

Catholicism and the "firm purpose of amendment" for sin

In confession the Church forgives sin on the basis that you resolve never to sin again.

Terribly, if a Catholic gets sterilised he or she has to get the procedure reversed and promise sincerely to do that in order to get forgiveness.

The Church claims to be practically speaking the physical Jesus. As it is the eyes business what happens to the finger because we are one body it is in a sense the business of the Church what you do. Nothing is private. Amendment for sin is a non-private matter.

A Catholic source says, "The social nature of Penance is seen further in the fact that the penitent recognizes the right of the Mystical Body to judge him, since it is through the Mystical Body he is in relation with God. Forgiveness of sin, then, is not just a matter between God and our individual souls. It is the Church which has been injured by transgressions. Therefore, our sins are not just our concern, they are the concern of the whole Church--the Church Militant on earth and the Church Triumphant in heaven."

But surprisingly, it does not care if

There must also be a firm resolve to avoid all mortal sins for the future, not merely any that may have been confessed, but all others, or else there can be no 1 friendship with God, whom we must love above all things. He cannot love God above all things who is prepared to offend him mortally. The purpose of amendment need not extend to all venial sins, provided that at least there is the sincere intention of avoiding some sin that is confessed, or at any rate of lessening the number of smaller transgressions.

. The Council, then, seems to teach 1 that sorrow for sin because of the fear of hell, or its moral turpitude, or on account of the punishment with which God afflicts the sinner even in this life, will be sufficient for the remission of sin in the sacrament of Penance, provided that it destroys all affection for sin in the heart of the penitent and converts him from sin to God. The slavish fear of hell, by which a man refrains from sinful acts while preserving his affection for them, is, of course, insufficient even with the help of the sacrament to forgive sin and reconcile the sinner with God. There is no harm, for example, in saying, "I should like to eat meat on a Friday, unless the Church forbade it"; and the same is true generally whenever the condition, "if it were lawful," is annexed to a merely positive prohibition. If this condition is annexed to a- desire against the natural law, as "I should like to steal if it were lawful," or "I should like to commit fornication if it were not forbidden," the condition does not remove all the malice of the vicious will, for the very tendency of the will toward such objects is against right reason. Such conditional desires, then, are sinful, unless they indicate a mere propensity towards such sins without any voluntary affection of the will. In any case, however, they are dangerous, and should not be indulged or expressed.

Furthermore, inasmuch as one

who is deprived by sin of the grace of God cannot long resist temptation and will fall again and again before long, the sinner is obliged to rise from his sin in order to avoid repeated falls. Of course it is better, and the sinner is to be urged, by all means, to rise at once when he has had the misfortune to fall into sin. He should never sleep while he is conscious of being out of the friendship of God. Still he is not bound under pain of committing a new sin to repent immediately after committing sin. It will be sufficient if he repent at least when repentance becomes necessary according to the doctrine which has just been laid down.