

Dalrock says:

August 15, 2017 at 2:49 pm

@Gary Eden

But he ignores the matters which were discussed more, such as masturbation or porn. Most people do those and the condemnations are patently ridiculous. Not to mention the condemners haven't a leg to stand on scripturally.

This is a lie. I have not ignored the issue of masturbation and porn. See [this](#) comment, [this](#) comment and (less directly) [this](#) comment in the Friend Zone post. See also [this](#) comment in the post on whether marriage causes sexual immorality.

No, rather than seek out the truth, we'll associate all these arguments with prostitution in order to shame them and mock them for trying to reason things out.

But this is the real problem with your claim. I don't have to do anything other than quote AT to make him look foolish. He carefully buries the nutty stuff deep inside a wall of text. When you take it out and shine a light on it, it will always look nutty. This isn't just regarding his assertion of holy Christian hookers. For example, take [this nugget](#):

*This is where it gets nuanced. Marriage is NOT the only *permitted* path to sex, it is the *repository* of sex. Take that as the statement of a theologian and consider it.*

*Consider the widow. If she has to have a "test drive" prior to saying "I do" to the man, is she in sin? According to the Bible, she is NOT. Should she be doing that merely for pleasure? No, but the decision is up to her. But if it were leading to marriage, is she in sin? That isn't the question, she isn't in sin if she'd doing it for pleasure or not, the point is she *should* only be doing such a thing within the path of getting married.*

See. No holy hookers involved, but he still looks nutty, because he is writing nutty things.

My question to you is: Did you not notice these nutty things and are defending them in error? Or did you notice the nutty things and like them, which is why you are defending them?