

**Name:** Oneil McQuick

**Date:** June 4, 2005

**Subject Asked:** Do an out of norm to someone and document it.

**How Done:** Reaction Paper.

**School:** BCC (Public Speaking)

Recently I did a Series on Sexuality, found at <http://sexuality.beplaced.com>, so I decided to use this reaction paper to test some of its thesis – to see if the notion of a sexually out of control young (18-30) populace exist. So I went up to a few persons, females only, and asked them the question, “Will you have sex with me?” Having no ministerial or religious outlook on me, though...

This is an out of norm because one doesn't go up to a total stranger and ask for sex immediately. The first response was from an Asian (immigrant) chick at school. Surprisingly, she didn't react startled or angry, but quietly said no and gave her age, 19.

The other was a “sexy” looking Afro-American chick (an American with an Afro, just kidding, read asterisk note\*). She also told me no; and not much, but a little attitude – like hell no. She said it's because she don't know me. Right! By this time I'm thinking, “chicks don't dig me.” Probably because I'm not that attractive and even “ruddy,” though she said even if I was the cutest guy, she'd have to know me. Again, right! What about one-night stands? They said no because I probably looked studious, approaching with a pen and paper in my hands. So my thesis on the hedonistic rampant sexual behavior still stands. For those who don't jump at it with a stranger, usually has a familiarity with many guys or gals (school, community, clubs, etc) to which they would jump to the offer right away or have. This has even gone as far as something called, “friends with benefits.” Hence, the excuse posed to me of “I need to know you first” is solved and still proves my theory that our societies have greatly fallen away. Single sex schools might now look promising to Christian parents, though the gay epidemic might plague that as well.

I wanted to check out more chicks but it was late and they weren't any more; probably even more blunt this time. A tap on the back, “I want to have sex with you, do you?” That is what I should have done and probably ended up with a bruised face after many slaps to it.

## AFTER THOUGHT

\* denotes - I don't see the harm in saying black or dark skinned or just plain old American; I also welcome the term colored because color makes the world beauteous rather than dull, more over you don't hear people often say, white American or Caucasian American, just white or American. The Americans who the name Afro was created for, neither directly comes from Africa or is going there. The same goes for the whites. All Americans migrated from the East in the early days. I found this out while constantly watching people and thinking on my newfound thing of observing the other beings amongst us – don't try that at home, kids and adults - God made us together but we sought to be apart. He instinctively put everything in us to be together and one, but sin, through pride, sought out separateness. Notice, a white plantation master would have sex with a black slave but wont marry or be seen in public with her. Instinctively he wants to be joined with her, that's what God put in us to stick together, but pride says because of your color I can't be seen with you. It also dawn on me when I was looking at myself naked in the mirror back ways, extremely dark I am, but I would never seek to date another dark girl, not prejudice or racist, but some kind of “pet peeve.” All the girls I've dated, probably except one, were all lighter skinned. I've seen some chicks with my complexion and would love to date them but something inside says no, how would the kids look. I guess even though emancipated by Christ, I'm still the product of a society that was based on shade prejudices. Why did something inside me say no, yet another thing inside me said that's a fine chick even if nothing sexual in the near future? The apostle Paul can answer that, "But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin" (Rom 7:23-25). He saw the thing that was separating us – sin. It is the thing that after we were made together it wants to separate us. As Paul said, it wars against your instinct to be together and capture you in apartness. Though admitting my “pet peeve,” I, like Paul, can be free from the condemnation and guilt of such captivation by serving Christ with the

mind “but with the flesh the law of sin.” In other words, though thoughts of apartness war with my instinctive desire for togetherness and sometimes wins, while being born again, my thoughts for togetherness is what counts to God and my striving for it. All civic things we instinctively do – hang out, “follow the Jones”, seek a mate, sports, want to talk to someone, etc – is all built in by God for togetherness, but sin separated us. Kind of jumping the gun, but I hope to show you that color or ethnicity doesn’t really matter in an upcoming thesis on the “other beings,” I’ve seen the same person white, black, fat, short, old, young and even more irreverent, male and female; already that sounds weird. Anyways, just to jump back out, there are some that surpassed the sin in us to be together regardless of – Pocahontas and John and others, though few – for those who don’t know, Pocahontas was a colonial days Indian while John was a Puritan Christian from Britain, she got converted and they got married.

This sin of apartness is not confined to a specific race or even humans, for angels are without flesh (human), yet they were some that decided to be apart from the others (1/3) and fell with satan. But notice that before this happened, the bible tells us that iniquity was found in them (Ezek 28:15). So what is keeping us apart is sin, without sin we would be together. Or, where no sin is, there is no apartness. How do we deal with sin? Not by the UN, Dali Lama, Krishna, Peace Corp., etc, sin is dealt with by the man who came and took it away for all those who believe. When those who believe become born again, they no longer have sin because Christ took it away (Heb 10:14). The effects might still be there but with being born again, that warring will be won most often. And even with “pet peeves,” it is not evil, for Christ himself had a favorite disciple. So only through Christ we can have true peace and togetherness. Besides that, humans have overcome some extent of the apartness, as given in the Pocahontas case. However, the togetherness that would out do them all is the 1/3 joining back, not only the 2/3, but us saints who are apart of that godly order of beings. It might be wishful thinking, but at least it was thought of for now. This apartness between these beings is mostly seen with the two angelic groups, for many of the 1/3 since Gen 6:4 have sought to be together with humans – becoming them, cohabitating with them and unfortunately making them err even further from God. So though they were together they were still apart, for they made them sin against God. You can’t be together and not want what is good for the person, that is apartness, just in it to satisfy that togetherness instinct but fail to give your mind to it because of sin. And it boils back down to the same opening remarks, they instinctively want to be with us, but the sin in them makes us apart. Example, they are still amongst us, even married to humans, but you don’t know it. So they instinctively crave what we crave – togetherness with something – because God made all beings like that. But sin...! They instinctively want to be with their former angelic friends, but the sin in them keeps them apart. O wretched fallen race that we are! Who shall deliver us from this death!

If this is solved, you might hear quotes like this from the Generals of the Temple of God in heaven,

“The war is over. The rebels are our country men again” (Ulysses S. Grant, 1822-1885, Civil War General).

“I have fought against the people of the North because I believe they were seeking to wrest from the South its dearest rights. But I have never seen a day when I did not pray for them” (Robert Lee, 1807-1870, Civil War General).

Notice that they always wanted to be together but something made them apart. Even though violence raged, that built in togetherness raged on still; to the point that R. Lee said that everyday he prayed for his “enemies,” the North, and U. Grant was relieved to know that those he fought were his friends in togetherness again. Grant could represent Michael and the blues (Angels), while Lee the leader of the Red (Fallen Angels-pleasure rebels). Since the 1/3 split both sides inwardly yearns to be together, but that will never show, only if solved as displayed in these generals comments, when the war ended. However, though enthusiastic to a solution or redemption, like humanity, not all will turn. On that same poster of the War Generals quotes, before these two was another and his quote was like this “no man kills me and live.” The passion here is clearly pride, rather than reasons outlined by Lee. This fellow would represent satan and the yellowrites (Fallen Angels-want to kill God and be him in Earth and Heaven).

You might learn more if the book is written – “Demonology Revealed: The Fallen Race.” I’m Oneil McQuick and that’s an after thought.