

# Response to Criticism

Assume for a moment you suddenly found a letter slipped under your door. You pick it up and open it. It is addressed to you from your worst enemy. In that letter you find attack after attack calling you a hypocrite and accusing you of wickedness in every way this enemy could think.

You read all the way through this large letter and, mysteriously you find you actually feel good inside. Why? You know this enemy has been someone who has had plenty of time to see what you are like in daily life. He actually knows you quite well. What leaves you feeling good, is that you have just read a letter that not one thing in it was true. Some was pure fantasy on this enemies part, the rest was wickedly twisted, taken out of context.

You know if someone else were given this letter, they would be shocked. They may not know if it was true or not, but you see, it's about you. You know for certain the truth. He can't fool you. What left you feeling good, was that such an enemy would surely use all the ammunition he had to legitimately level at you. He knew you and yet, such an enemy could not honestly find one thing to condemn you with. If there was anything he

could find, that surely would have been the very first item. You can bow your head and say, "Thank you Lord, you have preserved me so I passed the ruthless examination of my enemies."

.....

I have saved the necessary evil of responding, to those who attack what I have been teaching throughout the book, "The Collaring."

There are many attacks from a multitude of perspectives. I found an article that presents itself as a message from a Christian to Christians. It is quite extensive and may likely appear well thought out to a simple Christian. When I say "simple", I mean no insult. It is to be expected a young child will be simple. That is no sin, though it can be a danger. That is why the older Christians need to watch out for the safety of the younger.

I read the article, that gave a broad attack of the elements found in BDSM, and it felt like that letter from the enemy which fell flat on its face. To those who don't know, they might be scandalized, but for the educated and cautious, they pick up on the failure of the arguments and attacks. After reading that article, I had a very good feeling. He

tried to slander and shred such a lifestyle, but not one thing he said was accurate. It was taken out of context, twisted and in some cases crossed the line into apostasy in doctrine.

To go into great detail on every point of the article would make this article absolutely massive. Instead, I will itemize the primary criticisms and address those.

## Definitions and groupings

The article starts with simple Webster definitions for bondage, domination, sadism and masochism. His definitions were certainly hand picked to create a negative feeling.

Just a quick analysis of the full scope of his definition for the first term: *Bondage: "sadomasochistic sexual practices involving the physical restraint of one partner"* (Merriam-Webster Dictionary).

Now really, bondage has a much broader meaning than that. What he chose connects a loaded word, "sadomasochistic" to the remainder of the definition. It uses a negative adjective that colors the remainder of the sentence. If that adjective

was left off, the sentence would have been accurate, in this context only, and would not carry the loaded meaning of cruelty. You can tag the term “Merriam-Webster Dictionary” to it, but it still doesn’t mean a word game isn’t being played upon the reader of the article.

The article proceeded to acknowledge that what is encompassed in the term of “BDSM” is broad reaching and vaguely covers a lot of things. Even so, he condemns anyone who touches the area covered under that blanket term.

The remainder of the article poses seven questions and purports to give answers. Sound harmless enough? The leading questions and skewed answers need to be clearly thought through. You can’t afford to read such with simplicity.

## Question one

*1. Does the act degrade and dishonor God’s temple?*

Such a question certainly has its place in our consideration. There are most assuredly those who fall under the BDSM head that do degrade and dishonor their bodies. There are also those who do not. There are also those under the heading of non-BDSM that degrade and dishonor their bodies and those who do not.

At the end of the article, he asks that those who answer yes to any of these

seven questions, refrain from such behavior. Again, that sounds good, but if the thought is that if one finds degrading or dishonoring treatment under the heading of BDSM, then one needs to cease from anything under that heading. It also follows that if you find degrading or dishonoring treatment under the heading of what BDSMers call “vanilla”, or the standard relationship, that one should also cease from anything under that heading.

## Question two

*2. Does the act pervert sexual pleasure by mixing it with pain?*

The article quotes three verses to show pain is a by-product of sin and will end: Genesis 3:16-17; 6:6; Revelation 21:4. I looked the passages up. Read Genesis 3:16-17 carefully. It says the woman’s pain in childbearing and conception would be greatly increased. Did you catch that, “increased”? Before the fall there was pain! Not only did it say pain in the birthing process, it said there would be pain in the mating process. The passage of Genesis 6:6 does not even mention pain and the passage in Revelation is worth the effort of looking up the word translated pain there. The Greek word’s primary meaning is “great trouble”. I can also tell you that to say Rev. 21:4 means pain will be

removed from creation is a flat lie. The lake of fire will be a place of eternal pain and it is a part of creation.

There are also other passages that tell us the mating process is naturally associated with pain. This gets into rather intimate details, but Scripture saw the need to include these details. Solomon tells us:

*18 Let thy fountain be blessed: and rejoice with the wife of thy youth. 19 Let her be as the loving hind and pleasant roe; let her breasts satisfy thee at all times; and be thou ravished always with her love. Proverbs 5:18-19*

We also find a passage, though it is in reference to Israel’s unfaithfulness, it is referring to the mating acts:

*3 And they committed whoredoms in Egypt; they committed whoredoms in their youth: there were their breasts pressed, and there they bruised the teats of their virginity. Ezekiel 23:3*

These passages tell of a pain that is involved in the mating behavior. Solomon’s council speaks of a burning passion that will be to some degree pain inducing to the woman. Let me give you the example of a nursing mother. Did you know that many women stop nursing because of the pain involved? Are we to believe that the nursing child is sinning in afflicting such pain on its mother?

I want to quote the lead in from the second paragraph in the answer to question two

in the article, *"God designed us to enjoy many different pleasures, including sex, food, work, art, music and sports.* I thought about all the categories he listed. Did you know that pain is necessarily a part of every one of them?

Consider food. I love chile relleños! If I'm at a Mexican restaurant that makes a good one, I order one to have as my dessert. A good one has a touch of sweetness and leaves your mouth burning. Did you know that what causes that pain in the chili pepper is actually good for your health? No, it is not a sin to eat something that causes pain.

Consider sports. When you begin working out, two push-ups may be all you can do without pain. Ten and you're in agony. Is it sinful to press on to the ten? Press on and progress. Eventually you will get to ten with no pain. Then what? You press on to twenty! No, this is not sinful. Many also consider the mating practices rather athletic and actually require conditioning to work out more without pain.

One last thought in relation to the pain issue. We have taken a good, long look at the marital relationship in the parallel of the church to Christ. It appears to me the marital relationship is intended to teach us many things about the living relationship we should have with Christ. In it, we should see dominion of Christ over us. We should see His tender compassion

and love for us. We should see the absolute devotion of the church for the Master. As reflects on this pain issue, consider these verses:

*41 And they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name.*

*Acts 5:41*

*13 But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy.*

*1 Peter 4:13*

We can see that if we suffer pain for Christ's sake, it should actually be a cause of joy in our spirits. That being the case, why should it seem a strange thing if God has placed in the heart of the women to take a pleasure in suffering some for the sake of her husband?

## Question three

*3. Does the act stifle the work of the Holy Spirit in your life?*

The article made a blanket connection of BDSM with malice, hate, cruelty, lust, selfishness, control and domination. It claimed these are part of our sinful nature, so was the opposite of the fruit of the Holy Spirit. Again, we do find all these items amongst some of the BDSM practitioners. We also find them amongst the vanilla crowd. Do we pitch both because of this?

I want to interject at this point that control or domination is not evil or unbiblical. Shouldn't parents rightfully control and be in the dominant position with their children? If you blanket condemn such as not of the Holy Spirit, you have to condemn it in every manifestation. Such a condemnation is clearly false. The application in oppression is wrong.

The writer quoted from a corrupt Bible version Ephesians 4:31-32. Part of which read, *"Be kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other..."* As I said early in the book, Christian master/servant relationships do operate under the principles of kindness, tenderheartedness and respect. There is absolutely no desire to see the other suffer. It is quite the opposite.

Consider the further aspect of domination and control in respect to parental responsibility. When a parent disciplines an errant child, does such come from a desire to see the other suffer? Of course not, it comes from true love. If a husband disciplines his wife, is it not the same? Consider a play, which I cannot recommend reading due to an expletive near the beginning. Nonetheless, many will be familiar with William Shakespeare's *"The Taming of the Shrew"*. A story of an unbearable woman, lovingly known as 'the Shrew', who was tamed

by her husband. In the end, she was a perfect wife. Such is an example of appropriate need for discipline. I have also sadly witnessed several Christian men in need of exercising some discipline with their tyrannical wives. If their love for God was at the level it should be, they would see the absolute need to make their wives suffer a little for the sake of getting right with God.

Personally, my wife is too wonderful for words. She's not perfect, but you know something, neither am I. That gives her an even greater opportunity to excel in her virtues in still being so great with me even when I don't deserve it. Her submissive attitude towards me helps me to get back on the strait path all the quicker, like Peter said in 1 Peter 3:1-7.

As for my personal testimony in regards to question three, following this path of master/servant has helped further the work of the Holy Spirit in my life along with increased joy of the Spirit. Undoubtedly, not the answer the writer of the article wanted to hear.

## Question four

4. *Does the act corrupt God's perfect plan for love and sex in marriage?*

The writer started this question out by quoting, again from a corrupt Bible version, the passage of

Ephesians 5:22-29.

From that passage, he lists his key ideas. The first idea he presents, is where he crosses the line clearly into the camp of apostasy. He details that wives are to submit to their husbands as they do to God. He then goes on to say our submission to God does not involve punishment, since Jesus bore all our punishment on the cross. That flies directly in the face of 1 Corinthians chapter 5 where we are told a sinning Christian was to be put away from the fellowship. He was to be turned over for discipline, even to death if need be. We also saw Paul describing that some Christians had died because they partook of communion unworthily in 1 Corinthians 11:28-33. In those verses you will see the word, "*chasten*". Chastening is punishment. To teach God doesn't discipline His own, flies in the clear face of scripture.

The second key idea the writer listed, was that the husband is over the wife as Christ is over the church. He said Jesus did not treat the church harshly nor dominate it. While it is true Christ loves the church, it is also true that judgment begins at the house of God. Just read the seven letters to the seven churches in Revelation chapters 2 and 3. Most of those churches got red marks from Jesus. If the threat of removing their candlestick, i.e. destroying their church, wasn't harsh, what possibly is?

As far as the claim that Jesus does not dominate His own, what do you think he meant when He said:

*15 If ye love me, keep my commandments.*

*John 14:15*

The writer's third key idea was that the woman should not mistreat her husband. As I have said, in the Christian master/servant relationship there isn't any mistreatment either direction.

There are those who classify as 'Christian' everything from Mormonism and Seventh Day Adventism to Reformed Baptist and to Roman Catholic. Such is biblically an outrageously incorrect classification. Nonetheless, they do it. They can look at the polygamy seen in some Mormon groups and say, "Look at those Christians! Scandalous behavior." Is that fair? That doesn't even touch the true Christians, neither does it represent the largest percentage of their own self-defined 'Christian' group. Just from the research we have been conducting, the abuse cases and mistreatment is just like that, it is a small fraction of too broad a group. Statistically, the vanilla group appears to exhibit a much greater incidence of abuse than the BDSM group. Again, like Jesus said:

*24 Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment.*

*John 7:24*



The writer's final key idea was that we are to nurture our body and our spouse's body. He said, "*Nurturing, caring and feeding do not carry any connotation of bondage, pain or abuse.*"

Since he has determined the definition of bondage in his special limited sense, it is easy for that word to be used in a negative fashion. I have already done a thorough covering of the master/servant position. Dominion and subservience is biblically correct. 'Bondage' under his perception is condemned as not nurturing, caring and feeding. We have already discussed pain and abuse as well.

What I feel needs to be pointed out along the thought of nurturing, caring and feeding, is that the non-corrupted wife since the fall, according to Genesis 3:16, will desire to experience her husband's mastery of her. Remember that the husband is to seek to meet the needs of his wife. To do such is to nurture her. When she expresses the need to know you are her master, you will be neglecting the need of your wife if you do not take this position of master over her. In that position, she will want to find ways to express her subservience to her husband. If the master gives duties for her service, such will further nurture her inner craving. Showing such authority over one's wife will also meet the inner need of

the man. God has given the man the charge to lead his family. In western society, men have been milk-toasted down to be sops. They need to be addressed as the heads of the family to help them take their position in strength and courage.

The answer to the question, "*Does the act corrupt God's perfect plan for love and sex in marriage?*" The master/servant position illustrates that. To break away from such a position would be the corruption of God's perfect plan.

## Question five

5. *Does the act bring you under the rule of a defeated enemy?*

The second paragraph in the article, under question five begins, "*God commands us clearly to not allow sin (or anything other than God) to be our master (Genesis 4:7).*"

First off, Genesis 4:7 in no way says it is wrong to have a master. It simply does not say what that writer wants you to believe it says. Also, I have already given ample biblical evidence that having a master, as in a servant or having a master, as in a marital relationship, is actually scriptural.

The writer went on to say we are set free by Christ so any form of servitude is coming under the rule of Satan. Christ did set us free from the 'old man', the rule of our sin-

ful nature. At the same time, He made us slaves to Him, which we have already looked at in more depth. Also consider that we are under many forms of authority, to which we must submit. If you are employed, you are under a degree of rule by your employer. If you live in a country, you are under the rule of its government. If you have parents, you are under their authority and the list goes on.

The writer who criticized master/servant relationships, uses the dominion of Satan like a red-herring to his own end. I can understand someone being afraid of a master/servant relationship simply because they are totally removed from such comprehension in their cultural upbringing. Due to that, such a person will approach the subject with natural reserve. The problem comes when a person no longer comes to check something out with due caution, but with red-faced hatred. I would encourage everyone to take care against grouping all together as one. Look at the facts carefully and check context. Lack of such leads to the kind of error seen in the article of seven questions.

## Question six

6. *Is the act based on violence or graphic fantasies (e.g. sex, death, rape, torture, mutilation, etc.)?*

The writer relates how the

serial killer Ted Bundy ended up where he did, and BDSM was involved.

Did you know crimes are being committed by people who got involved with playing video games? Of course many kinds of video games aren't evil. There are many, that are, but to link video games as a whole to violent crime just isn't really fair to 'pong'. One can play a video game and no addiction ensues, another person may lose control. Playing a game isn't the problem, it's the condition of the heart and the type of games one chooses to play.

The question asks if the act is based on a graphic fantasy, then lists sex as one in a list of obviously distasteful items. Such grouping will naturally cast a bad light on everything in the list. Sex is not evil. Stuff like fornication and adultery are.

What is meant by "*graphic fantasies*"? Any fantasy is an imagination of the mind. Such is going to be played out in one's head in a visual manner. Based upon what the writer wrote in the question, for a husband, who sees a woman walk by who has clothes that are spray-painted on, to turn his imaginations to his wife, and dream of her is having a graphic fantasy. He comes home and satisfies that fantasy with his wife. In other words, the question insinuates that if a man uses fantasies of his wife to overcome the temptation to gaze at another woman, he

is sinning. Such carries the thought that if he does this to avoid lusting after that pornographic woman, he is sinning. How utterly stupid! Solomon gave his answer back in Proverbs 5:18-19.

The writer also makes that massive grouping, like we considered of the polygamous Mormons, to the whole of what someone calls 'Christianity'. To connect Sarah calling Abraham "lord" to the path of someone like Ted Bundy is unjust grouping.

## Question seven

7. *Is the act a 'perversion' of normal heterosexual relations?*

This final question tops the cake. The writer obviously sits to judge what is 'perverse' and what is 'normal'. Cultural upbringing determines for many what is 'perverse' and what is 'normal'.

For example, the Plain People Mennonites in the United States greet each other with a kiss. It is actually expected you will do so if you become a member of their church. They quote scripture that says the brethren are to greet one another with a holy kiss. The men kiss both men and women with a simple kiss on the lips. I understand it is part of their cultural upbringing. I don't condemn them for this but I tell you, personally – no way! To me, there is an inner feeling of 'perverse'. Intellectually,

I can accept it, but not subjectively. To them it would be a perversion to not greet the other in this way. Ah, so now, are we the ones being 'perverse'?

Scripture does not condemn this 'holy kiss'. It does condemn specific acts, such as homosexuality and in the same arena of heterosexual relationships, it condemns sexual relationships out of wedlock, for one. The writer quotes Romans 1:24-31. That passage covers many things, but of primary concern here, it covers the homosexual lifestyle (sodomy).

The writer made a list of "*key aspects of the peoples' behavior*". The first he lists is, "*They degraded their bodies with one another.*" This is accurate. Look up the passage in the good old King James Version and see how it says they did this. It is very clear that this was going after the homosexual lifestyle. No honest exegesis can pull out of this that the man being the master of his wife is a "*degrading of their bodies with one another*".

The next in the writer's list was, "*They worship created things instead of God (sexual fantasy is a form of worshipping the body).*"

The first part of that is true and the bracketed part can be, since we can make anything a god in our hearts. I must add an "however" here. The item in the list doesn't say it

can be a form of worshipping the body. It says it IS so. God gave us the sexual drive. It is OF GOD for a man to crave his wife and for the wife to crave her husband. This is not idolatry. For one to dream of one's wife or one's husband must be condemned in vanilla terms as well as master/servant terms, if the bracketed statement is correct. All such thoughts of one's spouse must be condemned as idolatrous, if that writer is correct. With that in mind, read the following passage:

*9 Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, 10 Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners,*

*shall inherit the kingdom of God.*

*1 Corinthians 6:9-10*

Idolaters will not go to heaven. There is only one other place they can go then, the lake of fire! To link sexual fantasy with one's spouse to the soul damning practice of idolatry is just off-track. The writer of the supposed 'Christian' criticism of the master/servant relationship just totally derailed. To list such a charge under the seventh question is to suggest that such a fantasy is 'perversion'. Romans 1 does not provide any such proof or evidence to this criticism.

## Summary

I must say here that other Christians, who have done extensive research, have born testimony that there is

nothing in the entire Bible that condemns the master/servant relationship for the married couple.

Scripture condemns many sexually related practices, but this paper of criticism doesn't show a legitimate charge of ungodliness. He tried, but as I said at the start of this chapter, if the attacker (enemy) gives it his best, but comes up with nothing real, wow! It goes to show there is nothing wrong with a master/servant path. The people who go to such efforts surely would have listed anything if they had any real meat.

That critical article does turn into a kind of blessing and cause of rejoicing. If you have chosen this path, or are seriously considering going this way, you can rest in a peace knowing God's blessing lies here with no condemnation.