

BIBLICAL TERRANOMICS

January, 1997

No.20

©James Wesley Stivers

PRESUMPTION & THE SIN OF UNCLEANNES

Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.

- Jesus in Matthew 12:31-32

Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness . . . they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

- Galatians 5:19-21

The great 19th Century revivalist, Charles Finney, after reviewing the success of his career, despaired that there was anyone in the Church who was truly converted. He always referred to the converts in his revivals as those who

had received "the *hope* of salvation" - a much more modest claim than what you will hear from chatter-happy evangelists of today. Why did he say that?

Finney knew that the "heart was deceitfully wicked" and that men may pursue the noblest of ventures for selfish motives, motives even hidden from themselves. He knew that pure hearts are hard to find.

Some people believe Finney set the standard too high. Maybe so, he was a perfectionist. But then, you must remember such sobering Scriptures as Ecclesiastes 7:28 and 1 Peter 4:18 - and our Lord's own observation in the Sermon on the Mount. There are few that find the narrow way which leads to eternal life.

After reading this study, you will realize that virtually the entire Christian world is caught-up in the sin of uncleanness, and doesn't even know it. It is a sure way of knowing that God wants to save you, when He tells you what your sin is. I hope that you respond to this essay with weeping and trembling. If you kick back, it is a sure sign that you are on the "broad road that leadeth to destruction."

THE THREE KINDS OF SIN

If you read the above Scriptures carefully, you will find that our Lord described three kinds of sin. The first one is the obvious one, the object of His warning. The sin committed against the Holy Ghost is the unpardonable sin. There has been much speculation among Christians concerning the exact nature of this sin. Some have wondered if it is possible to accidentally or ignorantly sin against the Holy Ghost. I do not think so. "Sins of ignorance" are those which occur when the subconscious mind suddenly prevails over the conscious mind during a powerful temptation. They belong to the second kind of sin which is forgivable.

Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is a conscious act. It is a "high-handed sin" one commits with his eyes open. Whatever this sin is, when it is committed, your fate is sealed. The Atonement of Jesus Christ is not efficacious for it.

Between the unpardonable sin and the pardonable sin is a third classification, and the failure to understand the Bible's treatment of this sin affords much confusion on this entire subject of sin and forgiveness. It is a category which our Lord did not directly mention, but which can be drawn in inference from what He said. And I am not making up this category. It is developed elsewhere in the Bible. The category is the *presumptuous sin*. It is the sin which can be forgiven in the life to come, *but not in this life*. Let me explain.

1 John 3:4 tells us that sin is the "transgression of the law". The Old Testament word is *chata* (pronounced *khawtaw*) and means "missing the mark". In fact, it is used in Judges 20:16 in reference to the accuracy of archers. The Greek word is *harmatia* and means the same thing.

The question before us is this: if we transgress the law *unintentionally*, have we still sinned? And the answer is unequivocally "Yes". It does not matter if an archer's arrow misses the target because he meant it so or not. He still missed it. He still "sinned". There are natural consequences to actions and the intention does not matter.

However, in terms of *governmental* consequences, God draws a distinction, and that distinction lies in the difference between the "sin of ignorance" and the "presumptuous sin".

In the book of Numbers we find this distinction:

And if any soul sin through ignorance, then he shall bring a sin offering. . . to make an atonement for him; and it shall be forgiven him.

But the soul that doeth ought presumptuously, whether he be born in the land or a stranger, the same reproacheth the LORD; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Because he hath despised the word of the LORD, and hath broken his commandment, that soul shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him.

- Numbers 15:27-28, 30-31

From reading the above text, it almost sounds like that presumptuous sins are unforgivable, just like the sin against the Holy Ghost. Certainly, the sin against the Holy Ghost is a presumptuous sin. This fact leads some commentators to have a rather broad and inclusive definition of the unpardonable sin, although Psalms 19:13 suggests otherwise. Not all presumptuous sins are sins against the person of the Holy Spirit.

Quoting other references will help us come to grips with the exact nature of this category of sin:

But if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor, to slay him with guile; thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die.

- Exodus 21:4

And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the LORD thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die; and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel. And all the people shall hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously.

- Deuteronomy 17:12-13

The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished: But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.

- 2 Peter 2:9-10

(Notice that the sin of uncleanness can be a presumptuous sin.) In another place, Jesus verified this distinction:

And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes.

But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.

- Luke 12:47-48

Adding further commentary of the Bible's teaching, I quote a theologian from an earlier time:

(PRESUMPTION) As it relates to the conduct or moral action, it implies arrogance and irreverence. As it relates to religion in general, it is a bold and daring confidence in the goodness of God, without obedience to his will. **PRESUMPTUOUS SINS** must be distinguished from sins of infirmity, or those failings peculiar to human nature, Ecc. 7:20, 1 John 1:8-9; from sins done through ignorance, Luke 12:48; and from sins into which men are hurried by sudden and violent temptation. Gal. 6:1. The ingredients which render sin presumptuous are, knowledge. John 15:22; deliberation and contrivance, Prov. 6:14, Ps. 36:4; obstinacy, Jer. 44:16; Deut. 1:13; inattention to the remonstrances of conscience. Acts 7:51; opposition to the dispensations of Providence, 2 Chron. 28:22; and repeated commission of the same sin. Ps. 77:17.

Presumptuous sins are numerous; such as profane swearing, perjury, theft, adultery, drunkenness, sabbath-breaking, & C. These may be more particularly considered as presumptuous sins, because they are generally committed against a known law and so often repeated. Such sins are most heinous in their nature, and most pernicious in their effects. They are said to be a reproach to the Lord, Num. 15:3: they harden the heart. 1 Tim. 4:2; draw down judgments from heaven. Num. 15:3 1; even when repented of, are seldom pardoned without some visible testimony of Gods displeasure. 2 Sam. 12:10. (Rev. Charles Buck. 1771-1815).

We know that all "sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4). And Jesus died to take it away. But some sins are greater transgressions than others. Why? In part it is because the Law requires restitution, and restitution

for some sins is more difficult than others. If I steal, I must restore twice what I stole. According to the Bible, if I cannot afford restitution, I must sell myself into slavery until the debt is paid. However, what if I murder someone? How do I restore a man's life?

Some sins, "the sins of ignorance", are inadvertent sins, the kind which are committed under the pressure of sudden temptation and ignorance - ignorance of the law and the nature of the situation. These happen through the weakness of character. Other sins, "the sins unto death" (1 John 5:16-17), are presumptuous sins. They are an open assault upon God's order. A presumptuous sin is one where the sinner knows he is doing wrong, he knows his act is contrary to the Word of God, but he despises God's Word, and with calculation, does it anyway. Christians who sin, thinking they will confess and be forgiven after the fact, are presumptuous sinners.

Presumptuous sinners cannot expect the Atonement of Christ to protect them *in this life*, but upon repentance, which only God knows if it is genuine, will protect them in the life to come. Presumptuous sinners must expect the wrath of God in this life to exact restitution. In the case of the murderer, he forfeits his own life. As in the case of King David who saw his family destroyed because he destroyed the family of another man, the presumptuous sinner will not be protected from the vengeance of Satan's attacks (1 Corinthians 5:5). He will be ruined and wasted, but upon repentance, his soul will be saved.

God must impose sanctions against presumptuous sins to discipline the sinner and move him towards repentance. He must punish to uphold the dignity of His Law and the sanctity of the One who spoke it. These judgments are painful, but necessary to restore us to God (Hebrews 10:26-30; 12:5-11).

Presumptuous sin is the sin of autonomy. Thus, antinomianism and humanism are presumptuous sins. God requires the Church and State to punish presumptuous sinners with excommunication and death. The failure of Church and State to perform their disciplinary duties will result in God's judgment upon them all.

Today in America, we have no justice. Churches do not excommunicate presumptuous sinners. The Courts do not execute incorrigible criminals (prisons are an unbiblical and immoral form of restitution). American society has been turned over by God to Satan "for the destruction of the flesh, that the soul might be saved" (1 Corinthians 5:5). No wonder we are drifting toward demonic government (tyranny) and demonic worship (New Age occultism).

Our generation is one of astonishing arrogance. Its rejection and proud ignorance of the Law of God have resulted in a wondrous state of self-assurance and self-complacency. God will not be mocked. His judgments will awaken us soon enough to the fact that our "righteousnesses are as filthy rags". Only then will there be hope - hope of godly sorrow, hope of repentance, and hope of restoration.

If you have been a presumptuous sinner, consider that it is "a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." You are in grave danger. Do not delay. Repent and weep before the LORD. Perhaps what I have written here has awakened you to your hardened heart. Perhaps, you finally have an explanation for your many tribulations. God is trying to reach you, but you will not listen. Repent and let the consequences of your evil choices run their course. Do not faint in the day of rebuke. Submit to God's rod, and He will yet heal you and lead you into His rest (Hebrews 4).

THE SIN OF UNCLEANNES

Now, finally, we reach the point of this discussion: **the Sin of Uncleanness**. For most Christians, this sin is one of great obscurity. Perhaps, it is because of an unholy prudery; perhaps, it is because of theological confusion over the Ceremonial Law. But in my opinion, I believe it is the result of the Gnostic inversion of Biblical values which was created by the Mahuzzims of the 2nd Century, expanded by the Apologists of the 3rd and 4th Centuries, and crystallized into dogma by the followers of Augustine. More on this later.

By and large, as I will explain later, sins of uncleanness are sins of ignorance. These might be masturbation and menstruation, for instance. These are sins associated with our fallen natures, as members of the human race.

People simply do not know the Law. They do not know how some bodily functions are a transgression of that law. Men who set themselves up as teachers and preachers of the Bible will suffer a greater judgment. They are supposed to know the law. They will be the first to fall into the ditch, as our Lord said. But unless our blindness is taken away, we will **all** fall into the ditch.

Other sins of uncleanness are presumptuous sins. These are sins like homosexuality, necrophilia, and bestiality. These sins are known as "wicked" sins (Genesis 13:13) and represent a studied decadence.

THE CEREMONIAL LAW

I am familiar with standard Evangelical views on the doctrine of Ceremonial Law. I am also familiar with the approach by Christian Reconstructionists R. J. Rushdoony, Gary North, Ray Sutton, James Jordan, Greg Bahnsen etc. I have not neglected the Gothardite position, either. To a large degree, what I am about to communicate is an interaction with their research. However, I believe their views represent hamstrung theology. They are all avowed Augustinians and are careful not to stray too far from their dogmatic roots.

Consequently, with my research on the Early Church, 1st Century Judaism, and Celtic Christianity, I have had to completely rethink the Reconstructionist positions - which, by the way, are skimpy. For instance, in his 1000 page commentary on Leviticus, Gary North spends two pages on the Laws of Uncleanness and spends most of that telling us that they were symbolic. Most of the Bible's systematic treatment of the Clean/Unclean status is found in Leviticus. I realize that North is an economist, but Jordan, a first-rate theologian, demonstrates the same shortfall. I have carefully studied his extensive writings on the ceremonial laws. Most of them can be summed-up as apologies for pork-eaters (re: dietary laws). Little exists on the New Testament ratification of these laws, and what is there, is a case for nullification. Jordan ends with a defense of birth control.

Rushdoony and Gothard teach that these laws are for purposes of hygiene, i.e. health laws. Jordan adequately refutes that position but fails to provide an alternative, except the symbolic approach (which North adopts and expands into a typological hermeneutic. A "typological hermeneutic" says that if an Old Testament law can be shown to have foreshadowed Christ and the Church, then it is nullified through its fulfillment, e.g. the Jubilee laws).

While I do not dismiss the hygienic or the typological hermeneutic, I do not believe they express the primary purpose for the ceremonial laws. As I have pointed out before (*The Family Spokesman* #35-44), the ceremonial laws were **pedagogical**; they were training tools. Paul describes them as a "tutor" leading

us to Christ - not just in an eschatological sense, but also, in an ethical sense (Galatians 3:24). Lacking the Holy Spirit, these laws existed as hedges designed to prevent the pious Israelite from falling onto the slippery slope of moral degradation. What this means for Christians is that we do not need to practice the Ceremonial Law to protect us from sin, since we have the pedagogical intent of it (the spirit of the law) written upon our hearts (Ezekiel 36:25-29). However, it is perverse reasoning to say that we are entitled to set aside and ignore *the moral law it was intended to teach us*.

The Early Church said that the Ceremonial Law (also known as the Ordinances) was an expression of various aspects of the Moral Law.

Thus, we find in the *Epistle of Barnabas* the following explanation for the Ceremonial & Dietary Law:

But forasmuch as Moses said; *Ye shall not eat swine nor eagle nor falcon nor crow nor any fish which hath no scale upon it*, he received his understanding three ordinances. Yea and further He saith unto them in Deuteronomy; *And I will lay as a covenant upon this people My ordinances*. So then it is not a commandment of God that they should not bite with their teeth, but Moses spake it in spirit. Accordingly he mentioned the swine with this intent. *Thou shalt not cleave*, saith he, *to such men who are like unto swine*; that is, when they are in luxury they forget the Lord, but when they are in want they recognize the Lord, just as the swine when it eateth knoweth not his lord, but when it is hungry it crieth out, and when it has received food again it is silent. *Neither shalt thou eat eagle nor falcon nor kite nor crow*.

Thou shalt not, He saith, *cleave unto, or be likened to, such men who know not how to provide food for themselves by toil and sweat, but in their lawlessness seize what belongeth to others, and as if they were walking in guilelessness watch and search about for some one to rob in their rapacity, just as these birds alone do not provide food for themselves, but sit idle and seek how they may eat the meat that belongeth to others, being pestilent in their evil-doings. And thou shalt not eat*, saith He, *lamprey nor polypus nor cuttle fish. Thou shalt not*, He meaneth, *become like unto such men, who are desperately wicked, and are already condemned to death, just as these fishes alone are accursed and swim in the depths, not swimming on the surface like the rest, but dwell on the ground beneath the deep sea. Moreoever thou shalt not eat hare. Why so? Thou shalt not be found a corrupter of boys, nor shalt thou become like such persons; for the hare gaineth on passage in the body every year; for according to the number of years it lives it has just so many orifices. Again neither shalt thou eat the hyena; thou shalt not*, saith He, *become an adulterer or a fornicator, neither shalt thou resemble such persons. Why so? Because this animal changeth its nature year by year, and becometh at one time male and at another female. Moreover He hath hated the weasel also and with good reason. Thou shalt not*, saith He, *become such as those men of whom we hear as working iniquity with their mouth for uncleanness, neither shalt thou cleave unto impure women who work iniquity with their mouth. For*

this animal conceiveth with its mouth. Concerning meats then Moses received three decrees to this effect and uttered them in a spiritual sense; but they accepted the, according to the lust of the flesh, as though they referred to eating. And David also receiveth knowledge of the same three decrees, and saith; *Blessed is the man who hath not gone in the counsel of the ungodly* - even as the fishes go in darkness into the depths; and hath not stood in the path of sinners - just as they who pretend to fear the Lord sin like swine; and hath not sat on the seat of the destroyers - as the birds that are seated for prey. Ye have now the complete lesson concerning eating. Again Moses saith; *Ye shall eat everything that divideth the hoof and cheweth the cud.* What meaneth he? He that receiveth the food knoweth Him that giveth the food, and being refreshed appeareth to rejoice in him. Well said he, having regard to the commandment. What then meaneth he? Cleave unto those that fear the Lord, with those who meditate in their heart on the distinction of the word which they have received, with those who tell of the ordinances of the Lord and keep them, with those who know that meditation is a work of gladness and who chew the cud of the word of the Lord. But why that which divideth the hoof? Because the righteous man both walketh in this world, and at the same time looketh for the holy world to come. Ye see how wise a lawgiver Moses was. But whence should they perceive or understand these things? Howbeit we having justly perceived the commandments tell them as the Lord willed. To this end He circumcised our ears and hearts, that we might understand these things.

Here Barnabas follows the same theme introduced in the book of Hebrews, where it is pointed out that all aspects of the Ceremonial Law were Biblical types designed to teach moral truths to the people in figures. This appears to be the approach of virtually all of the Church Fathers of the 1st and 2nd centuries. Apparently, some of them considered the Epistle of Barnabas as authentic and part of the Biblical Canon. Certainly, this opinion was true of Clement of Alexandria, who revisits this subject again in *Stromateis* and *The Instructor*, which unhappily, because he discusses the morality of deviant sexual practices, have been left in the Latin by prudish translators in Philip Schaff's edition of the patristic writings. After reciting numerous laws out of the Mosaic code, he adds,

Do you see how the legislation proclaims simultaneously the justice and goodness of God . . .? It has already been clearly shown that the Law is good and humane, a tutor leading us to Christ."

- Stromateis, Book Two

What he was talking about here was simply the spirit of the Moral Law - its meaning, its purpose, and its applications - as expressed in the various Mosaic regulations.

EXAMPLES OF THE MORAL LAW

The Great Commandment

The Law of Love

The Ten Commandments

EXAMPLES OF THE STATUTES

The Law of the Covenant

The Sermon on the Mount

Apostolic Rulings

EXAMPLES OF THE ORDINANCES

Dietary Laws

The Proverbs

The Precepts

The Sacraments

"UNCLEANNES" IN THE BIBLICAL TEXTS

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness.

-Matthew 23:27

Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves:

- Romans 1:24

I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness.

- Romans 6:19

I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean.

- Romans 14:14

Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate. saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you.

- 2 Corinthians 6:17

For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.

- 1 Corinthians 7:14

And lest, when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they have committed.

- 2 Corinthians 12:21

Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart: Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness. But ye have not so learned Christ.

- Ephesians 4:18-20

But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

- Ephesians 5:3-5

Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.

- Colossians 3:5

For God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness.

- 1 Thessalonians 4:7

Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their minds and conscience is defiled. They profess that they know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.

- Titus 1:15-16

Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.

- Hebrews 13:4

Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft . .

- Galatians 5:19-20

It is clear from the above texts that the subject of uncleanness is of extreme importance in the New Testament. But what was in the minds of the Apostles when they used the term "unclean"? What did the recipients of their Epistles understand it to mean?

While the above references are not exhaustive, they are representative of Apostolic treatment. In some cases uncleanness refers to evil motives (Matthew 23:27). In other cases it refers to defilement from association with idolatry (Romans 14; 1 Corinthians 9), or other sins, such as covenant union with unbelievers (2 Corinthians 6:17). Most of the time, however, it refers to a sin related to human sexuality. It is distinct from adultery, fornication, and lasciviousness. What is the sin of uncleanness?

The New Testament does not tell us, directly. It merely ratifies the Old Testament standard, as I will show. To understand what that standard is, we must return to the Old Testament.

An example of what I am saying is found in Romans chapter one and Paul's condemnation of homosexuality. It is quite clear from that text that homosexuality is a sin of uncleanness, specifically, although it might be considered fornication in a general sense. But Paul does not say *why* it fits

under that category. He assumes that his readers understand. Paul is writing to Roman Christians who are well-versed in the Mosaic law. Their understanding of that Law has equipped them to understand why homosexuality is not only sin, but also why it is a sin of *uncleanness*.

In Romans 14 Paul does give us a clue, however. In reference to Christians purchasing and eating "unclean" meat from the market - meats which were ritually defiled by consecration at a pagan temple - Paul makes it clear that there is no physical change which takes place in the meat because of a magical rite performed over it (v.14). It is still perfectly edible.

In verse 20 he tells us that "it is evil for that man who eateth with offence." So, it is the motive which decides the question. The man who eats with *an unclean mind* - an evil purpose - is defiled by his deed.

In reference to homosexuality, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with semen or seminal ejaculation. The sin lies in its being performed "with offence", by the man who uses it to reproach the Creator and His created purpose for the semen - which is procreation, principally, according to the Law. We will visit this subject shortly.

The book of Leviticus is the focal point for the Bible's teaching on defilement. It is too extensive to cite here, but I recommend you read it, especially chapters 5 through 18. There were three things which caused uncleanness: 1) things associated with death, 2) things associated with dirt, and 3) things associated with human reproduction.

For instance, if a man touched a corpse, he was ceremonially defiled. (If a man was defiled by touching a corpse, how much more perverse was necrophilia - to have sex with it!).

He was not allowed to eat a corpse of an animal that died with its blood. He was not allowed to eat animals, like pigs, that received their sustenance from dirt or from eating carrion (vultures).

In reference to human reproduction, leprosy caused uncleanness. Most people do not know that the leprosy in the Bible is not Hansen's disease, a disease where the flesh rots away. It was a venereal disease. The Septuagint, in fact, calls it "gonorrhoea".

Consequently, the hygienic school finds supporting evidence, here, that these laws served as health laws. The quarantine of highly contagious diseases protected the public health.

But this was a secondary application; there was more to this. Why did God punish people with venereal diseases? What was the *moral* uncleanness which led to physical and ceremonial uncleanness? Why were natural events, such as death, treated with such revulsion? Why were certain animals prohibited, such as the rabbit? A rabbit does not root in the dirt like a pig. It must be because, as was explained above by Barnabas, each of these aspects of nature contain within them a reflection of spiritual reality and a moral precept.

Why, then, does the Law hold childbirth as an uncleanness? Why is menstruation? Why is the seminal emission? What is the moral law that these regulations are trying to guard and teach? Do you really think God is just concerned about their messiness? The Early Fathers did not think so. They saw more.

THE DESIGN OF CREATION

God is entirely consistent and immutable. His laws are not unnatural. They stand harmoniously with His Design for Creation.

Modern man does not think so. He thinks God was sloppy when He made the world. He thinks it is full of mistakes. He thinks God is either too weak, or too ignorant, or too malevolent to create a harmonious universe. He does not believe in Divinely revealed Law. He believes in Natural Law.

Marquis de Sade believed in Natural Law. He said that anything which is possible, is natural. If it is natural, then it is moral. If it is possible to insert a penis into an anus, then it is perfectly moral to do so. We get the term "sadism" from his name. Sadism is a term we use to describe sexual torture.

The Bible condemns sodomy. Sodomy is the insertion of the man's penis into an orifice of another male (mouth or anus). It is a violation of the Creator's purpose for the male member. Where do we find the Creator's purpose for the male member? It is found in the Genesis narrative of creation.

Man was created to "be fruitful and multiply" (Genesis 1:28). "Fruitful" means to "have lots of seminal ejaculations". "Multiply" means to "abundantly

procreate". He was to do this with the female - the woman (Genesis 1:27). The Hebrew word for female means "to puncture". The female is designed to receive the penis and the semen. She is designed to conceive seed and bring forth offspring. A man's anus is not. It is that simple.

The men of Sodom did not agree with the Creator's design for their sexuality. So, God toasted them.

God does not want the seed of man misused. That is because it is life, the life God created. It represents future generations He has made in His image, future generations for whom Christ has died. He does not want them spilled on the ground. A man in the Bible did that once. His name was Onan. God killed him (Genesis 38:9).

It is more serious for a woman to spill seed than it is for a man. A man reproduces his seed from his gonads every time he ejaculates; the woman does not. Every time a woman menstruates, she passes seed that is lost forever. Woman should not menstruate; it is contrary to design. She is designed to conceive, not menstruate. A man who uses the female, yet does not help her conceive, is a wicked man. He might get Onan's judgment.

All men spill seed. They masturbate or have nocturnal emissions. Nobody's perfect. God still hates it. He calls it uncleanness. All men are sinners. All men need Jesus Christ as their Savior.

God wants us to be holy; He wants us to try not to spill seed. He wants us to use the female. He wants us to try to get her pregnant. It's that simple.

The men of the Bible married as early as they could. They married as many women as they could. They had sex as much as they could. They tried not to waste seed.

The women of the Bible married as early as they could. They had sex as much as they could. They tried to conceive.

Today, people like sex. It feels good. They figure out ways to avoid conception; they even kill unborn children. They make God angry. He takes away their sexual desire. They panic. They try sexual tricks to get the pleasure back. They become jaded. Nothing turns them on. God is judging them for abusing their sexuality. If they repent, He gives sexual desire back to them. If they do not, the judgment gets worse.

Eventually, sexual abusers must resort to perversion to arouse desire. They try drugs and witchcraft. They get diseases. They become barren, and then they die. Their civilization disappears like the melting snow. It is as if they never existed. They loved death, and so they died. It is that simple.

That is God's design.

THE SECONDARY PURPOSE OF SEX

The Bible tells us that God made the man and the woman to become "one flesh" (*henosis* in the Greek). That does not occur until the woman receives the man's semen into her body (1 Corinthians 6:16). Sex with a condom does not create the *henosis*. Condom sex is both the sin of uncleanness and lasciviousness. It is uncleanness because it is a fancy way of masturbating. It is lasciviousness because it excites sexual passion in the woman, but does not give her the seed.

God has made the woman with a physiological need for semen, apart from the needs of procreation. Long standing research shows that there are critical chemical substances in the semen which contribute to the physical and psychological health of the woman. Without semen, she increases her risk of cancer and depression, substantially, among other things (see *The Family Spokesman*, No. 37 for a review of these studies, available from this author).

A long neglected field of genetic research is Telegony. It is the study of the genetic alteration of the female's DNA by prolonged exposure to seminal absorption and fetal genetic imprint. Have you ever noticed how couples, celebrating their 50th wedding anniversaries, resemble each other? That is not just an anomaly; it is a result of the *henosis*.

Spiritual and physical union creates the foundation for family government. This is the secondary, yet essential, function of sex. That is why sexual intercourse can still be valid, even if conception is not possible, provided that it does not exceed in precedence over the moral obligation to procreate. Man does not have sovereignty over conception. Ultimately, only God does.

ORIGINAL SIN AND THE MAHUZZIM HERESY

The essence of man's original sin was the attempt "to be as gods" (Genesis 3:5). Gods live an effortless existence and make their own rules. They are accountable to no one but themselves and have the power to create their own morality.

Yahweh's judgment upon the human race was disciplinary. He did not suspend man's original design. Rather, He trapped man to the consequences of His choices by making his calling more difficult.

For instance, Adam still had to labor, as before the Fall. It just became more difficult - and necessary. Man became mortal and found that his sustenance came from one source: the cultivated earth. No longer could he leisurely sustain himself from the harvest of fruit trees. He had to till the ground, which resisted his will. He would sweat and bleed.

Eve still conceived and bore children, but it was now accompanied with labor and pain. She would sweat and bleed. She needed children now, more than ever, because old age would diminish her and her husband's ability to provide for their sustenance. They would increasingly rely upon their offspring to care for them. Also, she would find that she needed her husband to care for her in a wild world. But she could not keep her husband, unless she gave him what he was compelled to have - sex and offspring.

The effects of the Curse could be relieved only by complying with man's original calling. Only by hard work and procreation could man reduce the effects of the Fall. His brutish mind, however, revolted against God's moral discipline, and sought escape in the various "isms" of world history — statism and hedonism being among them.

What then is Original Sin? I discuss this somewhat in *Biblical Terranomics #17*. Original Sin is the brutish condition in which man finds himself, as the result of the withdrawal of God's presence from his psychic experience. It is man's inability to harmonize his will with the created order, a created order which includes his own being. Without Divine illumination, without the healing of his will, man cannot rise above brutishness. Sin compounds this fallen condition into further degradation, until man completely loses his moral agency and sinks to the level of beasts.

Augustine made the error of identifying man's fallen nature with the desire - the lust - to procreate. Sexual desire is the motive God has given mankind to

induce it, even coerce it, to procreate. To make war with that desire by repressing it or perverting it is an inversion of Biblical values. From the beginning, the Divine witness has taught that sexual desire is commendable, if it is fulfilled according to the Creator's design. The rejection of the sexual desire for women was one of the essential characteristics of the Mahuzzim heresy and the Antichrist predicted by the Prophet Daniel (11:38).

Augustine held that marriage was valid for purposes of procreation. However, influenced by his Manichean worldview, he saw the creation as inherently depraved and was persuaded that celibacy was morally superior to marriage and family life. Augustine forsook his family for the bishop's chair.

The Monastic movement was something which began in the Early Church during the 2nd Century, when heretical Christians, like Tatian, tried to out-Stoic the Stoics. In the 3rd Century, Apologists used the custom of abstinence as proof of Christianity's moral superiority over paganism. By the 4th century, through the pen of Athanasius, the idea of communities of celibates captured the imagination of Christian leaders. Young men fled the marriage bed for the cloister. These monks, lacking any familial loyalties, were favored for bishoprics by the Christian Emperors of the 5th Century. And thus, during the time of Augustine, the Church became allied with the Imperial State.

The doctrine of Original Sin, as interpreted by Augustine, became a tool for State control over the people. It has prevailed for over a thousand years. So have the sins of uncleanness.

ANSWERING OBJECTIONS

Legalists and perfectionists will not like what I have just said above. With their lips they will admit to their need of a Savior, but in their hearts they want to feel good about themselves. They really do not want to think of themselves as sinners *continuously* in need of a Savior. They will object, trying to point out exceptions and inconsistencies. Let's see if I can adequately respond to them.

OBJECTION #1 - "Why was childbirth and normal sex still considered acts of uncleanness, if what you are saying is true?"

ANSWER - Because God said it was. Do we need to understand why? Well, He tells us why. In the Old Testament, before the coming of Jesus Christ, the seed *of man was itself unclean*. Not only was the misuse of seed an act of uncleanness, so was the seed. It was not sanctified until the Atonement of Jesus Christ. Notice Paul's explanation in 1 Corinthians 7:14 - the children of believers are holy and not unclean. The children of unbelievers are unclean. Children born in the Old Testament were unclean. Nocturnal emissions were unclean for the same reason. Now they are no longer a source of uncleanness *unless they represent willful barrenness*.

Notice in this reference that the children are holy, even if one of the parents was an unbeliever. This was why our Lord Jesus Christ was not contaminated by Original Sin. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost. According to His humanity, He was the son of an unclean woman and a clean father. Mary was sanctified by the Holy Spirit and her offspring was made holy. More on this in a moment.

Clement of Alexandria taught Christians that the messiness of sexual intercourse was not a source of defilement. A man and woman could arise and go to worship directly after intercourse and not concern themselves with even bathing (*Stromateis, Bk.3:82*).

OBJECTION #2 - "In 1 Corinthians 7, Paul the Apostle teaches the moral superiority of perpetual virginity. This would mean he saw nothing evil in menstruation and nocturnal emissions, which celibates would surely have experienced."

ANSWER: Let's take a closer look at this. This is a sloppy interpretation of this text.

First, observe in verse 25 that Paul admits that this counsel is not written under Divine inspiration. This point is important. Paul is honestly telling us that these are his thoughts based upon his human reasoning. How can we use this with any universal authority when the Apostle has emphatically told us that it was meant merely as personal advice? We know that Paul considered Peter to be capable of mistakes (Galatians 2:11). It is certainly not disrespectful to believe that Paul made a mistake here.

Second, he clearly bases his advise upon eschatological expectations ("the time is short", v. 26, 29). It contains the same sense as our Lord's exclamation

in Matthew 24:19, where He pronounced a "Woe" upon pregnant and lactating women. He was not diminishing the maternal calling; rather, He was warning of its hazards during a time of tribulation.

Third, Paul saw the elimination of "distraction" as a spiritual benefit. The Corinthians lived in a sexually perverse culture. Paul felt a fast from sexual activity would allow the Corinthian Church the opportunity to pursue spiritual growth in other areas that were more urgent. These new converts were starting from scratch. Learning to control one's desires is a healthy exercise; although a prolonged abstinence is not (v. 1-2).

Finally, Paul reverses this ruling in 1 Timothy 4:3-4; 5:14 and elsewhere. According to Clement of Alexandria, Paul remarried himself and refers to his spouse in Philippians 4:1. So much for the celibacy movement.

OBJECTION #3 - "Some of the patriarchs in the Bible married late in life. According to what you say, they should have been married at puberty to avoid sin?"

ANSWER: Considering the longevity of those who lived in that period, they probably experienced a late puberty. But I never said they were perfect.

OBJECTION #4 - "It is a harsh moral standard to require pubescent girls and ill women to bear children, which can cause injury or even death. "

ANSWER: The Bible never said that overcoming sin would be easy. But I think we find ample evidence in the Bible, as well as the writings of the Early Church, that our sexual fruitfulness ought to be treated with as much respect as fruit trees. The Law required that fruit trees be left unharvested during the first three years of production. Pruning enhances fruitfulness. There is a difference between wisdom and fanaticism (Ecclesiastes 7:16-18).

Ezekiel 16:7 tells us that a woman is ready for sex when her pubic hair is fully grown and her breasts are fully formed. That occurs long after puberty.

In reference to women who are ill, we must remember that our Lord's "yoke is easy and His burden is light". He has suspended the curse of the Law. That is just another reason we need a Savior. The Law does not yield in its

standard. We will never achieve perfection in this flesh and we should stop fretting about it.

This is not a matter of determining our eternal destiny. It is a matter of reward. It is a matter of progressive sanctification. The Lord looks at the heart and knows our motives. He knows if we are physically frail and choose to serve another way. He also knows if we are avoiding pregnancy just because we want materialistic pleasure or do not want to be bothered with children.

OBJECTION #5 - "These laws are done away with in Christ."

ANSWER: This objection is the general objection of antinomians. It is not my intention to waste time refuting it. Many other writers have adequately responded to that error.

However, these Ceremonial laws in the Old Testament are often held to be abolished, even by those opposed to antinomianism. I do not quarrel with that view. I do not believe that menstruating women must provide a blood atonement every time they menstruate (Leviticus 15:29-30). That sort of thing is abolished in Christ.

However, I will say again that the Moral Law still stands, and whatever it was in the Moral Law that these ordinances represented, it is still valid and binding for us today. In reference to sexual uncleanness, I am saying these ordinances were designed to compel obedience to the Creation Mandate. Until we become angels, it still stands. Consequently, sins, such as menstruation, are no longer sinful because the seed is unclean - at least for the Christian - rather, menstruating is proof of the existence of sin: the antecedent choice of willful infertility. This could be expressed in the unlawful use of contraception, deviancy, the avoidance of marriage, and so on.

OBJECTION #6 - "If Jesus had nocturnal emissions, then He also sinned."

ANSWER: This objection provides us with an opportunity to discuss unique theological questions. No one seems to have faced this issue for 18 centuries, since the Docetist heresy.

As I have argued elsewhere, our Lord did have nocturnal emissions (*Biblical Terranomics No. 18*). His emissions were not sinful, however, because His seed was holy. Here lies the importance of the Incarnation and the Virgin Birth to the Atonement. Had not Christ been supernaturally conceived, He would have been defiled by Original Sin and disqualified as our Savior. Because He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, not only was **He** holy, His seed was holy, also (a condition we all now enjoy because of His Atonement and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit).

Nevertheless, the Scriptures do teach that Jesus experienced the "infirmity of the flesh" - the sinful nature. He bore the burden of seminal production. He was tempted by His flesh to ejaculate sinfully, such as masturbation. This is the meaning of passages like Romans 8:3, which says that Christ came in the "likeness of sinful flesh".

Obviously, as was true of His baptism, our Lord complied with the ordinances pertaining to nocturnal emissions, "to fulfill all righteousness", and thus, "condemn sin in the flesh".

Looking at this from another angle, these factors compelled Jesus to marry. If He experienced our "infirmities", then He must have experienced sexual desire. If He had sexual desire, then He must have had seminal emissions. If He had emissions, then He must have obeyed the Creation Ordinance, married and had children. If he still had nocturnal emissions, it would have been *sin if it indicated failure to make use of the female*. But if our Lord did not have access to His wife, because of her failure to be available for sexual intercourse, then it was her sin, not His. He would have been the victim and not the perpetrator.

For we do not have a high priest who cannot share our infirmities, but we have one who was tempted with everything as we are, and yet without sin.

- Hebrews 4:15 (Aramaic)

For the Christian, we stand on the same footing as our Lord, judicially. We are no longer required to comply with the ordinances of the letter of the law. But we are required, as always, to comply with the "spirit of the law" (Romans 7:22), "that the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (8:4). In this case we are talking about procreation "that we should bring forth fruit unto God" (7:4), and not infertile acts which "bring forth fruit unto death."

APPLICATIONS

Now that we have examined the Biblical foundation for understanding the Sin of Uncleanness, perhaps that understanding can be perfected if we look at various sexual practices to see how they relate to this Sin. Keep in mind, that some sins of uncleanness represent the sin of presumption (like sodomy), while others represent the sin of ignorance which grow from the infirmity of the flesh (like the menstruating of barren women).

I was baptized in the Methodist Church when I was a young boy. My pastor turned out to be a homosexual. When my uncle caught him in the act", he justified his perversion with this remark:

"At least I am not getting girls pregnant."

Ponder that for a moment. Following the First World War, a period of relaxed moral standards prevailed. The attitude of the time was that sexual license was tolerable, as long as it did not produce public scandal. "Scandal", of course, meant pregnancy, because a swelling belly is difficult to ignore.

With co-ed high schools, proms, and the jitter-bug, sexual promiscuity became irresistible. Young people looked for ways to have their fun without pregnancies. At that time, abortion and contraception were still either unavailable or against the law. So young people began to experiment with mutual masturbation, oral sex and anal sex. Its prevalence was far more extensive than most people realized. The meteoric success of Hugh Hefner's Playboy philosophy in the 1950s would not have been possible, if a significant part of the culture had not already surrendered itself to these sexual practices.

Sexual pleasure became the highest good; procreation became a moral evil. And young women who had indulged in these activities, still fancied themselves as virgins on their wedding day. Technically, they were, but morally, they were not. This pro-sex, anti-baby sentiment probably sums-up the moral philosophy of the 20th century.

Now, of course, we have various forms of contraception, natural planning, abortion, and abstinence. They all fall into the same moral category in terms of God's Creation Mandate. Even abstinence requires the destruction of seed. For the woman, of course, abstinence leads to menstruation. For the man, it also leads to the destruction of seed. Unejaculated semen eventually degrades and is

reabsorbed into the sexual gonads. The sperm die and dissolve. So, the consequences of prolonged abstinence is the same as infertile sex.

We can see, then, the explanation for several Biblical customs. One such custom was arranged marriage. In order to insure the marital success of their offspring, parents actively assisted their children in finding a spouse. This exalted marriage in the minds of young people as something of great value, because of parental blessing. It diminished the risk of harlotry for those who might have had romantic difficulty, which, of course, is a fount for all kinds of perversions.

Early marriage was another custom. The average Israelite male married his first wife at age 16 - shortly after puberty. Girls were married at 12. The bias among Israelites was toward teaching young people normal, procreative sexual activity - early. Bachelors and spinsters were suspect. They believed abstinence and late marriage tempted the young to seek sexual release in deviant activity, as I explained above.

Such Biblical customs were common in the United States until the early 20th Century. Girls who graduated from grammar school were generally married within a year. Boys took a few years longer because they needed to build a house and clear a homestead. But they were generally married by no later than 20 years of age.

The introduction of high schools in the 20th Century upset those customs. Co-ed high schools, the result of child-labor laws, have been the single greatest contribution to the moral decline of the American people.

Another Biblical custom which remedied the Sin of Uncleaness was plural marriage: the practice of men taking more than one wife. This custom diminished the number of menstruating women. It also eliminated the temptation for men to masturbate or to indulge in deviant sex.

The necessity of production requires release of the semen. If men do not have vaginal sex readily available to them, they seek release in other ways. If men could speak bluntly they would claim that a full scrotum and a full prostate cause as much suffering and anguish for a man as does a full bladder.

Most women, especially Christian women, do not appreciate the burden that monogamism imposes on some men. But Biblical women understood, and readily gave consent to their husbands to take additional wives and concubines.

The ministry of the Concubine is one which needs to be restored to society if the Sin of Uncleaness is to be eliminated. The Hebrew word for Concubine is "peleghesh" (pronounced *pee-leh-glesh*) which means "a matrix to spear". It is a strongly sexual term.

[It is not my intent to be guttural, but you must understand that such an earthy expression is used in the Bible and was understood in such a manner as I have described. It is *our* culture which has degraded sexuality - by our shameful abuse of it - so that we cannot discuss it frankly and honestly.]

Concubinage is a sexual ministry. Such a ministry is inconceivable to the moralists of our day. They equate it with prostitution, which proves their skewed values. I find it hard to believe that Keturah was Abraham's personal "whore". She was his concubine, who later became his mistress (Mrs.=wife) upon Sarah's death. Concubines were junior wives and enjoyed a dignity which harlots did not have in the Bible. Concubinage provided marriage for women who might have been wayward otherwise. Not only did it provide them with the opportunity for pregnancy and a family life (the elimination of menstruation), it saved them from the slippery slope of promiscuity, harlotry, and witchcraft. Societies which do not have this custom must create a class of prostitutes, either amateur or professional. And in such professions, we find the haunt of drugs, demonism, and eventually, human sacrifice (abortion, etc.).

CONCLUSION

The land of America is defiled. The Church of Jesus Christ is defiled. Revival has eluded us. Like Samson, we do not know that the Spirit of the LORD has departed from us. Our customs grieve Him. We are devoid of spiritual power.

The Jews of Jesus' day substituted sacrifice for righteousness. They did not concern themselves with changing their sinful life styles. They just bought the appropriate sacrifice, participated in the appropriate ritual and absolved themselves of its punishment. Our Lord blasted them with repeated rebukes and curses. They killed Him for it.

Today, the situation is unchanged. Most Christians think these ceremonial laws are abolished. They think the Bible's treatment of uncleanness involves some fetish or paranoia about bodily functions. They think Christ's Atonement has solved everything. They do not bother to change their life styles. They are

just as spiritually dead as were the hypocritical Pharisees of Jesus' day. And they will receive the same reward.

In ancient times, the use of semen and menstrual blood in pagan, magical rites was common. I do not want to get too mystical here, or grotesque, but my extensive research on the occult has convinced me that the spillage of seed and blood excites demonic activity. Uncleanness and the inversion of Biblical values lie at the core of witchcraft and satanism. It is a part of the defacing and the destruction of the image of God upon the earth. For Christians to participate in these practices and to deny their remedy, only empowers Satan's kingdom, vexes the Holy Spirit, and leaves us spiritually helpless.

Are you guilty of the sin of presumption? Are you guilty of uncleanness? Then repent and make provision to possess your vessel in holiness and honor.

Before we engage the Adversary in battle, we must, as did the Zadokites of old, cleanse the War Camp. Only then will Yahweh draw near and lead us into battle to possess the land.

* * * * *

ADDENDUM

Below, you will find a short exchange of correspondence with one of the women on my mailing list. See if you can find the errors in her arguments.

Dear James,

I appreciate the thought of your sending all the literature. To date there is nothing I or C. are in agreement with you on except, perhaps plural marriage.

I don't believe menstruation is proof of moral dereliction. There are many virtuous godly women who, married or single, cannot bear children. (And I do not say this only because God chose not to bless me in this way).

Enclosed is a summary of my basic doctrinal beliefs. Upon reading it you will see why I am in disagreement with you on most things.

Sincerely, Mrs. L.

Dear L.

Thanks for your letter. I must admit that I am mystified to find that you disagree with me on most things. After reading your Statement of Faith, I found myself in agreement with most of it; and those few areas where I had question, I certainly did not find them heretical.

Since you are a person who believes Christians should not eat "unclean meats", I find it difficult to understand why you cannot see the sin of another uncleanness: menstruating. Perhaps, you do not understand your own position or perhaps, you reacted emotionally to my newsletter. I don't think you got my point.

Regardless, I will not burden you with things you do not want to read. So, I won't send you anymore newsletters, unless I hear from you otherwise.

With Christian regards,

James

Dear James.

In the Statement of Beliefs that I sent you under the definition of sin, you will notice I believe sin to be "the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. This is referring to the 10 Commandments.

I do not believe that eating unclean foods violates any of these 10. I do believe that just as the 10 commandments are a living, eternal law set in motion, so are certain health laws set in motion. To violate one of the 10 is spiritual death. To violate one of the health laws could lead to physical death.

Sin is a matter of human choice. Menstruation is not. Therefore it is no sin. It is not something an unmarried or barren woman can control and therefore I do not believe we are judged for menstruation. Our salvation is not at stake because of menstruation.

Thanks for taking time to read my viewpoint

Mrs. L.

P.S. Please don't stop any literature that you are giving away. We both like to hear from you.

ANALYSIS

Now, let's examine the logic of this argument against the position that menstruation is a sin of uncleanness.

Mrs. L. obviously does not know my entire position or the evidence I use to support it. She is assuming that I am equating menstruation with murder or idolatry in all cases. From the above study, you know that there are different kinds of sin.

She has a truncated definition of sin, doesn't she? She is correct that sin is the transgression of the law, but she does not understand that it also includes the meaning of "missing the mark". For that reason, she believes that all sin must be voluntary. That is not true. Many sins are involuntary; for they are done in ignorance.

Just as Jesus said, the level of knowledge and understanding determines the severity of judgment. But all sinners are worthy of punishment.

She protects herself by narrowing the "law" to the 10 commandments. Thus, the food laws become food recommendations and not laws. Additionally, her definition is woefully inadequate. Homosexuality and bestiality are not mentioned in the 10 commandments. By this standard, can she justly call them sins which bring "spiritual death"? No, she cannot.

Now, she may say that these sins fall under the 7th Commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." And I would be willing to agree with that idea. But I can also use the sane hermeneutic to include the sins of uncleanness under that category, since homosexuality, as our study shows above, is also classified as an uncleanness. Homosexuality is an uncleanness; so is menstruation.

Of course, there is a difference. Homosexuality is a presumptuous sin of uncleanness. Menstruation is not. A woman who is trying to get pregnant, but is unable to do so, probably is punished enough already. She is saved by the

Cross of Calvary. However, a woman, who menstruates because she is not trying to get pregnant, is in a different moral situation. Willful barrenness is a more serious sin. Whether it has crossed the line into presumption depends upon the extenuating circumstances involved (does she have cancer? is she unmarried?, etc.). These matters pertain to our life of sanctification as Christians. Only after it becomes a pattern of selfish activity will God let it manifest itself into a sin that He can judge.

She is incorrect to say menstruation is not a matter of choice. For normal, healthy women, menstruating represents an antecedent choice to not get pregnant, either by electing not to marry, not to engage in sex at a fertile time, or to use a contraceptive. We do not excuse a drunk driver for the accident he has caused simply because he did not have control of his faculties. He had the moral capacity to avoid getting drunk. In this case, most women have the capacity to do certain things to avoid menstruation. Sexual intercourse is a moral duty.

* * * * *