



# The truth about sexual lust; Part 9.

“NATURE ITSELF TEACHES YOU”; PART 3  
MASTURBATION



From a section titled, “Release for Singles,” Fred Stoeker writes on page 118-119 of *Every Man’s Battle* (I swear I am not making this up)—

There remains the male seventy-two-hour cycle of sperm production. Without the impurity of the eyes, the pressure generated by lust is gone, but there’s still a natural physical pressure for release, though much weaker. “What

am I going to do about that? you might ask. “How will I get release?”

God has supplied the way of release, something with which you’re familiar. Clinically it’s called “nocturnal emissions.” But somewhere in a dank, smelly football locker room, some kid decided to call it a “wet dream” and that name stuck. The good news for singles is that nocturnal emissions can work *for* you in your quest for purity (They can also work for married guys who aren’t as sexually active as they would like to be.)

You may wonder how such dreams will work toward purity. After all, some of these dreams are pretty hot and heavy! The same pure eyes and mind that keep you from *actively* seeking release during the day will limit the impurity that your mind can use in dreams at night. Even these dreams will be dramatically pure in scope and content.

Pure dreams! Now we’re making tracks toward real perfection! This is what I have always wanted: dreams with women in them who behave themselves, who wear dresses past their ankles, who wear burlap bonnets, bake muffins, and work as the church secretary.

As for the wet dreams, I have apparently been misled over the years. I always thought wet dreams were God’s way of relieving sexual pressure from complete morons who didn’t know how to take care of it themselves.

On page 64 of *Every Man’s Battle*, Fred writes—

This [sexual] pressure men experience does not justify seeking release through pornography or masturbation. The body has built-in mechanisms of release (including nocturnal emissions and overflow into the urine), and in fact I’ve talked with many single men who, by consistently keeping their eyes and minds pure of sensual things, haven’t had sex or masturbated for years. The pressure “dries up,” they say.

Oh, how great all this is! Isn't this a happy little recipe for singles?

"But dad, I have this tremendous sexual pressure."

"Don't worry about it, son. Simply let it overflow into your urine as you sleep. After that, all your desire should dry right up!"

"Okay, dad!"

Once again, I think we need to talk to the babies. Before babies learn to talk, they grab for their gonads. It is the most natural thing in the world—unless, that is, one thinks natural is evil. Unless, that is, one believes sex organs are to be overcome rather than enjoyed. I envision another book titled *Every Baby's Battle*, but with a new subtitle, namely: "Winning the war on grabbing your gonads in the bathtub, one victory at a time."

How about: "If God had not meant us to play around down there, He would not have put the toys within reach." This is a famous quote. I can't remember who said it. (Oh, wait. It was me.) Reminds me of a Rodney Dangerfield joke: "When I was a kid, we were so poor, if I hadn't been born a boy, I wouldn't have had *anything* to play with."

Fred Stoeker is a classic religious sexual nutcase; a deviant in his own right.

If you desire holiness, you must stop masturbating.

—Fred Stoeker, page 113, *Every Man's Battle*

Okay, Fred. Thanks. But can I start Monday? I would like to enjoy the weekend.



Remember those list of sexual sins in Leviticus, chapter 20? I challenge you to find self-pleasuring (i.e. "masturbation") anywhere on the premises.

In *Due Benevolence*, author Clyde Pilkington has this to say about masturbation—

Here is a very natural means of sexual enjoyment, one which the Bible (even the law of Moses), does not condemn, or even regulate. What is the purpose of masturbation, or sexual self-pleasure? It is not procreation. It is not bonding. Here again we find an example of sexual activity for the very pleasure it brings. Many well-meaning Christians would attempt to make this a sinful act. Where is the clear teaching of Scripture that such a universally common act is sinful? God is so abundantly clear and straightforward in His prohibition of sin. If such a common activity were sinful, would He not have clearly addressed it? Those free from the tyranny of religious thought have no scruples about such an honorable, godly release.<sup>1</sup>

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

If masturbation is sinful, where is the Biblical law saying so? How can a sexual practice involving no one but the practitioner, be evil? And when does that evil begin? Has the small child sinned when (s)he discovers that touching the genitals feels good? ... Is the "sinfulness" of masturbation determined by one's age? Or by how often one touches one's genitals? Or by how much pleasure one derives from the practice? If it is sinful, how do we actually *know* that, and what exactly is it that *makes* it a sin?<sup>2</sup>

### "Onanism"

There is only one Scripture passage able to be twisted and turned askew to condemn masturbation, and it is the "sin of Onan," in Genesis 38:8-10. Even a cursory reading of the context will inform the honest seeker that the sin was not that of spilling seed outside a woman's vagina, but rather of failing to produce offspring for a deceased brother's wife. Here is the entire passage, from the *Concordant Version of the Old Testament*:

And saying is Judah to Onan, "Come to your brother's wife and wed her, your brother's widow, and raise seed for your brother." And know does Onan that the seed will not become his. And it comes, when he is coming to his brother's wife, then he ruins it on the earth, to avoid giving seed to his brother. And evil in the eyes of Yahweh is what he does, and, moreover, He is putting him to death also.

<sup>1</sup> Pg. 49

<sup>2</sup> Pg. 130

The key words of this passage are, “he ruins it on the earth, *to avoid giving seed to his brother.*”

The spilling of seed has a context here, and the context is the refusal to act in accord with the law requiring the disbursement of seed to a deceased brother’s wife. It was for this God killed Onan, not for spilling his seed outside a female receptacle.

In Leviticus 15:16-18, God had already told Israel how to deal with this simple matter of spilled seed—

A man, when an emission of semen comes forth from him, will bathe all his flesh in water and be unclean until evening. Every garment and all leather on which his emission of semen has come, he will rinse in water, and it will be unclean until the evening. Also a woman with whom a man is lying with an emission of semen, they will both bathe in water and be unclean until evening.

Where is the capital punishment? Where is the angry God? A man masturbates and gets semen on his wife’s leather miniskirt; no problem. He washes the semen off the skirt, takes a bath, and calls it a day—a really good day.

Arterburn and Stoeker might say: “The man has had a nocturnal emission! This is what God was referring to. The man did not *consciously* waste his seed.”

Martin Zender might reply: “You are adding to the passage by assuming what is not there.” This hypothetical man who is lying with a woman (the passage does not even specify that the woman is his wife)—is he having a wet dream on her? No. Either she is masturbating him, or giving him oral sex.

An Amishman reading this might say, “May you and your ‘oral sex’ go straight to hell! How dare you use the phrase, ‘oral sex.’ You have to at least admit—you and your sinful ‘oral sex’—that the release of semen *must* be evil, or else the man would not be unclean.”

Martin Zender might reply, “Take it easy, Elmer. In the next verse, verse 19, a menstruating woman is also unclean, including anything she sits on. Menstruation is as natural as can be. Are we talking about sin here? You are assuming uncleanness to be sin. I am assuming it to be uncleanness. Uncleanness is something needing cleaned up—*period*. (Pardon the pun there.) You know, like an oil spill.”

“I don’t like your tone, Mr. Zender.”

“I don’t like your lack of a mustache, Mr. Yoder.”

At a conference at which I spoke on the topic of human sexuality, a man raised his hand during the question and answer session and asked: “My son thinks about sex non-stop. He is in that time of life when his hormones are



raging. He doesn’t know what to do with the pressure. What should I tell him?”

*What an odd question*, I thought. The man may as well have said, “My son thinks about food all the time. He is at that time of life when he really has an appetite. He doesn’t know what to do with his appetite. What should I tell him?”

Honestly. Do I also have to tell these people to sleep when they’re tired? To scratch when they itch?

“Martin, my son is thirsty all the time! What should I tell him?”

“Tell him to bounce his eyes from all liquids, especially water. Thirst is natural, therefore it is evil.”

What I did tell this man was: “My goodness, sir. Tell him to masturbate like crazy.”

Masturbation is God’s outlet for sexual frustration. It is one of God’s most marvelous gifts. To treat it as a sin is borderline insanity. To me, it is as crazy as telling a hungry person not to eat and a thirsty person not to drink.

“Martin. My son has this huge build-up of waste product every afternoon that congregates in the lower portions of his bowels. What should I tell him?”

Have we really become this stupid? Why is food and



drink and sleep and the evacuation of the bowels so god-awful natural, holy, right, good, and accepted, while sexual pleasure has become a horned (or horny) demon, the indulgence of which will inevitably “rocket us by stages” into frothy bouts of illegal intercourse?

Earl Paulk writes in, *Sex is God’s Idea*—

The other extreme in social, sexual values is an oppressive “Victorian” regard for sexuality in which people try to hide a normal experience of human life which is undeniably obvious. An oppressive view of sexuality undermines any healthy view of the subject by implying that sexual intimacy is necessary to produce children, but any other reason is sinful, risqué and taboo. Too many Christians live their entire lives in emotional bondage which produces guilt. Unfortunately, the Church has traditionally commended suppression because it maintains behavior codes which appear to be “spiritual.”

As a young pastor who was called into the ministry at the age of seventeen, I can remember a pastor saying to me, “If you ever touch a woman, your ministry is over!” I lived years of my life in complete adherence to a rigid morality which was devoid of any expressions of compassion or tenderness. Fear ruled my emotions. My pharisaic morals caused me to be a strict disciplinarian and a harsh judge of others who would “fall into sin.” Inside an emotional prison, I was so threatened by the possibility of “wrong” feelings that even proper, approved relationships were strained at times under tremendous convictions that I must “deny the flesh.”

My impeccable moral standards were controlled by the expectations of the Church and society. Only years later through a series of devastating circumstances did I begin to comprehend that God’s desires in Christian relationships are demonstrated in the example of Jesus Christ. Jesus loved people with a freedom and purity that accepted them wherever they were in their lives and lifted them to a higher, purer realm. He loved women as well as other men. He was touchable and physically expressive. He had no fear of being close to people and allowed them to express their affections to Him openly in spite of criticism from “religious” leaders.

Jesus deliberately broke moral codes of His day to love and minister to certain people. He probably even confused His disciples with His conversation with the Samaritan woman at the well who was “living with” her latest (at least number six) boyfriend



“I lived years of my life in complete adherence to a rigid morality which was devoid of any expressions of compassion or tenderness.”

—Earl Paulk

(John 4). His virtue healed a woman with an issue of blood when the Mosaic law forbade a man to touch her (Mark 5:25-30). His disciples were certainly not the type of men the Church would normally ordain as pastors: unscrupulous businessmen (Matthew 21:31) and burly fishermen with crude language and unrefined manners ...

The Pharisees behaved as if normal human needs never

existed. The Pharisees never admitted to having ... normal feelings ... Physical desires are an important part of man as God created him. Until we understand and acknowledge this area of man's nature, we will never be able to move to the higher spiritual dimensions that God has given us the capacity to enjoy.

Paul said, "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual" (I Corinthians 15:46). Paul asks, "Doth not even nature itself teach you ...?" (I Corinthians 11:14).

Sex is God's idea. Christian sexuality is as much a demonstration of God's goodness and love as giving to the poor or sharing the plan of salvation with someone. Christian sexual intimacy is a witness to the world of love relationships which are given and blessed by God ... God is searching for people who are boldly challenging every worldly distortion of His goodness and love.<sup>3</sup>

FRED STOEKER:

As I continued to fight sexual temptation as a married man, many a day I wistfully mourned, *A hormone drop would really help*. I was tired of the battle and wanted it badly to go away.

You will have to take up your hormone issue with God, Fred; while you're at it, ask Him about your sacs. As for the battle that I assume you must be exhausted of by now (unless, by this time, you have become a *total* religious automaton), I have an excellent resource for you. It is called: *The Lie of Every Man's Battle*, and it will be coming to a bookstore near you.

### The spiritual art of clean

Titus 1:15—

All, indeed, is clean to the clean, yet to the defiled and unbelieving nothing is clean, but their mind as well as conscience is defiled. They are avowing an acquaintance with God, yet by their acts are denying it, being abominable and stubborn, and disqualified for every good act.

Either this verse is true, or it isn't. If a woman's beautiful, scantily-clad body on the page of a website is clean to me, then it is clean. If I can look at that body—even stare at it—and thank God for it, and feel good about it, and celebrate it, and not feel one shred of guilt about enjoying it—then that naked body is, to me, clean. If I can look at a women's swimsuit catalog and marvel at the wonder of the

female form in barely-there beachwear; if I can look at—even stare at—the smiles of the women in such a state of dress (or undress) and thank God for these beauties who avail themselves to the righteous cause of bikini designers, then that catalog photo, and the model, and the bikini, and the body within it, are all clean to me.

"All, indeed, is clean to the clean."

Is this verse true, or isn't it?

### The defiled conscience

It is only to the defiled conscience and to the unbelieving (that is, to the person who believes God's creation to be evil), that nothing is clean. Aren't Arterburn and Stoeker the ones with defiled consciences? It is they, not me, who have learned, through the agency of religion, law, and guilt, to deny the way God made them. Such a denial must be learned. A natural man, left alone, will revel in feminine beauty. A defiled conscience, due to some past trauma, condemnation, or religious prohibition, will stiff-arm it.

It appears these men avow an acquaintance with God that they do not possess. They seem unable to trust nature or the grace of Christ. Thus, they miss the mark on both ends. Bouncing the eyes from feminine beauty is a bad check written to cover the bad check of calling good, "evil."

Men who distrust both nature and grace are spiritually undeveloped and disqualified for every good act, including the writing of books on the topic of sex that purport to be helpful.

—MZ

(To be continued.)



<sup>3</sup> Earl Paulk, *Sex Is God's Idea*, K Dimension Publishers, 1985, pp. 5-7, 26, 34.