

13-Nov-10

**Hidden Human Sex Habits**

**CAPTION:** “...*This ‘straight testimony’ may be deemed by the reader as material inappropriate for the eyes and ears of their immature ones. But all others who have taken on the mission to consume ‘strong meat’ can receive my simple answer: Those Christ-abiding men who have wives that love Him, love which is made manifest by their zeal to elevate Him in their homes, can yield to the wishes, perhaps heretofore hidden in the hearts of their wives, and can unapologetically heap upon them the full intensity of their passions ...*”

Dear S \_\_\_\_\_,

You wrote an extensive letter with questions pertaining to human sexuality and many of the associated dimensions thereto pertaining. So as to prepare this letter for the field, that the brethren may also benefit, I will not herein quote your letter by inserting captions from it. This I will not do because your letter was very long, and some of the terminology may offend the sensibilities of the reader. Thus, I will do the seemingly impossible by giving to you a straight testimony and at the same time take pains to make the reading as pleasant as possible.

I believe that last night’s study, *Jacob’s Search for Congeniality*, 13-Nov-2010, addressed most of your questions, and in our phone conversation afterwards you seemed to agree with that conclusion. It gave to you help so that you can, without my direct involvement, prayerfully study your way through the external and internal questions which are sure to erupt. To relisten to it; it will shortly be posted on the website. I do understand that, though the church has deeply buried these issues under the dark ecclesiastical robes of her modesty, our sexuality is a very dominant component and catalyst of our behavior, one which a genuine minister representing the very *Creator of Sex* Himself cannot ignore. The Kingdom being now with us, to righteously abide therein, we absolutely must order all of our behaviors to be in harmony with the Word requiring clearer focus on this issue, a focus unheard of in all human history. Only in so doing can one’s conscious be devoid of all false guilt allowing the saints to come boldly before the Father’s throne. This is a central component of my ministry from which I cannot shirk. Therefore, I thank you for your direct inquiry into some deeply private and personal issues such as

**ORAL STIMULATION**~~~~~The ability to smoothly and seductively speak to a woman, a wife, can be the beginning point of influencing her mood; this was proven by the serpent in the garden as he was able to, merely by speech, change Eve’s mind. However, you desire to venture beyond and to know if there are other more physical uses for the mouth and tongue to inspire exciting sex. Choosing the good and refusing the evil brings us to this issue. We must discern the righteousness of the technique, creative as it may be, which allows the males to orally stimulate female genitalia. After all, we, with clear conscience, use our mouths to kiss other portions of her body north of the naval. We do so to excite her to receive us. In fact, the ability to excite our women has been the fascination of men since the creation; this was man’s first commission. Years before the Ten Commandments were handed to the church, the very first commandment of Adam and Eve was to replenish the earth; it was to have sex. Such a commission, child birth, could not have occurred without Adam inserting his obviously very-large-male sex organ, his penis, within Eve. The dimension of this which almost no ministry seems to ever

## *Hidden human Sex Habits*

consider is that compliance to the Lord's command was the understanding that Eve, based upon the intricacies of her biological engineering, needed to premoisten so as to be made receptive to Adam's insertion. For a woman to respond in this way, it is done involuntarily. It may seem trite to say the following, but it is a cause for reflection and ministerial counsel nonetheless: Self lubrication was essential then as there was no other superior medium of lubrication than that which Christ created within Eve. So already we have learned by narrowing our discussion of righteousness so as to see that man's mission was to stimulate the woman for she—not him— was the intended one to be penetrated. Resultantly, Adam's commission was, in final analysis, to seduce Eve to a point of lubrication, a point whereby, before penetration, she melted in his arms to facilitate their mission to replenish the earth. All can now visualize the real challenge by imagining the fear within Eve which Adam was required to allay. Such wedding-night jitters still exist today and can be affirmed by all newly-wed-female virgins. To penetrate Eve by successfully arousing her, Adam needed to learn what pleased her; he needed to "know" her. Then, all of her frightened, internal organs would unfreeze at the thought of his penetration; they would have become prepared to welcome Adam's intrusion and the insertion of his seed. Thus we are told of Adam's eventual success whereby the Bible says, "**And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived...**" —Gen 4: 1. Let us be clear: This Text does not suggest that Adam had oral sex with Eve, but it does prove that he successfully seduced her. There are many ways to excite a woman, and mastering those ways, with a clear conscious, is still man's challenge.

With this context of human sexuality in place, we can understand the inspired author of Genesis, Moses', summary statement. Immediately after he described both the creation of Eve and her introduction to Adam, he recorded that which Christ reiterated in Matt 19: 5, "**Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.**" —Gen 2: 24. The father and the mother could only refer to God and the Church; Adam and Eve had no parents but Christ. To cleave to his wife, means to —ultimately— physically embrace her; it could have no other meaning as only thus can they become one flesh. The Lord added to the thesis of this Text the following conclusion: "**What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.**" —Matt 19: 6. By this addendum, God describes righteous sexuality that extends beyond the initial motive of replenishment or the production of children: It now introduces an even higher goal, the standard of eternal oneness. Such is eternal for Father's endorsement of it disallows any other forces to put it asunder. Since the grave is the ultimate asunderment and since resurrected couples are no longer to be considered married (Matt 22: 30), then Father's endorsement of properly-cleaving couples pertains to "last-day", Gospel teachers who shall never see death. It endorses all marriages that follow this pattern; by this conclusion, no last-day, **TRULY**-Christian couple need to do as humans have historically done and seek ecclesiastical approval pertaining to the way in which they cleave together. They merely need to win Father's certification by following the principles of His word. In other words, a Christian cannot possibly unite with an anti-Christian and have unity. To become "one flesh" they logically must unite doctrinally. Put in a different way, before a Godly man can cleave physically to a woman, he must orally stimulate her by the words of his tongue arousing within her a desire to walk by his side, to walk with him in Christ. So, in a way, the marriage first begins with this dimension of oral sex, doctrinal conversion. However, if she rejects Christ, then it is not possible to cleave to her for she will hate and repel the man and do so merely because of his allegiance to Christ. It is through Christ; no other unity can win Father's endorsement because He said, at Father's command, "**I am THE WAY, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.**"—John 14: 6. So we see that physical cleavage is authorized by Father through the marital unity of couples who come to Christ. Adam and Eve did not do this; they hid from the Lord. Be it not mistaken, the concept of marital cleavage is not just limited to allegiance to Christ: Another authority must likewise be consulted, the wife. Sure the husband rules, but pray tell me, how can he cleave, how can he comply with Father's law of marriage, if his sexual desires cause his wife to flee from or emotionally repel him? Remember, the wife is not commanded to cleave to the husband, the opposite properly describes the command. Thus, merely by her divine license, the man cannot force upon her sexual demands that gratify him

## *The Mustard Seed Advent, 13-Nov-2010*

---

but torment her making her sick to her stomach. If he does not comply with this wisdom by restraining some of his aberrant fantasies, then she will hate the very thought of any intercourse with him. This may be one reason why the gentiles perversely seek intoxication in order to find joy in sex. It is impossible for such tactics to win Father's marital endorsement. With as much plainness as I can muster, I believe that this requisite should answer your question about some of the highly imaginative sexual tactics to which you raise: Respect the woman's ordination. When this is done, none need to consult with a minister nor with Christ to avoid bedroom strife; instead, leave father and mother and consult your Christian wife. After all, is not she the one who is to be invaded by her man's penetration? If she enjoys his fantasies, then they will facilitate his assignment to cleave to her. As a parenthetical insertion, I must say that if the commission to have sex and to cleave was not directly commanded of Adam, if he and Eve were not biologically designed by God for this purpose, then we—as reserved, conservative, and bashfully-shy human beings—would recoil in embarrassment from this “straight testimony”. We would do so as do little children who live in a world that is semi-detached from the realities of this conversation. We would abide by yesterday's pretensions and live by the presumption that such discussions were Satanic, perverted, and vulgar. This we would have done because we failed yesterday in our growth to learn to choose the good and refuse the evil. *“For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil”* —Heb 5: 13, 14.

Whether a husband's oral stimulation of his wife's genitalia can be considered righteous is a very complex issue, one that requires a heightened sense of good and evil. It is not as simple as you may have first presumed; it cannot be out rightly condemned as yesterday's ecclesiastical authorities have done. To more fully answer, let us go back to the Garden of Eden and then make reference to the 10 Commandments—sources of righteousness commended to us in the *Testimony of Jesus*. Eve was cursed for her original sin, but her curse was different than Adam's. Adam was cursed because he exalted the voice of his wife above the commandments of God. The Lord said, *“..Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I **COMMANDED** thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake...”*—Gen 3: 17. Adam was cursed for heeding unto his wife and exalting her above God. Ponder for a moment if you disagree: Is not Adam's sin the same, the very same thing as idolatry? Do not idol worshippers elevate other sources of inspiration above Christ? The First and Second Commandments give to us the answer: *“Thou shalt have no other gods before me...Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God...”*—Exod 20: 3-5. Another god is simply the purveyance of another “**WAY**” to life, joy, and happiness; it is a way, the serpent's way, which Christ condemns. Such ways which out rightly oppose Christ should not be worshipped; one, whether male or female, should not bow down to them. And bowing down is the posture assumed by a man or a woman to allow them to kiss their partner's genitals. Today it is all coming to light: A husband cannot assume a worshipful posture seeking to stimulate his wife if she opposes Christ. She is not deserving of such worship! On the other hand, if the two love the Lord, then to kiss her is the same as kissing your own flesh; it is not idolatry.

Before Eve was created, Christ commanded Adam to honor His prohibition regarding the forbidden fruit. Adam was wrong to cleave to Eve by rejecting the Lord's commandment: In this, he should not have hearkened unto her voice; he should not have bowed to her will seeking to stimulate or please her. The results of his idolatry were manifested by the resultant children who filled the world with crime and brutality, a thing which the flood could only partially abate. As stated above, if a wife pulls her husband away from Christ, then he cannot cleave to her with Father's endorsement. Their marriage is diverging in different directions and will eventually be put asunder, by man, by the son of man, by the designated ruler in the Kingdom, the *mustard seed*, the son of David. Such women at the “midnight cry” will awaken and will request the extra oil, and

### *Hidden human Sex Habits*

David and his disciples, even her husband if he is included, will deny it to her. Then she will search to acquire it from other sources; that is, by studying the website, and then afterwards make an appeal to Christ for entry into the *Wedding Supper of the Lamb*, the union between Christ and David, and the Scriptures describes the rest: “**Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not.**”—Matt 25: 11, 12. “**My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me;**”—John 10: 27. For a man to bring joy to his Christ-loving wife by his passionate, oral kisses is in harmony with the commission of the Father, the commission to cleave unto his wife. It is not false worship; such a marital bed is deemed honorable. So the difference comes with the religion: Does your wife love the Lord? The *Testimony of Jesus* will help all to answer this question:

**“...If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father’s which sent me. These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you.”**—John 14: 23-25

On the other hand, if the wife is at war with “*the way the truth and the life*” —another name for Christ— then to please her is to commit the original sin; it is to elevate her will above that of the Father. For this cause, it is impossible to answer your question as I cannot discern the status with Christ of the woman who may fall within the scope of this letter. This “straight testimony” may be deemed by the reader as material inappropriate for the eyes and ears of their immature ones. But all others who have taken on the mission to consume “strong meat” can receive my simple answer: Those Christ-abiding men who have wives that love Him, love which is made manifest by their zeal to elevate Him in their homes, can yield to the wishes, perhaps heretofore hidden in the hearts of their wives, and can unapologetically heap upon them the full intensity of their passions —including oral stimulation of their biblically-defined, **CLEAN** female genitals. Consider this to be the beginning of their joy which the Lord promised to His end-time disciples. There is absolutely no ecclesiastical authority which can condemn their mission of cleaving unto their wives. This conclusion may seem indecent and depraved, but such is to be expected from the spiritually juvenile saints, people whose milk diet has stunted their ability to choose the good and refuse the evil.

Bear in mind, young women —as Eve was in the garden— ladies who are unimpeded in the process of self-moistening, may not yearn for this level of passion. They may be ready to receive you without harboring such hidden desires. Consequently, the MSA counsels that to practice such intimate, marital-bed behavior on them may become self-defeating and superfluous. Remember, they determine the standard for successful cleavage! Even still, individual management on this question is the freedom that the Lord gives to His sons. But there is a flipside: Women do not stay young forever. Unfortunately, sin has greatly disabled the efficient function of many, including upstanding Davidians, especially those who have advanced in age. Even Sarah, at age 90, gave testimony to the erosion of her female biological capacity; after being told that she would have a child, she laughed inwardly saying, “**After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also?**”—Gen 18: 12. But the MSC’s judgment for husbands of women who hate Christ, whether their wives be old or young, cannot now legally find divine approval to please their rebellious, wives in this manner; it is forbidden fruit. In these closing days, their sexual relationships must be limited to the hesitant, conservative parameter of church tradition since that is the false god to whom their wives have devoted their worship. You say that Webster defines oral sex to be sodomy; therefore, oral sexual stimulation is indeed taboo for them. “**Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them**”. They have become the force of alternate religion; they preach an anti-Christ gospel. Since they reject the righteousness of Christ as expressed in the OT, then allow them to be adjudged by Webster, the standards which they truly uphold. Such marriages to vain and rebellious women have no divine unity; they have no oneness, and they cannot enjoy the Father’s endorsement to win everlasting unity.

Having dispensed with that question, I must now address your

## *The Mustard Seed Advent, 13-Nov-2010*

---

OTHER QUESTIONS ABOUT SEX~~~~~As your imagination is further expanded into the various dimensions of human sexuality, you must confine the answers to your curiosity with the parameters that have been written or conveyed. Instead of exploding with questions, harness that explosion by a sober perusal of the careful teachings unfolded in the MSC's studies which have evoked your questions. Do not engender a question from your own inferential conclusions until your inferences can be validated. To illustrate, the E-mail to which you refer, *Polygamy and Righteousness*, was sent to explain why Christ was right to install or permit polygamy in the context of the Old-Testament (OT), monolithic culture of Israel. Your letter seems to ignore this orientation with the assumption that justification of polygamy must therefore extend to gentile society today. Thus, your questions are devoid of proper discipline and foundation. To expound the illustration further, the commentary of sexual activity during pregnancy and its deleterious results was not issued in that E-mail study to install a legal prohibition against sex during pregnancy as your question implied. Instead, it was given as a reason to exemplify the wisdom of the Lord's laws pertaining to polygamy. I neither know nor have I asserted that any such regulation or law against sex during pregnancy existed yesterday or today. With that MSC E-mail, we merely have a tighter argument of Christ's righteousness yesterday. It hammered home the thesis that people who challenge His righteousness should do so by examining their options: They need to intelligently assess the failures of their more-favored, Assyrian standards. Another illustration exemplifying your need to carefully adhere to the context of the MSC's discourse on human sexuality can be given regarding the issue of "*strap-on penises*" worn by some creative women. You make a link to this and Sodomy or whoredom and then, from that self-created connection, you conjure questions. This tactic is misleading because no connection between that offense and sodomy or whoredom was made or inferred by the MSC's studies, thus rendering your question to be without foundation. Your own creative curiosity made those links. The MSC was merely attempting to exalt Christ's righteousness by citing His law which declares that a woman must not wear that which pertains to a man (Deut 22: 5). It should be added, this law does not show regard to the gender of her intended partner —be that partner male or female. Instead, it forbids her from wearing such a devise —pure and simple. Finally, the MSC has no fixed definition of a concubine. Its best assessment, based upon scriptural examples, is that women classed as such in the OT, was so done as a legal loophole, permissible by the Lord, to allow Hebrew men to have intercourse with women, exclusive to them, who could never qualify or meet the higher standard of a proper, Hebrew wife, somebody whom they could legally put away. Thus did my study refer to Abraham, the man to whom we as Davidians are commanded to look to in *Isa 51*, showing that he distinguished between his wives and his concubines. Beyond that, the MSC merely asserts that Christ was right in allowing such a thing yesterday with Israel. You cannot extrapolate our current context, our society to that regulation because we now can neither precisely define a Hebrew, nor establish a geographic territory to house them, nor define for ourselves the Lord's governance, nor establish the men whom the Lord deploys as Abraham's son as opposed to those deployed as his servants and/or his illegitimate sons. Yesterday and today, the gentiles were/are not yet given to Christ: He has not yet inherited authority upon them. If you desire to expand on the theme of concubines showing exactly what defines them —the MSC has not been given this commission— then you must do so as commanded, and search the Scriptures. After so doing, present your findings to the MSC as your ministerial authority so that it can endorse your themes and adjudge them to be harmonious with Christ's righteousness.

Regarding the exact moment when a woman can be called a wife —either before marital consummation or after— we likewise must be thoughtfully reasonable. The Bible deploys that term to define Eve's station because that was the purpose of her creation. The term, wife, is not used with the precision that you suggest: to pinpoint the stage of intimacy with Adam. What other term could the Lord have used? Would any dare suggest that the Lord would create for His son, Adam, a concubine with the intent of giving him a wife afterwards? Do we suspect that He needlessly wastes His energy by doing the same work twice? If that is not convincing, then consider that both

### *Hidden human Sex Habits*

were commanded to reproduce, an assignment given for husbands and wives; thus, Eve's station was obviously implied. Because in the Bible, a man who takes his qualified woman into his tent and afterwards she becomes his wife, does not stipulate that she cannot be called his wife before she goes in. Her father gives her to the man, then he escorts her into the proverbial tent —the very reason for the father's gift to the man. Let us not be facetious to presume that one step before she enters she cannot be called his wife. The Lord had license to use that term with Moses knowing that, in the story, Adam would eventually consummate the marriage. If Adam did not consummate the marriage, then we would not be around to argue with Him pertaining to the point. Finally, consider the answer from another perspective: Adam and Eve were the world's first prearranged marriage or betrothal. Had Adam not heeded to the voice of his wife, Eve, yielding his victory instead of his fall, then we would possibly —depending upon the Lord's resolution— have had the world's first divorce. As Joseph before having relations with Mary was encouraged not to so do, Adam potentially would have done with Eve: He would have put her away.

Finally, in assessing the righteousness of Christ, take great care to do it in the context of His ministry, His Old-Testament laws and prophecies, and His testimony. Be certain to define all your terms in that context. If you search, you may find that the definition of whoredom and sodomy need not come from Paul or from Webster, men who circulated in a different societal context. The OT gives its own definitions. Since those definitions were conveyed during Christ's administration, then we can rely upon them to discern His meaning. Search for yourself, without my need to give examples, and see if this helps your analysis.

In summation, you must reconsecrate yourself to the point that book 5.0 and the MSC's E-mails have emphasized: We still are under gentile, pluralism and gentile standards. In keeping within the boundaries of that theme, we must honor the laws of our government until the son of David is given authority to rise from his seat at the right hand of Christ and rule in the midst of his enemies. As we wait for that day, be also consecrated to the theme of finding favor with God and with man.

Sincerely,

Derek