



The truth about sexual lust; Part 5.



“SEXUAL IMMORALITY,” Part 2

Before listing those things Stephen Arterburn and Fred Stoeker dredge from their swamp of personal hang-ups and include under the vague, unscriptural umbrella of “sexual immorality,” let’s drive the last nail and hammer home the Scriptural meaning of *porneia*.

Again, *porneia* is the noun. Jesus used it in Matthew 5:32 to teach the only reason a man could divorce his wife. We also looked at the same word in its verb form, namely,

porneuo, which means to do the thing. This is the form Paul uses twice in 1 Corinthians, chapter 10, warning the Corinthians not to “commit prostitution” (CLNT). This prostitution, we now know, involved men putting their penises inside the vaginas of cult prostitutes.

Now we turn to the third Scriptural form of the word, describing the person who engages in *porneia*. This form of the word is *porne*, and it is translated “prostitute” 11 times in the Concordant Literal New Testament. The only variation from this consistency is the rendering of *pornos* as “paramour” 10 times in the *Concordant Literal New Testament*, to define a male prostitute.

A law of language dictates that the various forms of a word cannot mean more or less than their root form. Consider, for instance, “day,” and “daily.” “Day” is the noun, “daily” the adjective. The adjective, “daily,” cannot mean something different than its noun, “day.” That is, if “day” means “day,” then “daily” has to do with a day. “Daily” cannot suddenly mean “hourly.”

As inconsistent as the NIV is with the translation of *porneia*, it can’t help but translate *porne* “prostitute” in 1 Corinthians 6:15, which is the correct rendering. Remarkably, however, from verses 16-20, where the verb form of the word (*porneia*) appears, the NIV reverts to the vague and meaningless “sexual immorality” (verse 18), and then unaccountably translates it yet another way, “sins sexually,” also in verse 18.

I quote this entire passage because from this we can easily see not only the inconsistency of the NIV (an inconsistency fueling and wrongly justifying Arterburn’s and Stoeker’s sex crusade), but also Paul’s allusions to the spiritual prostitution associated with men putting their penises into the vaginas of cult-prostitutes, leading 24,000 people away from the true God (i.e. “idolatry”).

Here is that passage from the NIV. I have pointed out all forms of the Greek word *porneia*:

15 Do you not know that you bodies are members of Christ himself? Shall I then take the members of Christ and unite them with a prostitute (*porne*)? Never!

16 Do you not know that he who unites himself with a prostitute (*porne*), becomes one flesh?

17 But he who unites himself with the Lord is one with him in spirit.

18 Flee sexual immorality (*porneia*). All other sins a man commits are outside his body, but he who sins sexually (*porneia*) sins against his own body.

19 Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy spirit, who is in you, whom you have received from God? You are not your own;

20 You were bought at a price. Therefore honor God with your body.

The NIV was forced to make the first two occurrences of *porne* “prostitute,” because a “sexually immoral” person did not fit the context. After all, when a man unites himself with a person who is merely sexually immoral (in some vague, undefined way), does he become one flesh with her? No. There must be sexual penetration. The NIV is right here. But why do the NIV translators suddenly become interpreters and stop consistently translating the same exact word (*porne*), though now in its verb form (*porneia*)?

In other words, why do they make *porne* “prostitute,” but make *porneia*, “sexual immorality?” If *porne* is “prostitute,” then *porneia* cannot rightfully be anything but “prostitution.” This accords with the laws of language (i.e.

“day,” and “daily”) Is there a version of Scripture that translates in accord with the laws of language? There is.

Here is the same passage from the *Concordant Literal New Testament*:

15 Are you not aware that your bodies are members of Christ? Taking, then, the members of Christ away, should I be making them members of a prostitute (*porne*)? May it not be coming to that!

16 Or are you not aware that he who joins a prostitute (*porne*) is one body? For, He is averring, the two will be one flesh.

17 Now he who joins the Lord is one spirit.

18 Flee from prostitution (*porneia*). The penalty of every sin, whatsoever a man should be doing is outside of the body, yet he who is committing prostitution (*porneia*) is sinning against his own body.

19 Or are you not aware that your body is a temple of the holy spirit in you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own?

20 For you are bought with a price. By all means glorify God in your body.”

What is so hard about translating consistently?

What would be the reason for not translating consistently? An agenda, perhaps?

Here is a comparison of the NIV and the CLNT. Notice the inconsistency in the NIV, and the beauty (and common sense) of consistency in the CLNT:

VERSE 15

NIV: “... unite them with a prostitute (*porne*)”

CLNT: “... making them members of a prostitute (*porne*)”

VERSE 16

NIV: “... unites himself with a prostitute (*porne*)”

CLNT: “...joins a prostitute (*porne*)”

VERSE 18

NIV: “Flee sexual immorality (*porneia*).”

CLNT: “Flee from prostitution (*porneia*).”

VERSE 18

NIV: “He who sins sexually (*porneia*) sins against his own body.”

CLNT: “He who is committing prostitution (*porneia*) is sinning against his own body.

The reference to “your body is a temple” in verse 19, should not be lost on anyone. Paul is comparing Christ dwelling in us to the practice of the cult-prostitutes who drew men into the worship of false gods.

Paul says, “he who joins” a prostitute “is one body” with



the prostitute. The joining here is literal, that is, it's the sexual union between a male and a female that has the penis of the man entering the vagina of a woman. This is what makes a man and a woman one flesh; it does not happen when they hold hands, it does not happen when they kiss, and it does not happen when they sexually fantasize about one another, or sit on the couch watching R-rated videos, or look at erotic photographs of one another. We are clearly talking about intercourse.

Why are we talking about intercourse? Because the comparison is, "he who joins the Lord is one spirit." Even Arterburn and Stoeker would admit that joining the Lord is more than just reading about Him, or using His name, or going to church. It is an intimate relationship. And yet, while admitting to this, they make *porneia* to be things as innocent as looking at bra ads in the newspaper and watching "sexy," R-rated videos.

"He who is committing *porneia* is sinning against his own body." How can a man looking at bra ads in the newspaper be sinning against his own body? This is a matter of flesh penetrating flesh, not eyeballs gazing upon paper, or upon a woman running down the sidewalk in Spandex.

"The penalty of every sin, whatsoever a man should be doing is outside of the body." Looking at a bra ad is outside of the body, and so is watching a woman run. It is all outside the body. Prostitution, however, is a sin that involves the coming together of two bodies. Thus, prostitution, according to Paul's context, is inside the body.

The CLNT is not the only consistent version translating *porneia* and it various forms consistently. *Young's Literal Translation* also gets it right:

- 15 Have ye not known that your bodies are members of Christ? Having taken, then, the members of the Christ, shall I make them members of **an harlot?** (*porne*). Let it not be!
- 16 Have ye not known that he who is joined to **the harlot** (*porne*) is one body? "For they shall be—saith He—the two for one flesh."
- 17 And he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit;
- 18 flee the **whoredom** (*porneia*); every sin—whatever a man may commit—is without the body, and he who is **committing whoredom** (*porneia*), against his own body doth sin.

Here are our three translations under consideration—from worst to best—and their treatment of *porne* and its

related form (*porne* being the noun, and *porneia* being the verb) from the four references from 1 Corinthians 6:15-18. I have highlighted the most damaging translation (NIV) in dark face type—the translation that has sent Arterburn and Stoeker on their mission of error—

	NIV	YL	CLNT
<i>porne</i>	prostitute	harlot	prostitute
<i>porneia</i>	prostitute sexual immorality sins sexually	harlot whoredom committing whoredom	prostitute prostitution committing prostitution

I am taking so much time making a case for consistent translating because it is vitally important to your peace and freedom in Christ. It is important in protecting you from Arterburn's and Stoeker's personal mission against, and fear of, all things sexual. As you can see, it is the faulty rendering of the NIV that has given Stephen Arterburn and Fred Stoeker license to make *porneia* whatever they want it to be, which is precisely what they do. Thus, they have built their entire book (*Every Man's Battle*)—including all of its stern warnings against "sexual immorality"—on a faulty foundation. This would not bother me so much, except that



thousands of men have, without question or investigation, taken the words of Arterburn and Stoeker and the grammatically-warped NIV as gospel truth. The result is that thousands of men have entered upon an unnatural and thus unnecessary sexual battle against their natural, God-given instincts, at the same time jeopardizing their marriages by harboring resentment against their wives, who for the most part promote this course.



If *porne* is specifically and obviously a prostitute in verses 15 and 16 of 1 Corinthians 6 (even the NIV admits that), then the two occurrences of *porneia* (the verb form of *porne*) in verse 18, by the laws of language, *must* be “prostitution.” It’s that simple. We understand it clearly in real-world cases. Why is it that we somehow lose our minds when it comes to Scripture?

For instance, we have a specific English word for a person who propels him or herself through the water, and it is “swimmer.” This is the noun. The verb form is “swim,” and the thing itself is called “swimming.” Same word, different forms. Now let’s say someone writes a book, warning people with a fear of water (there actually is such a thing; it’s called, “aquaphobia”) against swimming. Here is a passage from that hypothetical book—

If you have aquaphobia, would you want to be a *swimmer*? I would hope not! Why would you even want to hang out with other *swimmers*? Flee *swimming*, because every aquaphobic who *swims* is sinning against his or her own fear.

Now let’s say an esteemed writer wants to translate this book into another language. This esteemed writer is looking at the English book, and sees the word “swim” (verb) and its various forms, including “swimming,” (a noun; the thing done) and “swimmer” (also a noun; the person who

does the thing.) The writer translates “swimmer” correctly into the target language, both times, making it “swimmer.” But when this translator gets to the other forms of the word (“swimming” and “swims”) he decides to get creative and take literary license. Why? This hypothetical writer doesn’t like any kind of physical activity. The author, himself, is weak, frail, and allergic to exercise, and he believes most people should avoid exerting themselves. Here, then, is the resultant translation—

If you have aquaphobia, would you want to be a swimmer? I would hope not! Why would you even want to hang out with other swimmers? Flee every sport, because every aquaphobic who partakes in sports is sinning against his or her own fear.

Because this person is esteemed in his native country, everyone reading his book (with no access to the original), takes him seriously and stops engaging in any and all physical activity. Before long, thousands of people are becoming unnecessarily sedentary, all because the translator took a liberty and inserted a personal bias, based on his own weakness, personal qualms and hang-ups, into his translation.

What would you do if you had a heart for people, and you found out about this crime? Would you not write a book to those poor people, making them aware of the original work and the original intention of the original author, and thus freeing them from a terrible prohibition there were never meant to bear?

* * *

The bottom line is that *porneia* ought to be translated “prostitution” across the board, that is, in every single occurrence where the word appears in scripture.

So what is prostitution?

The CLNT defines it as: “Unlawful intercourse of the sexes.”

The key word is “intercourse.” It is a man putting his penis into an illegal vagina. Prostitution not only includes cult-prostitution, but any such unlawful intercourse, such as that found in 1 Corinthians 5:1—

Absolutely, it is heard that there is prostitution among you, and such prostitution, which is not even named among the nations, so that someone has his father’s wife.

This sinner was not merely fantasizing about his father’s wife. He was not watching her jog in tight shorts.



He was not masturbating to pictures of her modeling bras in the women's undergarment section of *The Corinthian Gazette*.

"Someone *has* his father's wife." For the love of God, this man was putting his penis inside of the vagina of his father's wife.

I know you are probably getting tired of me using the terms, "penis," and "vagina." *Martin! Stop using the words "penis" and "vagina." We are tired of hearing them!*

I know you are tired of hearing them. I understand how tired you are of the words penis and vagina. The words penis and vagina are completely exhausting you; I get it.

Good! I want you to never forget them. Because every single occurrence of *porneia* in the Greek Scriptures has to do with penises entering illegal vaginas. From Old Testament days onward, God has never changed His definition of it. Prostitution (*porneia*), according to Scriptural usage, is "unlawful *intercourse* of the sexes."

There is no phrase in the entire Bible that says, "sexual immorality."

Let me repeat that, this time in boldface type:

There is no phrase in the entire Bible that says, "sexual immorality."

God would never leave it to us to decide what was right and wrong in an area as important and insistent as human sexuality.

Before I show you the short list of sexual things that God does prohibit, I have one more nail to add to the coffin that will convince you beyond a shadow of a doubt that

Arterburn and Stoeker have taken radical and damaging license with the specific sin of *porneia*.

I will soon be showing you a list of the improbable and crazy things that Arterburn and Stoeker consider to be *porneia*. You already know that looking at bra ads is one of the biggies. Watching women jog on the beach is, to these men, another serious form of *porneia*. Since these things are considered *porneia* by Arterburn and Stoeker, then certainly adultery and homosexuality must be included. Remember, the verse that they begin the entire book with is Ephesians 5:3, "But among you there must not be even a hint of sexual immorality ..." (pg. 9) Immediately following this, Stephen shares a terrible personal incidence of girl-watching from his car near the beach, where his "eyes locked on to this goddesslike blonde" (pg. 10), who was at the same time a "remarkable specimen of female athleticism," causing him to become "embarrassed, humiliated, saturated with guilt." In another part of the book, Fred weaves his traumatic yarn concerning, "a monster lurking about" (pg. 13), which turns out to be, "models posing in bras and panties" (pg. 13), who are "always smiling."

Here is 1 Corinthians 6:9-10, from Arterburn and Stoeker's version of choice, that is, the *New International Version*. For the various offenders of this passage, I have provided the corresponding Greek noun:

Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral (*pornos*) nor idolaters (*eidololatrias*) nor adulterers (*moichos*) nor male prostitutes (*malakon*) nor homosexual offenders (*arsenokoites*) nor thieves (*kleptes*) nor the greedy (*pleonektes*) nor drunkards (*methusos*) nor slanderers (*loidoros*) nor swindlers (*harpax*) will inherit the kingdom of God.

Question: If "sexually immorality" (*porneia*, and its various forms) includes every kind of sexual sin imaginable, including adultery and homosexuality, then why is the "sexually immoral" person, in this NIV context, listed separately along with adulterers and homosexuals?

Answer: It is because God is careful and specific, while Arterburn and Stoeker are reckless and have failed to do their homework. This verse proves that so-called "sexual immorality" is *distinct* from sins such as adultery and homosexuality.

Let's stick to the sexual sins of this passage. I already told you that Arterburn's and Stoeker's key phrase—the phrase they use throughout the book to challenge and condemn everyone to live in accord with God's supposed standards, namely, "sexual immorality"—appears nowhere



in properly translated Scripture. 1 Corinthians 6:9 is proof. To warn the “sexually immoral,” as the NIV does here, and then to incriminate (in *addition* to the sexually immoral) adulterers and homosexuals, is like saying, “All football players are prohibited from staying out past 10 p.m., and that goes for running backs and linebackers as well.”

A “sexually immoral” person, even according to this NIV context, is different from an adulterer. And an adulterer is different from a homosexual person. I don’t know how the NIV “translators” can look this passage in the eye and not see the mistake. I don’t know how Stephen Arterburn and Fred Stoeker can stare at this translation and go on their merry way using *porneia* to condemn everything from looking at underwear ads to admiring female fitness enthusiasts.

The NIV makes a mess of this passage; God is not so sloppy. Rather, God is so specific and careful that what He actually said in this passage (ignoring for a moment the nefarious nature of the characters listed here), is beautiful.

Here is how the CLNT translates 1 Corinthians 6:9; I’m sticking only with the sexual sinners:

Neither paramours (*pornos*) ... nor adulterers (*moichos*), nor catamites (*malakon*), nor sodomites (*arsenokoites*) ... shall be enjoying the allotment of God’s kingdom.
What fabulous precision.

A *pornos* is specifically a paramour, that is a male prostitute. A male prostitute is a man who sticks his penis into illegal vaginas. (The NIV is up to its usual “sexually immoral” trick here, not even realizing that the translation, in this passage, is unworkable.)

A *malakon* is most certainly not “a male prostitute.” *Pornos* is that, and we have already used that word in this very passage, not that anyone would know it from the rendering, “sexually immoral.” A *malakon* is a catamite. What is a catamite? I had to look it up myself. According to the *Oxford Dictionary* : a catamite is “a boy kept for homosexual practices.”

Wikipedia has: “A young man involved in a sexual relationship with an older man.”

The English element of this Greek word is “SOFT.” The Scriptural definition of catamite, according to the keyword concordance to the CLNT, is “a male used for unnatural purposes, joined with sodomite.”

Now I’m up to speed. In male-male relationships, one party plays the male, the other the female. The male player in this unholy alliance is the sodomite (*arsenokoites*) and the man playing the female role is the catamite (*malakon*). It is the sodomite, then, who puts his penis into the rectum of the catamite. Got it.

Oh, the marvelous specificity of God. In 1 Corinthians 6:9, God does not leave it for anyone to guess anything. God will have none of this loosey goosey “sexually immoral” talk, not even a mention of “homosexual offenders,” which the NIV has for *arsenokoites* . No, not even “homosexual offender” is specific enough for God. God is into details. God knows what He wants to say. He knows exactly what He wants to warn against, and it is these four things:

- ▶ males who stick their penises into illegal vaginas
- ▶ people who steal other people’s spouses
- ▶ men who put their penises into other men’s rectums, and
- ▶ the men who let them do it

God really doesn’t give us many more sexual prohibitions other than these. Well, He does have a few more. Does He list them anywhere? Of course He does. He lists them in the toughest, sternest, strictest, most comprehensive list of do’s and don’ts in the entire Bible, namely, the law of Moses, more specifically, the book of Leviticus. Behold, then, God’s complete catalog of what you just aren’t supposed to do. Not surprisingly, Paul’s New Testament warnings coincide precisely with what God prohibited in Old Testament days. Not surprisingly, the

most serious sexual sins have to do with penises entering illegal vaginas.

God's prohibitions

Here, then, are God's sexual prohibitions, from Leviticus, chapter 20. I will put these in list form, to make them easier to see. You can go to Leviticus, chapter 20 and check this out for yourself ("lies with," by the way, is a Scriptural euphemism for "has sex with"; it is sexual penetration)—

"Any man of the sons of Israel and of the sojourners sojourning in Israel who should give any of his seed to Moloch shall be put to death (vs. 2)."

"I Myself will set My face against that man and against his family and will cut off from among their people him and all those prostitution after him, to prostitute after Moloch" (vs. 5)

"As for a man who commits adultery with another man's wife ... the adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death, yea death" (vs. 10).

"As for a man who lies with his father's wife, he has exposed his father's nakedness. The two of them shall be put to death, yea death" (vs. 11).

"And a man who lies with his daughter-in-law, the two of them shall be put to death, yea death" (vs. 12).

"As for a man who lies with a male as if going to bed with a woman, they do an abhorrence. The two of them shall be put to death, yea death" (vs. 13).

"As for a man who takes a woman and her mother, this is lewdness. With fire shall they burn him and them so that no such lewdness may come up in your midst" (vs. 14).

"As for a man who gives his emission to a beast, he shall be put to death, yea death, and the beast shall you kill" (vs. 15).

"As for a woman who approaches to any beast to copulate with it, you will kill the woman and the beast. They shall be put to death, yea death" (vs. 16).

"As for a man who takes his sister, the daughter of his father or the daughter of his mother, and sees her nakedness, this is a base thing, and they will be cut off before the eyes of the sons of their people" (vs. 17).

"As for a man who lies with a menstruous woman and exposes her nakedness, he causes her fountain to be naked, and she exposes the fountain of her bloodflows. Then the two of them will be cut off from among their people" (vs. 18).

"The nakedness of your mother's sister or your father's sister you shall not expose, for he who does so causes his kin to be naked; their depravity shall they bear" (vs. 19).

"As for a man who lies with his aunt, the nakedness of his

uncle he has exposed. Their sin shall they bear; heirless shall they die" (vs. 20).

"As for a man who takes the wife of his brother, this is impurity. The nakedness of his brother has he exposed; heirless shall they become" (vs. 21). 61

"You will observe all My statutes and all My judgments and keep them so that the land, where I am bringing you to dwell in it, shall not vomit you out" (vs. 22).



People you can't have sex with

Leviticus, chapter 18, tells an Israelite who he can and can't have sex with. It's a pretty straightforward list; check it out for yourself. It's pretty much the same as chapter twenty. You may be surprised who is not on the list. If a person is not on the list, it means you can have sex with that person. This list deals purely with the individuals involved in the sexual activity, and not with any wrongdoing committed against the individuals, addressed other places in the law. For instance, rape was a sexual crime punishable by death (Deuteronomy 22:25). The rape law would have included sexual violation of children, as they were spoken of under Mosaic Law as, "your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, and your children, which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil ..." (Deuteronomy 1:39).

Pedophilia, then, was included under the Mosaic rape law, answering to our "statutory rape."

* * *

That's it. These are the only sexual sins that bother God. It is all fairly simple and straightforward. I can put

chapters 18 and 20 of Leviticus in a nutshell:

- ▶ Don't rape people, including children.
- ▶ Don't steal another man's wife.
- ▶ Don't screw your relatives.
- ▶ Don't screw horses (sheep, goats, elephants, etc.)
- ▶ Males, do not put your penises into each other's asses.
- ▶ If a woman is menstruating, leave her alone.
- ▶ Don't look at your naked sister.

That's it. This is God's list of things He considers sexually immoral. Anyone adding to this list has a higher standard than God, mocking God's prohibitions.



Not everything in these passages entails prostitution. Every case of a penis entering an illegal vagina (screwing your relatives, stealing another man's wife) is specifically prostitution, and is specifically what the New Testament refers to every time the word *porneia* appears. This is an important point. Every time *porneia* appears in the New Testament, it refers to these prohibitions from the Old Testament. How do I know? Besides cult prostitution (which was a form of idolatry), there were never any other prohi-

bitions. There were never any other standards. These are God's standards; these are God's prohibitions. These are God's *only* prohibitions.¹ Anyone adding to them adds to the Word of God, and does so at his or her own peril.

For the cases of prostitution (penises entering illegal vaginas), people were killed. For merely looking at naked relatives, offenders were cut off from other people. Exposing a woman's menstrual blood was not a capital offense, but it got one ostracized.

This passage shows us the marvelous specificity of God. It shows us how God could have said many other things, but didn't (Arterburn and Stoeker take over where God left off; lucky for God). Of course, the thing immediately jumping out at a person is what God does not prohibit. People have told me, "You cannot say that just because it is not on these lists, that God doesn't prohibit it."

Yes, you can.

There is nothing here about masturbation, or oral sex, or looking at bra ads (or even lusting after women, as we shall see in detail in our "lusting" section); there is nothing about lingerie, high-heels, battery-operated vibrators, sexual bondage, watching a woman swing naked from a chandelier (as long as it's not your sister), looking at *Playboy*, masturbating to *Playboy*; there is nothing here about paying a woman for sexual favors. There is nothing here about two single people having consensual sex.

God loves sex. Why shouldn't He? He invented it. In the Bible, He talks about it all the time. He loves the variety; His universe throbs with variety. God meant for us to play with ourselves and pleasure ourselves. He meant for us to *admire* every beautiful thing in His wide creation, not bounce our eyes from it. God loves role-playing. God loves spontaneity. God loves pictures of naked people; why wouldn't He? He created people naked. God loves the sex act. He loves orgasms. He loves sexual lust; He invented sexual lust; He invented all the hormones that makes people desire one another ("lust" merely means "desire"; don't shoot the messenger; don't pre-judge me; don't throw the book against a wall; hang onto your hormones; more writing on "lust" is upcoming in a future edition) God loves all the noises and the fluids of sex. He loves the "dirty talk."

1 Even *these* standards came only to Israelites.



Just don't whisper sweet nothings into the ears of horses. Is this too much to ask?

What *does* God hate? It's a legitimate question. He tells us. There is a specific list in the sixth chapter of Proverbs detailing for us everything God hates. Judging from the wide-ranging and arbitrary sexual prohibitions found in *Every Man's Battle*, one

would think everything God hates has to do with sex. After all, doesn't God hate sex and sexual lust more than anything? Let's take a look.

From Proverbs 6:16-19—

These are six things Yahweh hates, Even seven that are an abhorrence to His soul:

Exalted eyes,
A false tongue,
And hands that shed innocent blood;
A heart engrossed with lawless devisings,
Feet that make haste to run to evil,
A false witness who breathes out lies,
And one who instigates quarrels among brothers.

There are the seven things God hates. Not a word about sex; not a word.

Hmm. Drawing any conclusions?

A new kind of list, from modern preachers

Apparently, God's list of sexual no-no's is incomplete. God is too liberal. He had no idea how sexually immoral we would become. If God could modify His list of sexual prohibition and the things He considers to be crimes of *porneia* (He desperately wants to), then surely He would have given that task to religious, careful, and very zealous men such as Stephen Arterburn and Fred Stoeker. Thank God He raised up these men to expand upon His prohibitions and give us a completely new list of things that, if not controlled, will put one on shaky, moral ground with the God of the Universe.

Here, then, is a partial list of the things Arterburn and

Stoeker consider acts of *porneia*, that is "ungodly sexual actions" (pg. 3):

looking at bra and panty ads (pg. 13)
looking at *Gallery* magazine (pg. 14)
looking at *Playboy* (pg. 146)
watching *Forrest Gump* (pg. 20)
imagining sex with Sally Field (pg. 22)
admiring female fashion trends (pg. 23)
watching women's fitness shows (pg. 24)
masturbating (pg. 26)
sexual fantasizing (pg. 87)
watching *Baywatch* re-runs (pg. 116)
looking at suggestive billboards while driving (pg. 117)
looking at female joggers in "tight nylon shorts" (pg. 126)
watching "beer and bikini commercials" (pg. 126)
watching "movies rated PG-13 or higher" (pg. 126)
looking at "receptionists with low-cut or tight blouses" (pg. 126)

* * *



STEPHEN ARTERBURN:

We've been ridiculed by the world's sophisticates who find God's standard ridiculous and confining. That's fine with us, because we have a bigger concern—you.

Thank you, Stephen, but mind your own damn business. We were all doing quite well until you showed up. I only wish the world's sophisticates were sophisticated enough to realize that it is not God's standards which are ridiculous and confining, but yours. I have an even bigger

concern than yours, Stephen, namely, that your book makes people imagine that *your* personal standards for sexual behavior are *God's* personal standards. It is the very reason I am writing this book—to refute *your* book.

From publisher Dan Rich (from the Introduction to *Every Man's Battle*)—

When I read Fred's manuscript, I was immediately struck by its potential. Here was an example of what we at WaterBrook look for most: books that offer Christians encouragement, support, and challenge by authors who can communicate 'old truths through new eyes' and lead readers to renewed hope and redemption.

By "renewed hope and redemption," do you mean "profound despair and condemnation"?

From Fred Stoeker, warning against the perils of mixing God's standards with our own:

► "Because our own standards on sexual purity have been so mixed with God's, and since many Christians don't read their Bibles very often, many men have no clue about God's standard for sexual purity" (pg. 45).

► "Why do we so easily mix in our own standards with God's?" (pg. 43).

► "We aren't victims of some vast conspiracy to ensnare us sexually; we've simply chosen to mix in our own standards of sexual conduct with God's standard."

► "Sometimes we choose wrong sexual standards not because we're naive, but simply because we're rebellious" (pg. 43).

► "Mixture can destroy a people."

► "Mixing in your own standards leads to being ensnared, and even worse" (pg. 44).

► "If we followed [God's] standards we would never see sexual bondage" (pg. 42).

Fred, you are guilty of the very crime you warn others about! It is *you* who have mixed *your* standards with God's, while vainly supposing that it is the *world* that has watered down God's standards. No. The world is much smarter than you. *You* are the one—you and your religious zealot friend Stephen Arterburn—who have chosen the wrong sexual standards. Therefore, *you* are the naive person; *you* are the rebellious one.

"If we followed God's standards we would never see sexual bondage."

That's right, Fred. But since you *don't* follow God's standards (you mix your personal standards with His),

you have fallen into the worst sexual bondage of all: battling your natural instincts and—by extension—God Himself. Even more heinous, you have written a book causing millions of gullible men to join you in your stupid, misguided, self-righteous battle for some homemade, non-existing, unnecessary sexual and religious perfection.



* * *

Philo Thelos writes in, *Divine Sex: Liberating Sex from Religious Tradition*—

Biblical sexual morality does not even resemble modern Christian sexual morality... Nothing is sinful because "it just seems to be wrong." Subjective opinions, even if followed by the masses, can never establish a thing as sinful; otherwise sin becomes whatever people think sin to be. Sin is only what God says it is ... Preachers, pastors, church leaders in general, learn their concepts from their peers just like all people do. Few of them are willing to expend the time and energy required to examine, for themselves, every line of biblical text. It is just too easy to take for granted what passes muster in the majority of churches, as being the "biblical norm."

As an ex-pastor I can say from experience that it is unusual to find preachers who do their own study. Most of them are pressed for time and know too little about using Bible study tools. Copying their messages from another's material is a standard solution for many Christian teachers. Thus in many areas, what is preached is merely what has been preached, and only occasionally does it meet the test of true biblical scholarship.

What rules the day as "biblical morality" is not truly biblical at all. It is religious morality ... Modern religious sexual standards have been developed over time by the human penchant for filling in the gaps left by God's silence on most sexual topics.

That these human standards have become almost universally accepted in the church does not make them anything other than human standards. They still lack God's authority. The Bible still does not teach them despite the many who believe otherwise ... The modern Christian church is a self-appointed, worldwide enforcer of a multitude of heavy sexual burdens that it has "laid upon men's shoulders" (Matthew 23:4), threatening people everywhere ... Millions of people are afraid of sex, confused about sex and "guilty" about sex, all because of the faulty standards set by an apostate church.

Sex has become the unmentionable subject, and a "nasty" practice because of the church's ignorance ... Where God has granted liberty, the church has denied it. What God has not seen fit even to comment on, the church has boldly and adamantly legislated ...

Only after understanding what God says about sex in the Bible, will any person be able to form a right opinion about it. And it is useless to answer with, "But there are some things that are just obviously wrong." ... What is obviously wrong to one group of people is just as obviously right to another group of people. Our subjective opinions, regardless of how deeply we feel them, can never be made the basis for moral standards. Our obligation is simple.

Let God be God! Let God do all the legislating about all sexual matters ... Religious leaders have much to gain by not questioning the status quo and many will not even seriously consider any alternate viewpoint in any sexual matter. They have been trained by their mentors, pressured by their peers, and threatened by their financial insecurity to give nothing but the majority report on sexual issues. So if you want to be confident that you are getting close to objective Bible truth, look for yourself. You will be amazed, even flabbergasted, at what you find when you look for yourself, with eyes that want to see what is in the Bible. You may even be angry at what has been kept from you by those who were responsible to tell you, "just the truth ma'am," but who, for many reasons, could not find the truth for themselves.²

* * *

One can hear the condescending sneer of a Pharisee when Fred writes on page 43, "Or maybe you've considered God's standard too ridiculous to take seriously."

Fred again, from page 43:

When someone suggested that God expects even singles

to avoid every hint of sexual immorality, one attractive young woman blurted out, "Nobody could possibly expect us to live that way!"

By mixing God's standards with their own, the Pharisees also laid unwarranted, additional burdens upon people's backs (Mark 7:1-9), to the point that Jesus rebuked them, saying:

"You are repudiating the precept of God, that you should be keeping your tradition" (Mark 7:9).

Substitute the phrase "personal prohibitions concerning sex" for "tradition" in this verse, and would not our Lord level this accusation against Arterburn and Stoeker? "You are repudiating the precept of God, that you should be keeping your personal prohibitions concerning sex!"

"Many men have no clue about God's standard for sexual purity," says Fred Stoeker, page 45.

I'll say. You and Stephen are the poster boys of "no clue." Fred again, from page 48—

We should not be in close association with another Christian who persists in sexual immorality.



It was for this very thing that the Pharisees derided Christ, Who "came eating and drinking" (Matthew 11:19), and was well-known to be "a friend of tax collectors and sinners" (Matthew 11:19), some of whom were no doubt "loose women." Our Lord's association with such women inspired Him to tell the startled Pharisees at a later time (Matthew 21:31)—

"Verily I am saying to you that the tax collectors and the prostitutes are preceding you into the kingdom of God."

The result of mixing one's own standards with God's, is—as Arterburn and Stoeker tell us—"destructive."

"If we followed [God's] standards we would never see sexual bondage," says Fred Stoeker, on page 42.

"Mixing in your own standards leads to being ensnared, and even worse," says Fred again on page 44.

I agree on both counts. Therefore, I exhort everyone to read God's standard for sexual behavior in Leviticus, chapters 18 and 20, and stop mixing them with their own. By doing so, our readers will avoid the ensnarement and sexual bondage that is *Every Man's Battle*. —MZ

(To be continued.)

2 Philo Theos, *Divine Sex; Liberating Sex From Religious Tradition* (2002), pp. i, iv, xii, xv, 139, 155