelty.

However, to the extent spouses are truly committed to love each other for life, there is no danger of a “line”, according to our common understanding. Assuming treatment continues after the wedding about like before, friends are normally not suspicious of a bond based on deception.

When the deception upon which a bond is based is exposed, it produces the deepest heartbreak which human beings can experience.

Remember, this feature of sex stands alone, not dependent upon any fear of disease, physical abuse, or pregnancy. This is the common experience of promiscuous people who do not regard such hazards.

How could there be any clearer evidence that sexual pleasure is not just physical? That it has a spiritual dimension so vital that where it is missing, sex can give little pleasure?

Since sex is not just physical but requires real love, you can see that the quality of love dictates the quality of sex.

At the lowest extreme of the spectrum of quality are prostitutes who almost completely suppress their yearning for real love. They are content with mere money. Very literally, they “sell their souls”. That is, they starve their souls of the nourishment they need, for the sake of money. This is evident even if we do not count eternal consequences. Yet even they will not lie down for everybody. Even they require a little bit of assurance that the intentions of their clients are at least benevolent enough that the abuse of their bodies will stop with sex, and will not proceed through torture, injury, or death. (Only a little bit of assurance is all they can afford; prostitutes accept great danger from their “lovers”.)

As a result, it is a common feature of portrayals of prostitutes in our media that their actual enjoyment of sex is minimal. If they seem satisfied with their work, it is not pleasure that satisfies them, but money, according to common portrayals.

In fact, I don’t think I have ever seen prostitution justified, in media portrayals, with “why shouldn’t a woman be allowed an occupation that provides incredible pleasure and incredible money both?” Rather, the typical justification goes “she may be hard, cold, and cynical, but life has dealt her a bitter hand. She is continually used and abused. Her life is hard. Don’t blame her. Blame God.”

Many persuade themselves that prostitutes are justified, but hardly anyone even tries to persuade anybody that prostitutes experience sexual pleasure. Sexual pleasure, for prostitutes, barely and rarely exists, according to even the most favorable media portrayals of them. (Not counting portrayals in pornography, whose purpose is to feed fantasies, not address facts.)

The case seems pretty overwhelming that sexual pleasure cannot thrive on physical sensation alone, but requires a spiritual relationship.

Remember, I have already acknowledged this spiritual relationship can be fake. That is,

fornicators can enjoy real sexual pleasure even if they have deceived each other to create a pretense of real love where none exists. Pleasure can even occur for someone who sees not the person with him, but a fantasy of someone else, doing something else, thinking something else. But fantasy must end. When it does, the heart hardens. It freezes solid. Deceit must be exposed. When it does, the pain of heartbreak exceeds the former pleasure.

At the highest end of the spectrum of quality sexual pleasure are married couples who can absolutely trust each other to be there for each other as long as they live, no matter what their mood, no matter their health, no matter anything, because their commitment to each other is based not merely on how long an emotional feeling (called “being in love”) lasts, but on a reverence for God who commands lifetime self-sacrificial commitment no matter how they feel.

So much the better, if their God commands husbands to love their wives as much as Christ loved the church, enough to give his life for it, Ephesians 5:25.

It is ironic, from the perspective of the undeniable superior pleasure of sex within marriage, that our media often portrays fornication as more tantalizing!

How do they even do it, even if you can solve the puzzle of why they would want to do it? By portraying bedroom scenes only outside marriage, as if they do not occur within marriage; and by justifying adultery by showing passionate adulterous strangers competing with insensitive spouses: a portrayal opposite reality, as we can see from the foregoing facts.

Sex is always in the context of a human relationship, so that the quality of sex depends on the quality of the relationship. Marriage is the ultimate relationship. The poorer the relationship, the more dehumanization is likely to be present.

The more commitment, the more romance. The more dehumanization, the more sex is perverted into something tragic, sometimes disgusting.

Understanding Lust

Does God show us clearly where He has drawn a line between looking and “lust”? There are a few somewhat frightening verses indicating there is such a line.

Job 31:1 *I made a covenant [contract] with mine eyes; why then should I think upon a maid?*

So, what were the terms of that contract?

In the next passage, Jesus said there is a difference between “looking” and “lusting”, and that difference is so critical that if you can’t figure out that difference and control your eyes you are far better off blind! This context indicates “lust” means to will, or choose, to commit adultery. That is, were there opportunity, you would have already committed adultery with her. Material marketed as pornography is marketed with the express intention that you have an actual sexual experience with quite a large number of women, though without their physical presence. It is the ultimate dehumanization.

*Matthew 5:27 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: 28 But I say unto you, That **whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.** 29 And if thy right eye offend thee, [cause you to turn back from the path toward God; the image is of a boulder which has fallen and blocked the narrow mountain path you are on, making it impossible to continue on that path, forcing you to turn back] **pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.***

Romans, below, links “lust” with “covet”, from Moses 10th Commandment. “Covet”

means, in that context, to want what belongs to your neighbor. If that is what it means, it turns out that Jesus was not, after all, introducing some new law, but only pointing out a logical connection between the 7th commandment (against adultery) and the 10th in the same way any pastor today draws lessons from comparisons of verses.

Rom 7:7 What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

Here is Moses' 10th Commandment, so you can see how its context defines "covet" as wanting what is your neighbor's:

Exodus 20:17 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.

Here is another New Testament passage with different words but the same message: be content with what is yours.

1Thessalonians 4:3 For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication: 4 That every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour; 5 Not in the lust of concupiscence, [Gr: longing for what is forbidden] even as the Gentiles which know not God: 6 That no man go beyond and defraud his brother in any matter: because that the Lord is the avenger of all such, as we also have forewarned you and testified. 7 For God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness.

Solomon warned that an adulterer is hated more than a thief. That is no less true today, despite our "enlightened" tolerance of "free love". If it is your property stolen, compared with if it is your wife violated, there is no comparison which will more readily make your blood boil!

*Proverbs 6:23 For the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; and reproofs of instruction are the way of life: 24 To keep thee from the evil woman, from the flattery of the tongue of a strange woman. 25 **Lust not after her beauty in thine heart;** neither let her take thee with her eyelids. 26 For by means of a whorish woman a man is brought to a piece of bread: and **the adulteress will hunt for the precious life.** 27 Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burned? 28 Can one go upon hot coals, and his feet not be burned? 29 **So he that goeth in to his neighbour's wife; whosoever toucheth her shall not be innocent.** 30 Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry; 31 But if he be found, he shall restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house. 32 But whoso committeth adultery with a woman lacketh understanding: he that doeth it destroyeth his own soul. 33 A wound and dishonour shall he get; and his reproach shall not be wiped away. 34 For jealousy is the rage of a man: therefore he will not spare in the day of vengeance. 35 He will not regard any ransom; neither will he rest content, though thou givest many gifts.*

And yet mere "looking" is not condemned by God. In fact even God's Book chronicles a few particularly attractive women.

Job 42:15 And in all the land were no women found so fair as the daughters of Job: and their father gave them inheritance among their brethren.

1Ki 1:1 Now king was and stricken in years; and they covered him with clothes, but he gat no heat. **2** Wherefore his servants said unto him, Let there be sought for my lord the king a young virgin: and let her stand before the king, and let her cherish him, and let her lie in thy bosom, that my lord the king may get heat. **3** So they sought for a fair damsel throughout all the coasts of Israel, and found Abishag a Shunammite, and brought her to the king. **4** And the damsel was very fair, and cherished the king, and ministered to him: but the king knew her not.

Gen 12:10 And there was a famine in the land: and Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there; for the famine was grievous in the land. **11** And it came to pass, when he was come near to enter into Egypt, that he said unto his wife, Behold now, I know that thou art a fair woman to look upon: **12**

Therefore it shall come to pass, when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they shall say, This *is* his wife: and they will kill me, but they will save thee alive. **13** Say, I pray thee, thou *art* my sister: that it may be well with me for thy sake; and my soul shall live because of thee. **14** And it came to pass, that, when Abram was come into Egypt, the Egyptians beheld the woman that she *was* very fair. **15** The princes also of Pharaoh saw her, and commended her before Pharaoh: and the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house.

From the preceding verses we see the line drawn not at what you look at, but what you desire as you look. Or, it is not what you see, but how you look. But that raises an inescapable question for anyone who attempts to live by this difference: *how much can you look at, without affecting how you look?* For example, can you buy pornography, and “enjoy God’s beauty”, without lusting? If you can, why not? Or how about materials not marketed as pornography but yet which have scenes that are pretty suggestive? Or even common TV or newspaper ads which deliberately target the male hormone market?

The following Bible study shows God does have clearly defined limits to how much either men or women ought to expose their flesh, and by today’s standards God is incredibly conservative! Although God’s judgment explicitly falls only upon the yearning for “forbidden fruit”, and not upon looking alone, God’s dress standards are a warning that looking at flesh exposed beyond His limits is not safe.

When an immodest scene flashes across the TV screen unannounced, or when a woman walks up to you with too much showing, it is impossible not to see it at least briefly. But when you turn for a longer look, you make a choice which may not be safe.

Before we get to the Bible study on God’s limits to modesty, let me point out how even Hollywood, and even the social norms of our hedonistic society, confirm the danger of looking too long at too much.

Watch Hollywood stars in film or TV. Even when a starlet is immodest, the man’s eyes are always on her face. You do not see the man’s eyes pointing down. There are scenes showing what is down there, implying the man sees it, but when the camera returns to the man’s eyes they are not looking below the neck except where adultery is beginning, and even rarely then.

Where a man is shown looking at more, without the woman’s provocation, the woman is shown afraid, trying to get away. This is real life. Even when a woman dresses to excite sin, the quickest way a man can make her afraid is to look too long at what she reveals without her prior invitation. A man who does that is hated and despised by everyone.

This is Hollywood’s ultimate hypocrisy: to show you things you should not see, and rake in your dollars for showing you, all the while fully understanding the social mores against it.

Oh, and a word about that “prior invitation” business: when you find a woman who is not afraid when a strange man “stares” at what she should not have revealed, but rather is pleased or excited, that does not make it safe, for either the man or the woman! Proverbs 6:26 warns the man. What can warn the woman, if all experience, evidence, common sense, and divine commandment cannot? If you can dehumanize a prostitute you don’t know enough to be content with her “choice”, try to imagine loving her as much as your own daughter and see if you can still stomach the fate of a life cut short by disease if not shorter by violence, in a world devoid of self sacrificial love, but only containing a pretense of human decency which lasts about half an hour before its mask comes off revealing, as often as not, contempt at best, and brutality at worst.

Lest there be any doubt at how cruelly the world displays temptation only to jeer at anyone caught in it, Jay Leno made it clear during the first speech by Sarah Palin when Senator John McCain first invited her to run as Vice President in 2008. He showed a clip of Senator McCain standing behind her and smiling, and for about 1 full second his eyes appeared to look below her belt somewhere, and Leno’s film editors added a white dotted line with an arrow to enhance where they assumed he was looking. What was even more ominous than that was that the audience laughed. Is, indeed, the world, which spends more on pornography than on politics, quicker than God to judge any man who even

notices their temptations for one second?

And Sarah Palin wasn't even immodestly dressed! It's not as if McCain was doing something perverted!

Typical of the devil. He is in more of a hurry to trip you than God. In fact, James 1 assures us God does not trip us. He only warns us where the devil's traps are. It is the world which waits like vultures for you to fall, and then feasts on your decayed dignity.

Now to the Bible study. These are my notes, with excerpts from the book Christian Modesty and the Public Undressing of America, by Jeff Pollard, (The Vision Forum, Inc.: San Antonio, Texas) p. 25-26

This shirt-like garment usually had **long sleeves, and extended down to the ankles when worn as a dress coat. 'Hard-working men, slaves, and prisoners wore them more abbreviated – sometimes even to their knees, and without sleeves --.'** (*Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary*, s.v. "Dress," by Frederick Owen and Steven Barabas.") Several well known lexicons echo that it was "[the] principal ordinary garment of man and woman, worn next to the skin (*The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew-English Lexicon*, [Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1979])...a long shirt-like garment usually of linen (*James Strong, Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, [Nashville: Abingdon, 1890])...Adam's was made of fur." (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, Vol 1, s.v. "Kuttonet" by Gleason J. Archer, Jr.) The **kuttonet resembled the Roman 'tunic' corresponding most nearly to our 'long shirt,' reaching below the knees always, and, in case it was designed for dress occasions, reaching almost to the ground;** (*The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 2, s.v. "Dress," by George B. Eager.) while the simplest kind was sleeveless, reaching only to the knees. (*Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1, s.v. "Dress" by Edgar C. James.) Another description tells us that it was made of linen or wool and reached down to the knees or to the ankles. (*New Bible Dictionary*, s.v. "Dress," by C. de Wit.) **All these sources agree regarding the kuttonet: it covered the body from at least the neck to the knees, while sometimes reaching mid-calf or all the way to the feet.**

Pollard observes that "In other words, God did *not* give a fur bikini to represent our righteousness and salvation. Moreover, this was not the only time God used this design." (p. 26) God describes how He covered the Mosaic priests:

Ex 28:3 And thou shalt speak unto all that are wise hearted, whom I have filled with the spirit of wisdom, that they may make Aaron's garments to consecrate him, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office. 4 And these are the garments which they shall make; a breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a broidered coat, a mitre, and a girdle: and they shall make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, and his sons, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office.

Alfred Edersheim: How did Jesus dress?

Three, or else four articles commonly constituted the dress of the body. First came the undergarment, commonly the *Chaluq* or the *Kittuna* (the Biblical *Kethoneth*), from which later some have derived the word 'cotton.' The *Chaluq* might be of linen or of wool. The sages wore it down to the feet. It was covered by the upper garment or *Talith* to within about a handbreadth. The *Chaluq* lay close to the body, and had no other opening than that round the neck and for the arms. At the bottom it had a kind of hem. To possess only one such 'coat' or inner garment was a mark of poverty. Hence, when the Apostles were sent on their temporary mission, they were directed not to take 'two coats.' Closely similar to, if not identical with, the *Chaluq*, was the ancient garment mentioned in the Old Testament as *Kethoneth* to which the Greek '*Chiton*' corresponds. As the garment which our Lord wore, and those of which He spoke to His Apostles are designated by that name, we conclude that

it represents the well-known *Kethoneth* or Rabbinic *Kittuna*. This might be of almost any material, even leather, though it was generally of wool or flax...We can now form an approximate idea of the outward appearance of Jesus on that spring-morning amidst the throng at Capernaum. He would, we may safely assume, go about in the ordinary, although not in the more ostentatious, dress, worn by the Jewish teachers of Galilee...The *Chalug*, or more probably the *Kittuna*, which formed His inner garment, must have been close-fitting, and descended to His feet. Since it was not only so worn by teachers, but was, regarded as absolutely necessary for any one who could publicly read or ‘Targum’ the Scriptures, or exercise any function in the Synagogue. (Alfred Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, [New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1904], 622, 624)

Even the martyrs in Heaven are clothed neck to feet, even though sexual temptations are surely no longer a factor since there are no longer any marital relations, Matthew 22:30.

Revelation 6:11 And white **robes** were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellowservants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they *were*, should be fulfilled.

Online Bible Greek Lexicon: 4749 stolh stole *stol-ay*

from [4724](#); TDNT-7:687,1088; n f

AV-robe 5, long clothing 1, long garment 1, them + [848](#) 1, long robe 1; 9

1) an equipment

2) an equipment in clothes, clothing

2a) spec. a loose outer garment for men extending to the feet, worn by kings, priests, and persons of rank

Hard working men, not working where women could see them, worked in their underclothes, which left their arms exposed, and their legs below their knees. But the Bible describes them as “naked” and it was shameful to so appear in the presence of women or even in the presence of important men.

Pollard writes,

Burton Scott Easton says, “Both the Greek and Hebrew forms mean ‘without clothing,’ but in both languages they are used frequently in the sense of ‘lightly clad’ or, simply, ‘without an outer garment.’” Thomas Boston observed that “the Hebrews call him naked who hath cast off his upper garment.” (*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia Vol III, s.v. “Naked,”* by Burton Scott Easton. Boston, *Garments*, 237.

Peter quickly covered his “nakedness” when not one woman was present, but only Jesus! John 21:7.

Isaiah walked “naked and barefoot” 3 years to show the imminent fate of Egyptians and Ethiopians for their sins; except that the “nakedness” of Isaiah was only that he did not wear his outer garment of burlap, but when Assyria would later lead away Egyptians and Ethiopians into captivity it would be “even with their buttocks uncovered”. (The Online Bible lexicons explain that *qv*, (*sak*), the Hebrew word for “sackcloth”, means a coarse sack used for grain, worn in mourning or humiliation, and has a link to the related Greek word *sakkov* (*sak’-kos*) which has more detail: “of Hebrew origin... a receptacle for holding or carrying various things, as money, food, etc.; a coarse cloth, **a dark course stuff made especially from the hair of animals**; a garment of the like material, and clinging to the person like a sack, which was wont to be worn (or **drawn over the tunic instead of the cloak or**

mantle) by mourners, penitents, suppliants and also by those who like the Hebrew prophets, lead an austere life.”

King Saul “stripped off his clothes”, 1 Samuel 19:24, and prophesied.

King David was “girded with a linen ephod” when he “danced before the Lord” in public, 2 Samuel 6:14-22, but one of his wives complained that he “uncovered himself to day in the eyes of the handmaids”, “shamelessly”. David responded that he was willing “to be base in mine own sight” before the Lord. The event was the carrying of the Ark of the Covenant into Jerusalem.

God associates this degree of “nakedness” with “shame” and associates it with the behavior of prostitutes. Examples: Isaiah 47:3, Nahum 3:5, Ezekiel 16:35-37, Revelation 3:18.

Isn’t it interesting that people will strip down for beaches and parties and parade proudly, but the same people, marched away just as naked as captives in war, would be ashamed? One difference may be who is watching. In the same sense that a prostitute who behaves proudly before a client cringes in shame before her father or a preacher, watch how God deals with a loose woman: (Actually the “harlot” described here is a metaphor for the nation of Israel which commits “adultery” with cruel false gods):

Ezekiel 16:37 Behold, therefore I will gather all thy lovers, with whom thou hast taken pleasure, and all them that thou hast loved, **with all them that thou hast hated**; I will even gather them round about **against thee**, and will discover thy nakedness unto them, that they may see all thy nakedness.

Pagans in Bible times dress like Americans today. Pollard quotes “Fashion expert Alison Lurie” as writing “Historically ...shame seems to have played very little part in development of costume. In ancient Egypt, Crete, and Greece, the naked body was not considered immodest; slaves and athletes habitually went without clothing, while people of high rank wore garments that were cut and draped so as to show a good deal when in motion.” (*Alison Lurie, The Language of Clothes, (New York: Random House, 1981), 212-214.*)

In Luke 8:26-35, a man possessed by demons was naked. After Jesus cured him and he was “in his right mind”, he was “clothed”.

Pollard thoroughly traces the history of “the Undressing of America”. Here is one short example he gives from a book about swimwear:

...in part thanks to the influence of the more daringly cut French swimsuits, the American bathing costume underwent a revolution. Until that time, bathing attire had been modeled on streetwear...by the 1890-s, however, underwear began a relentless if slow migration outward that would come to a full, triumphal exposure in the bikini of the 1960s. ...what the conceivers of the suit strove to suppress was the natural association between underwear and swimwear, a cogent and undeniable comparison. It was also true that the women’s swimwear industry in its early stages was closely affiliated with the bra and girdle industry, just as men’s wear for swimming was intimately, as it were, connected with the underwear business. (*Richard Martin and Harold Koda, Splash! A History of Swimwear; [New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc, 1990], 58.*)

Pollard quotes Richard Baxter: 66

Women should be especially aware of how their clothing impacts men; because generally speaking, men are far more visually oriented than women. Richard Baxter wisely commented that women sin when their clothing tends “to the ensnaring of the minds of the beholders in *shameless*, lustful, wanton passions, though you say, you intend it not, it is your sin, that you do that which probably will procure it, yea, that you did not your best to avoid it. And though it be their sin and vanity that is the cause, it is nevertheless your sin to be the unnecessary occasion: for you must consider that you live among diseased souls! And you must not lay a stumbling-block in their way, nor blow up the fire of their lust, nor make your ornaments their snares; but you must walk among sinful persons, as you would do with a candle

among straw or gunpowder; or else you may see the flame which you would not foresee, when it is too late to quench it.” He goes on to admonish women, saying, “You should rather serve Christ with your apparel, by expressing humility, self-denial, chastity, and sobriety, to draw others to imitate you in good, than to serve the devil, and pride, and lust by it, by drawing men to imitate you in evil.” It is quite rare to find a woman who actually understands the effect her clothing has on others. Many truly do not grasp that they are candles among gunpowder.

Richard Baxter, A Christian Directory in Baxter’s Practical Works Vol 1, (London: George Virtue; reprint ed., Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1990), 392.

p. 67

Thomas Brooks also warned that “they that borrowed the fashions of the Egyptians may get their boils and blothes. Certainly such as fear the Lord should go in no apparel, but, first, such as they are willing to die in; secondly, to appear before the Ancient of Days in...thirdly, to stand before a judgment-seat.” Brooks, London’s Lamentations, 52.

It was a Culture War with real physical casualties. With every additional square inch of flesh revealed which previously was unthinkable in American culture, over each round of public contention, real social costs were levied, up to and including increasing real crime which snuffed out real physical lives.

During the first decade of the 1900’s, women’s arms were bared. This seems laughable against what is bared today, but then it was turbulent, and Biblically “naked”.

Through the 1920’s, legs and backs were progressively bared.

Cleavage, exposing tops of breasts, (or maybe this word means baring skin between the breasts) appeared in the 1930’s. Women’s overskirts were jettisoned on the beach. Legal restrictions protecting public modesty were regularly challenged and all but discarded. Men exposed their chests; which had previously been illegal. The first two-piece women’s bathing suit appeared in fashion magazines in 1935, baring a few inches of flesh between the two pieces, but that didn’t become popular until the 1940’s. New fabrics were invented which made it possible to cling more tightly to the body, showing more curves.

During the 1940’s and 1950’s the two pieces got farther apart. The Maillot was a one piece suit with holes revealing the midriff and sides. Elasticated knits clung more tightly. Costumes were skin tight while designers could still say the skin under them was technically “covered”. Suits crept lower on the bosom and higher on the leg. Straps were stripped off. Shoulders bared. Bosoms and waistlines, skin tight.

During this time men with cameras made these smiling “nudes” a merchandising tool for everything from automobiles to political campaigns.

The navel was exposed in the 1960’s and 1970’s. In the 1970’s suits rose above the leg to reveal hips. One piece suits managed to expose all the way from the thigh to the waist.

In the 1980’s and 1990’s, thongs revealed breasts and buttocks.

(p. 42-44)

Dehumanization: Dark Delights

The second reason union, with many, undermines
the hope of Holy Union with one.

The second reason promiscuity perverts the sexual relationship with your One and Only is related to the first reason. Because of the human hunger for a good relationship, if the relationship is poor there must be a pretense that it is good, or the sex will not be “good”. That is why people who have the least respect for committed relationships, who are most determined to treat sex like a source of animal pleasure, engage in “visualization” or “fantasy”. That is, while consummating sex with the person actually with them, they “visualize” a different person who may have previously existed, or who never existed except in a “dirty” picture.

You may not find this a comfortable subject. It would be unnecessary, if God saying “don’t commit adultery” were enough for you. You wouldn’t need to know the morally disgusting swamps you would avoid. But “don’t do it” isn’t enough. You want reasons. You want evidence. So now you will finally get what you want. But our search for evidence will take you past smelly pastures.

Pornography is an industry entirely devoted to serving this process of “visualization”. Pornography provides not only a focus of concentration for the eyes, but a fictional story for the mind to substitute for reality. It should be obvious that if your sexual “partner” is fantasizing about someone else, his relationship with you is dehumanizing. It should be obvious that to the extent a married relationship is entirely free of this perversion, it offers the most joyful kind of sex.

In our society, there is no question of *if* your “partner” has been exposed to pornography, but *how much*. Even without ever purchasing hard core porn, there is enough material in movies, TV, and songs to provide material for visualization. America has disrobed quite a bit since the 1930’s when it was still illegal for a man to be naked from his waist up in public. If, in addition, you have been promiscuous, you have those memories to compete with the reality before you.

For this reason, we must speak even of sex within marriage as pure only in degree. It is *to the extent* sex in marriage is free of fantasies induced by memories of former affairs, filthy stories or pictures, that sex in marriage has the joy I have described. Obviously the spouses with the best shot at such joy were virgins when married, who have scrupulously avoided pornography, soap operas, romance novels, etc.

Even the most promiscuous people, who are not the least ashamed of dehumanizing their sexual partners, still cannot escape their hunger for a real human relationship. It’s just that they replace reality with fantasy. “Fetish” is an industry-wide word for the most perverted of fornicators. A “fetish” is a visualization so insatiable that it does not apologize, but parades right out in front of everybody. Like whipping or being whipped, or being poked in a cage. Or imprisoning your victim with leather straps.

There is a whole category of such literature where the sex act includes killing your victim. A “snuff film” is a movie wherein the victim portrayed as killed in the movie, as part of sexual gratification, was actually killed in real life as the film was rolling. There are even enough people who like sex with dead bodies that such criminals have their very own category.

A fetish consists not only of the outwardly visible shenanigans, but also the fictional story in the mind of the person acting all this out; a story of a fictional person with fictional longings, fictional qualities, which replace the real human being in the imagination of the pervert going through all this.

Fantasies begin with imagined justifications, then move to cruelty, sick stuff, and in too many cases, to real rape and murder. The name "Ted Bundy" is that of a convicted rapist/murderer who frankly confessed to James Dobson, before his execution, the contribution of pornography to his ruined life. His was only the most publicized such confession.

Christian martyrs report communist torturers who hold drunken, bloody orgies which leave rooms strewn with pieces of human bodies.

So there is definitely a wide variation in the quality of sex, which depends on the quality of the human relationship.

A relationship primarily of sex, with little spiritual dimension, little love, no commitment, is shallow, unfulfilling, and dehumanizing. Its pleasures are built on lies, which destroy hearts as the hormones subside. It treats human beings as if they were animals without souls. But they are not. We have souls. Souls which can be strangled by lies until they "die".

If you think sex with anyone is good because it can never be bad to "spiritually bond" with anyone, consider incest.

Now isn't that an interesting point? If you see no harm in sex with a strange man, because it surely must be good to spiritually bond with him, think about your revulsion for sex with your father. Don't you want to spiritually bond with your father? But that is an "abomination" to you, isn't it? "Abomination" means "morally disgusting".

Incest is not an abomination because of the "guilt trips" laid down by "organized religion". This is an abomination because daughters are so vulnerable if they can't even trust their own fathers! For a father to abuse so crucial a trust is the ultimate betrayal.

Why? Even if there were no Bible to condemn it, even if the Biblical list of "degrees of consanguinity" were not copied into Iowa law to make it illegal, what would still be wrong with it?

Here is an attempt to put it in words:

While there are good genetic reasons to shun incest among blood relations, the fundamental problem with incest is that it strikes at the soundness of the family. And since the family is central to God's purposes and work on earth, his judgment on this practice is fierce. Families simply cannot survive sexual intrigue among their members. Elwell, Walter A. ; Comfort, Philip Wesley: *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*.

Wheaton, Ill. : Tyndale House Publishers, 2001 (Tyndale Reference Library), S. 634

Just such a relationship is recorded as the origin of the tribes of Moab and Ammon, in Genesis 19. Lot's two daughters knew it was an abomination which their father would never do, sober, so they coaxed him to get drunk, so they could have children. The Moabites and the Ammonites came to be some of the worst of Israel's enemies. Deuteronomy 23:3-6.

Incest was again thoroughly condemned in 1 Corinthians 5.

Because all this is true even before we take into account sexually transmitted disease (STD) and pregnancy, disease seems the act of a God who cares about us enough to give us a disincentive to pervert sex away from the joy of a real committed relationship with a real human being.

But after we add STD's back into the mix, the cruel affections of the promiscuous are

the more apparent. There is no accountability for infecting another with a life-shortening disease in the name of “love”. Yet for any promiscuous person, it is normal; it is average; it is to be expected that deceit, added to infection, is offered as “love”.

Likewise with pregnancy. It is inconceivable to me that a woman could conceive and want to kill her baby, whom I would feel so honored to raise. To bring a human being into the world through what you call “love”, who must depend on you, when you have no intention of being dependable, dehumanizes that baby, and the other parent who is left with double responsibility when you walk out.

Meanwhile, sanctified sex, within marriage, is never followed by any of this betrayal or heartbreak. It is pleasure and real love, combined.

CONCLUSION

Adultery is a benefit without the cost – Pleasure without commitment – and stolen from another. It is like seizing someone else’s house, living in it, contaminating it, and then throwing it away. It is not what lovers do. It is what tyrants do.

Jesus said even if you don’t have the actual opportunity to commit adultery, but you would if you could, your heart is as wicked. That is what He meant when he said you commit adultery if you “lust after a woman in your heart”. Matthew 5. Besides bringing the spiritual condemnation of which He warned, lust plants fantasies in your soul which will tarnish your future sexual pleasure.

Jesus was not talking about merely noticing how pretty a woman is. Job’s daughters were the prettiest in the land, the Bible says in Job 42:15, so someone must have noticed, who was in good standing with God, to get that included in the Bible. Abraham’s wife was so beautiful, at the age of 90, that when he had to travel among a bunch of thugs who were in the habit of taking whatever they wanted, Abraham had to lie to them to save his life. Genesis 12.

It is healthy and good for a man to be attracted by a woman’s beauty so much that he is driven to ask her hand in marriage.

That doesn’t mean it is healthy to stare at the beauty of people who are immodestly dressed. That is where it turns sick. If you long for adultery, you are going to find Heaven very difficult. Because even in Heaven, the saints are modestly dressed: the “robes” described in Revelation 7 cover at least to the elbows and knees, and perhaps to the wrists and ankles.

Adultery is discontentment with the blessings and opportunities God has given you. If your very own wife is not enough to satisfy you, there is real danger that you have hardened your heart to perfection, to such an extent that even Heaven will not satisfy you.

That’s right, Heaven does not satisfy everyone. It does not satisfy Satan. Paradise did not satisfy Adam and Eve. God’s love does not satisfy people who persecute God’s ambassadors. Even Paul found that contentment with what God provides was something he had to learn.

Philippians 4:11 Not that I speak in respect of want: for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content.

God offers you your own spouse, to make the lesson of learning to be content as easy for you as anyone can imagine! If you can’t be content with that, you are pretty far gone. You will find fault with Heaven.

You will find yourself walking away from Heaven, even before St. Peter has a chance to throw you out, once you find out that no one will be allowed to hurt others, in Heaven.

Appendix

Albert Barnes, who published his Bible commentary in 1868, details the extent of pedophilia in the ancient world, and details the effects of disease generated by sodomy that were understood in 1868. This commentary is found under Romans 1:27:

And likewise the men ... - The sin which is here specified is what was the shameful sin of Sodom, and which from that has been called sodomy. It would scarcely be credible that man had been guilty of a crime so base and so degrading, unless there was ample and full testimony to it. Perhaps there is no sin which so deeply shows the depravity of man as this; none which would so much induce one "to hang his head, and blush to think himself a man." And yet the evidence that the apostle did not bring a railing accusation against the pagan world; that he did not advance a charge which was unfounded, is too painfully clear. It has been indeed a matter of controversy whether pæderasty, or the love of boys, among the ancients was not a pure and harmless love, but the evidence is against it. (See this discussed in Dr. Leland's *Advantage and Necessity of Revelation*, vol. i. 49-56.) The crime with which the apostle charges the Gentiles here was by no means confined to the lower classes of the people.

It doubtless pervaded all classes, and we have distinct specifications of its existence in a great number of cases. Even Virgil speaks of the attachment of Corydon to Alexis, without seeming to feel the necessity of a blush for it. Maximus Tyrius (*Diss.* 10) says that in the time of Socrates, this vice was common among the Greeks; and is at pains to vindicate Socrates from it as almost a solitary exception. Cicero (*Tuscul. Ques.* iv. 34) says, that "Dicearchus had accused Plato of it, and probably not unjustly." He also says (*Tuscul. Q.* iv. 33), that the practice was common among the Greeks, and that their poets and great men, and even their learned men and philosophers, not only practiced, but gloried in it. And he adds, that it was the custom, not of particular cities only, but of Greece in general. (*Tuscul. Ques.* v. 20.) Xenophon says, that "the unnatural love of boys is so common, that in many places it is established by the public laws."

He particularly alludes to Sparta. (See Leland's *Advantage*, etc. i. 56.) Plato says that the Cretans practiced this crime, and justified themselves by the example of Jupiter and Ganymede. (*Book of Laws*, i.) And Aristotle says, that among the Cretans there was a law encouraging that sort of unnatural love. (Aristotle, *Politic.* b. ii. chapter 10.) Plutarch says, that this was practiced at Thebes, and at Elis. He further says, that Solon, the great lawgiver of Athens, "was not proof against beautiful boys, and had not courage to resist the force of love." (*Life of Solon.*) Diogenes Laertius says that this vice was practiced by the Stoic Zeno. Among the Romans, to whom Paul was writing, this vice was no less common. Cicero introduces, without any mark of disapprobation, Cotta, a man of the first rank and genius, freely and familiarly owning to other Romans of the same quality, that this worse than beastly vice was practiced by himself, and quoting the authority of ancient philosophers in vindication of it. (*De Natura Deorum*, b. i. chapter 28.) It appears from what Seneca says (*epis.* 95) that in his time it was practiced openly at Rome, and without shame.

He speaks of flocks and troops of boys, distinguished by their colors and nations; and says that great care was taken to train them up for this detestable employment. Those who may wish to see a further account of the morality in the pagan world may find it detailed in Tholuck's "Nature and moral Influence of Heathenism," in the *Biblical Repository*, vol. ii., and in Leland's *Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation*. There is not the least evidence that this abominable vice was confined to Greece and Rome. If so common there, if it had the sanction even of their philosophers, it may be presumed that it was practiced elsewhere, and that the sin against nature was a common crime throughout the pagan world. Navaratte, in his account of the empire of China (*book ii.* chapter 6), says that it is extremely common among the Chinese. And there is every reason to believe, that both in the old world and the new, this abominable crime is still practiced. If such was the state of the pagan world, then surely the argument of the apostle is well sustained, that there was need of some other plan of

salvation than was taught by the light of nature.

That which is unseemly - That which is shameful, or disgraceful.

And receiving in themselves ... - The meaning of this doubtless is, that the effect of such base and unnatural passions was, to enfeeble the body, to produce premature old age, disease, decay, and an early death. That this is the effect of the indulgence of licentious passions, is amply proved by the history of man. The despots who practice polygamy, and keep harems in the East, are commonly superannuated at forty years of age; and it is well known, even in Christian countries, that the effect of licentious indulgence is to break down and destroy the constitution. How much more might this be expected to follow the practice of the vice specified in the verse under examination! God has marked the indulgence of licentious passions with his frown. Since the time of the Romans and the Greeks, as if there had not been sufficient restraints before, he has originated a new disease, which is one of the most loathsome and distressing which has ever afflicted man, and which has swept off millions of victims. But the effect on the body was not all. It tended to debase the mind; to sink man below the level of the brute; to destroy the sensibility; and to “sear the conscience as with a hot iron.” The last remnant of reason and conscience, it would seem, must be extinguished in those who would indulge in this unnatural and degrading vice. See Suetonius’ Life of Nere, 28.