

Catholicism empowers men to procreate through Rape!

Contraception is forbidden under all circumstances in the Roman Catholic faith as a sin.

When a man and wife decide to go to bed together and the man has AIDS the wife must not protect herself by contraception. If he proceeds to rape her, she must not ask him to use a condom. She must ask him to take the condom off if he puts one on.

Even if birth control were a sin, there is no justification or reason in the insistence of the Church that it is as bad as murder and you will go to Hell forever if you die unrepentant of the sin of birth control just like you would for murder. The stance of the Church is extremism and bigotry. The Church could teach that it is venial sin - this is sin that you have to pay for by suffering in Purgatory not a sin so serious that you would suffer punishment for it that never ends and which can never end.

Some, and this appears to be the orthodox Catholic view, say the sperms of the man can be understood as unjust aggressors threatening the woman's life. But even then the condom is forbidden. Accordingly, if a woman is raped she has no right to do anything to try and prevent the sperm reaching her ovum and fertilising it. If you can't protect yourself from sperm to save your life you cannot protect yourself from pregnancy either. To attempt contraception after rape would be to risk the egg which may be fertilised so it's a sin. Some say that since the woman didn't consent to the rapist's actions, his sperm is an unjust aggressor to be defended against. They teach that the ban on contraception urges that those who freely engage in sex must never use contraception and be open to life so this is different.

More orthodox Catholics reply:

All motherhood is a sacrifice. Many women have had to carry rapist's babies for abortion was forbidden to them by the Church. Therefore the victim should pray for God's help in accepting her circumstances and any child that may arrive.

If a woman has sex and consents and afterwards regrets it, the sperm inside her from that point on are unjust aggressors. Yet the Church forbids contraceptive activity such as going to the bath to disinfect the vagina and hopefully kill the sperm. The unjust aggressors idea is contrary to Catholic principles. If a wife has sex with her husband and regrets the fact that it was open to life, the sperm become unjust aggressors then if the idea is to be accepted.

It is a sacrifice when a wife has sex with her AIDS stricken husband and puts herself at risk. We praise her for that. We ask this heroism of many women so why should she or any female rape be an exception? Are we to insult them and blaspheme God by acting as if they can't exercise such heroism? We all have sacrifices to make that demand heroism at some point in our lives. The harm that may result from the victim's pregnancy does not prove that it should be prevented. God sends greater suffering to so many and nothing can prevent him. He does what he sees is right.

The whole point about condemning contraception is that God wants to be able to give children through marital sex and to use contraception is frustrating his plan. If it is not God's will and if its not right to let a woman become pregnant she won't. To try and treat a rape victim to prevent conception is to try and stop God's plan for he may will that she give birth to the rapist's baby just as he wills a woman to get pregnant though her and the baby will die because of the pregnancy. The Magisterium of the Church which is infallible states that contraception is always wrong. The universal belief of the Church is infallible and all Churches agreed that contraception was a sin until the Protestants started changing their minds in the 1930's.

There are those who fail to understand that preventing a rape victim conceiving is contraception. They are advocating the contraceptive mentality which seeks that people not God plan their families.

If the woman really trusts in God she will not be afraid. We cannot change morality to suit people who have little or no faith. For example, the person who isn't sure that abortion is murder cannot be allowed to have one just because she isn't sure or doubts that abortion really is murder. To let a rape victim use treatment to prevent conception is to pander to somebody's lack of faith and confidence in God. All such mistrust is sinful.

To have treatment preventing conception in existence at all is a sin. It will be abused. And human nature being overwhelmingly inclined to use contraception will abuse it. We allow knives because only a few will kill with them so allowing them is justifiable. But contraception is going to be popular so we cannot allow it.

To say a woman may use contraception when raped is to say that treatments to help this happen should exist. It is to say that

rapists should use condoms and rape if they wish! If the treatment were morally good, the fact that the treatment exists would be a source of tremendous temptation to so many and that would make it sinful to provide it. It would be a sin to avail of it for that would be consenting to its being provided.

The pope teaches that the battle against contraception and abortion is the one fight. If you are selfish enough to use contraception naturally you will be inclined to use abortion should it fail. To allow a rape victim to use contraception is encouraging her to abort if it fails. The logic is inescapable. She will be more inclined to abort than most women for she won't want a rapist's baby.

What about the teaching that the ban on contraception only applies to those who are married and who engage in sex freely? In the rape, the rapist raped the woman freely. The woman didn't give any consent but refused but he forced her. So one half of the involved parties did consent. How does that affect the situation? The Church forbids a wife to use contraception to stop conception when she has found out from her doctor shortly after having sex with her husband that she must never have another baby for it will kill her. The sperm then morally is in the same position as the sperm of the rapist. It's an unjust aggressor according to some. But she is not allowed to do anything to stop conception. So how can a rape victim consistently be allowed to do what she is not? A wife who made a mistake with natural family planning isn't allowed the treatments to prevent conception. So the ban on contraception stands if only one partner knows exactly what they are doing.

If contraception is bad, then it follows that the man who consented to put his sperm in the unwilling woman is the one whose will comes first not her's. Why? Because contraception is so seriously wrong and an unnatural. Its a further violation of the woman. One of their wills has to come first. In other words, does the man's will to put sperm in the woman come before her will not to be violated in this way? Some say hers' comes first for she is not the one doing wrong. But this has been answered by the fact that preventing conception is so restricted.

Some Catholic authors say that intervention to prevent conception is allowed then and only then. That the contraception is only allowed then shows that it is horrendously bad to interfere with conception or try to prevent it.

Suppose that if a woman was raped attempts are allowed by the Church to prevent her getting pregnant. Then the fact that contraception is only allowed then in such an extreme situation shows that it is bad to interfere with conception or try to prevent it.

Only the civil courts have the right to decide if a woman has really been raped. It is a sin for a Catholic doctor to take a woman at her word and help prevent her conceiving a baby after she has been raped. The courts take time to do this and the treatments need to be performed quickly so allowing them at all is sinful. Even if contraception in principle could be allowed only for a woman who was raped, in practice it couldn't be done. If you make exceptions for rules just because of what a person says then this becomes dangerous. For example, the Church forbids you to sack an employee who says she has stolen from you. If she cannot give any evidence you ignore her. Contraception is a grave matter when it is forbidden even to save a woman's health. It cannot be treated lightly so proof of rape would be necessary.

Contraception is always wrong. Condoms are bad even when the intention is to avoid AIDS and not pregnancy for it makes the sex unnatural. An attempt to prevent pregnancy after having sex is still contraception.

Here is another reply:

Sperm can live for up to a week inside a woman and so until that week is up there is still the chance of getting pregnant. Yet the Church forbids any attempt to prevent conception even if the woman is raped. The Morning After Pill needs to be taken in 24 hours though it might still be effective until 72 hours.

It has been suggested that if a woman is raped, the rapist's sperms inside her can be considered to be unjust aggressors and therefore steps can be taken to prevent conception as long as there is no chance of killing the egg if it has been fertilised. The reasoning goes that as the woman did not consent to the sex, she is under no obligation to be open to new life being made. They say she can get treatment to stop conception happening because it is not an act of contraception but an act of self-defence.

An unwanted baby can be considered an unjust aggressor too. The baby inherits the genes of its father meaning it has at least some of his wicked traits.

To say a woman may stop a rapists sperm from making her pregnant because it is not an act of contraception but self-defence is hypocritical. It is using contraception to defend yourself. It is the same as saying that if a burglar breaks into your home and you shoot him dead that it is not killing but self-defence. You can need to kill somebody to save yourself and intend to kill them.

The sperms are not unjust aggressors - its not their fault they are in the wrong place at the wrong time. The Church would say that the rapist is bad not the sperm.

Is she protecting herself from further harm by killing the rapists sperm? This implies that the baby that may come is a curse and not to be celebrated. The Church says that contraception derides respect for new life as it implies that God should plan your family not you!

The Church says innocent until proven guilty in court so it cannot say the woman really was raped.

Treatment to prevent conception is contraception and self-defence. To say it is not contraception is to lie. Thus the treatment is condemned by Church teaching against contraception. It is possibly self-defence. We are surer it is an attempt to contracept than we are that it is self-defence. That is important. It means the intention to contracept is dominant.

Nobody can prove that fertilisation has or hasn't taken place. The treatments to prevent fertilisation can kill the fertilised ovum or stop it implanting. The Church forbids treatments that may do this. But any treatment may do that. Also, the ones that have the lowest chance of doing it will not be very effective. The best treatment is one that kills all the sperm and the ovum.

It doesn't make sense to say that a woman who regrets sex as she was drunk should not be given access to these treatments and that a woman who is raped should.

If contraception is wrong then a rapist using a condom is sinning more than one who doesn't. This is vile doctrine. Even if the Church would let a woman get help to avoid conception after rape it doesn't allow any protection during rape. Treatments to remove the risk of pregnancy after rape are no use to women in poorer countries or in rural and remote areas. In their case, the Church empowers men to procreate through rape.

WORKS CONSULTED

A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Catholic Truth Society, Westminster, 1985

A Teenager's Answer to "Shall I Go to the Prom?" Sherry Burgess, Guardian of Truth Publications, Kentucky

A Work of the Flesh: Sexualism, Weldon E Warnock, Guardian of Truth Publications, Kentucky

Believing in God, PJ McGrath, Wolfhound Press, Dublin, 1995

Biblical Dictionary and Concordance of the New American Bible, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington DC, 1971

Contraception and Chastity, Elizabeth Anscombe, Catholic Truth Society, London

Contraception, John T Noonan, Jr., A Mentor-Omega Book, New American Library, New York, 1965

Courtship and the Dangers of Petting, John R Rice, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, 1943

Divorce, John R Rice, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, 1946

Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven, Uta Ranke Heinmann, Penguin, London, 1991

God Is Not Great, The Case Against Religion, Christopher Hitchens, Atlantic Books, London, 2007

Moral Questions, Bishops Conference, Catholic Truth Society, London, 1971

New Catholic Encyclopedia, The Catholic University of America and the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., Washington, District of Columbia, 1967

Papal Sin, Structures of Deceit, Garry Wills, Darton Longman and Todd, London, 2000

Pornography – A Psychiatrist's Verdict, Melvin Anchell MD, Liguori Publications, Missouri

Preparing for a Mixed Marriage, Irish Episcopal Conference, Veritas, Dublin, 1984

Questions and Answers on Sex and Marriage, Natural Fertility and Responsible Parenthood, Luton Good Counsel, Catholic Truth Society, London, 2007

Rediscovering Gay History, John Boswell, Gay Christian Movement, UK, 1982

Rome has Spoken, A Guide to Forgotten Papal Statements and How They Have Changed Through the Centuries, Maureen Fiedler and Linda Rabben (Editors), Crossroad Publishing, New York, 1998

Scattered Vows, Exodus From the Priesthood, David Rice, Blackstaff Press, Belfast, 1990

Sex & Marriage A Catholic Perspective, John M Hamrogue C SS R, Liguori, Illinois, 1987

Shall We Dance? Dick Blackford, Guardian of Truth Publications, Kentucky

Son of Joseph, The Parentage of Jesus, Geoffrey Parrinder, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1992

The Emancipation of a Freethinker, Herbert Ellsworth Cory, The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1947

"The Lord Hateth Putting Away!" and Reflections on Marriage and Divorce The Committee of the Christadelphian, Birmingham, 1985

The Pope and Contraception, Brenda Maddox, Counterblasts 18, Chatto & Windus, London 1991

Vicars of Christ, Peter de Rosa, Corgi, London, 1993

