

SEX OUTSIDE MARRIAGE THE CASE FOR IT BEING IMMORAL

The Roman Catholic Church says that to have sex outside marriage means you are telling the person you are having sex with, “I am giving you my whole self now. This means I am giving you myself for life.” The Church says that sex is a language, it tells the person you have sex with that you give yourself to them entirely. They argue that sex is only suitable for marriage, where a man takes a woman for life as his sexual partner, for outside of marriage it is simply a lie. Sex in marriage then means that the husband is telling his wife that he belongs to nobody but her for life and vice versa.

This is simply utter rubbish.

We all know this for most of us have had sex meaning, “I give you my body entirely now.” It is your body you give in sex. And you are not giving your body to the person you have sex with forever. Even if you get married and vow to stay together you will naturally intend to separate and stop having sex if you don’t get along with your partner. To give yourself is to give your heart not your body and even then nobody says you belong to the person who you give your heart to forever. If you give your heart to another and you have sex together it is giving the heart more than having sex that involves the self-giving.

It is said that marriage involves vowing to stay together not the husband giving himself entirely to his wife or vice versa. But if that is so, you don’t need marriage for that. The Church cannot accept this view so marriage for it must mean total self-giving. Though the Church can release you from lifelong vows the Church claims it cannot release you from your marriage vows because the meaning of marriage is mutual lifelong self-giving.

Marriage in theory and practice is trying to treat the other person as your property. And that is not acceptable no matter how well you treat them or how kind you are to them. The demeaning attitude is still there underneath all the kind deeds.

If the married persons give themselves to their spouses for life, then they belong to the persons they give themselves to. But nobody belongs to anybody. People are ends in themselves. They are not property. People belong only to themselves.

The Church says sex in marriage means lifelong commitment and self-giving. Yet the Church says that our love and goodness in this life are tainted by sin and nobody is entirely good which was why Jesus said in the gospels that nobody was good but God only. So entire self-giving is an impossible ideal. Husbands and wives debate things together – does that sound like entire self-giving?

Nobody ever gives their whole selves to anybody. You might give your body and your time in sex but that is all. Are husbands who don’t feel much for their wives giving their whole selves? They are holding back and yet the Church permits their sex. As long as separation or divorce is allowed, then by having sex in marriage you are saying that you are giving yourself only as long as the other person doesn’t do something that entitles you to look for a separation or divorce! That is not giving your whole self. All faiths allow annulments. Are you giving your whole self to a woman who is your wife if you would or even might try to get the marriage annulled if it broke down? Many people looking for annulments are surprised when they get them so don’t be complacent and say that this question isn’t applicable to you!

If your wife disapproves of your smoking are you giving your whole self to her? Her disapproval is preventing her from accepting you entirely. To give yourself to her is to tell her that she is accepting you entirely. It’s a lie. Also you die prematurely when you smoke. Are you giving her your whole self when you are lessening your life-span? You are taking years or months when you could be together from her.

To say that sex is saying “I give myself to you entirely and for as long as we are alive together” contradicts the marriage vows in which something similar is said. If sex says that then it follows that you are marrying when you have sex. Sex then contradicts the marriage vows because they can’t work, they can’t cause marriage – only sex can. If two unmarried people have sex they are marrying each other. It is saying that you are more married when you have sex with your bride than when you made your vows to her.

If sex means you give your whole self then why say that it means you give yourself to your partner for life? Why not eternity? Why should it just be for this life? If you really give your whole self then you give yourself forever. Like the Mormon Church, the Catholic Church should then believe in eternal marriage. To say you give your whole self to a person in sex must mean you are marrying them for all time and all eternity. The Church has the nerve to wreck lives with its teaching and yet it proves itself unable to really believe this teaching. If it really believed it, then it wouldn’t be contradicting it by saying marriage ends with death!

If sex is giving your whole self to another person then how can it be right to look for a new partner or wife or husband if that person dies? To say I give myself to you until divorce if it happens is putting a condition on it as much as saying I give myself to you until you die is. It is not giving your whole self. If you give your whole self to a person you will be like the person who having lost their beloved wife or husband refuses to even think about a new partner for they loved the old partner so much. In Christianity, marriage ends only by death. What if in the future you die and are revived? If you married and wanted to marry, you could get killed in a hospital so that you can die and be brought back to life again a free man or woman. The Church couldn't possibly deny that it succeeds in dissolving the marriage or ending it leaving you free to marry again. Some day it may be possible. In that day, people will see how silly it is to oppose divorce for this will amount to the same thing. The Church should allow divorce.

Even if this is not possible, it would be the same if it could happen – people will be wishing it could be done and if that is acceptable then these people are ending marriages in their hearts. It is just like when Jesus said that if you lust for a woman you sin in your heart with her even if you never touch her.

Sex isn't the only way you give yourself to another person. You give yourself to your child when you get pregnant. That doesn't mean you shouldn't have any more babies or that the child should stay with you instead of getting married and going away or that you should refuse to go to parties and look after your child instead. When you tell your sweetheart that you love her or him and nobody else and swear undying love are you not giving yourself in a deeper way that sex could ever signify? The closeness of that moment could be closer than sex. Don't you see then the absurdity of the Christian doctrine that sex means you are giving yourself not just now but for life?

When you work you are giving your precious time to your employer and yourself. You could be dead next week and better off having a party instead of working and yet you work. You put the job before the thought that you could be dead and should be living it up in the meantime. Does this giving yourself mean you should work to this person until death?

You could intend a great commitment to a person through sex outside marriage and then when you get married you may feel less committed. Marriage can change relationships. To say that unenthusiastic and unloving sex in marriage is good for it promises and signifies lifelong commitment and that sex between two unmarried people who are really into each other and are soul mates should but does not just because they are not married and so is a lie, is just bigoted cruel insulting nonsense. It is really just saying that there is no honest commitment without a simple ceremony. Did you know that you are insincere when you take out a loan wearing white shoes?

If sex outside marriage is lying to the sexual partner that he or she is the one for life as the Church says then sex within marriage when one of you believe in divorce is also lying. Why? For the marriage could end in divorce and the sex is not saying, "I take you for life no matter how bad things get", but, "I take you for life but if things get too bad we will get divorced".

How far must a man and woman go before their sex is saying, "I take you for life"? Does oral sex say that? Anal sex? Heavy petting? Foreplay? Masturbation? Is ejaculation necessary? Can you see how saying sex says that confines people to a silly biological morality in which it is physics that count more than feelings and intentions?

The Roman Catholic position on sex outside marriage comes from the Bible which strictly forbids it. Some feel that the prohibition in the Bible was just a rule made by God to test us. The Roman Church feels that it is because sex outside marriage denies the language of sex which speaks of committing to another completely and forever. We can be sure that the Roman Church is wrong but we can also be sure that to start teaching that God made laws to test us or for a mysterious good purpose is fanaticism. It speaks of putting faith before people. The Roman Church knows that its reasons for condemning sex outside wedlock are wrong – it is a philosophically trained faith. But it just ignores the facts and is a dishonest religion.

The big advantage the Church sees in the idea that sex says to the person that you give yourself to them forever is in this total self-giving for it gives the Church an excuse to trick people into accepting or at least not opposing its stance on contraception. The Church does in fact say that since sex is self-giving using contraception is holding yourself back and is not sacrificially giving yourself to the other person. Sex must be great fun when it is all about sacrifice! Who in their right mind would marry if it were? So sex then for a Catholic says, "I give myself to you so much that we leave our union open to life and hold nothing back." Obviously oral sex must be a sin for it is not open to life. Logically the man should simply get on the woman and forget about foreplay and all the rest. Anything else is holding back. But what if they plan to have full sex? It makes no difference. The other acts do not involve the self-giving in the way that full sex does. It would be like putting the ring on every finger but the correct one at a wedding before you put it on the correct finger. If the couple were having sex for the total self-giving reason they wouldn't need the other acts. There is actually more self-giving and sacrifice in sex that takes place without much enjoyment than there is with sex that does. The Church says that we only show love by sacrifice.

Surely then a barren couple cannot give themselves as well as a fertile couple can? Surely their relationship is being said to be defective.

Does the Church forbid sex outside marriage because of the danger of catching venereal disease?

It doesn't forbid going to public hospitals and clinics where diseases are frequently caught. It doesn't forbid boxing with its dangers and the danger of infection. It doesn't command that men and women getting married go and get checked up first. It forbids condoms which help stop venereal disease and holds that a rapist using a condom sins more than one that does not. It holds that God's law sometimes requires suffering – for example, under religious persecution it is still not right to abandon your Catholic faith so suffering venereal disease is not a proof that sex outside marriage is wrong for the Church. The Church teaches an inhuman morality that has no relevance to modern life.

Does the Church forbid sex outside marriage because of the danger of pregnancy?

The Church holds that sex outside marriage is still seriously sinful even between a barren couple or a couple that are not just using the pill but condoms as well to be double sure that they are safe so the fear of pregnancy is not a major reason for forbidding sex outside marriage. The Church doesn't forbid sex in marriage when the wife has been warned by doctors that she will die if she gets pregnant again. The Church holds that all sex must be open to life and that remains true even when natural family planning is practiced. An unwanted pregnancy can cause as much destruction in marriage as outside of it. And yet the Church forbids contraception or abortion. There is no danger of unmarried pregnancy from oral sex and the Church holds that it is a far bigger sin than ordinary sex. The Church holds that "oral sodomy" is an unnatural sin. It is putting the sex organs where they are not designed by God to be put.

The Church abhors promiscuity. If a man married and was widowed every year by the end of his life he would have slept with as many women as promiscuous men have and the Church would approve. There is nothing bothering the Church only people having sex without its permission. The Church is not concerned about promiscuity causing disease. It welcomes ladykillers to the altar for marriage to innocent young virgins. It is law and not people it cares for. It is astonishing that some people are so naïve as to be happy with the "compassion" they get from the two-faced load of Christian crap.

It is possible for a man and woman to experience total intimacy in a kiss. They might have sex later and not feel as close. Assuming that it is possible for something to express everlasting commitment. It is not necessarily the language of sex that says, "I belong to you forever". It could be anything. A man can practice and experience greater intimacy with his wife by her hospital bed when he visits her than through sex. The Church by imagining a language for sex is demeaning the intimacy of say the hospital visit. Kissing intimately is a very sexual act and yet the Church allows actresses and actors to engage in it in films.

The sex outside marriage ban is just about religious rules not people. It is sheer nonsense and only hypocrisy can inspire people to support it. The Catholic Church pretends that its attitude towards sex stems from it regarding sex as very very holy. The Jehovah's Witnesses use the same excuse to ban blood transfusions and cause lots of sickness and death. They say that the Bible says the life of the flesh is in the blood and so to respect blood is to respect life. The Catholic Church says that the Catholic should be prepared to die in defence of the Church's teaching on sex. Comparing the two you can see that the attitudes are really just pretending to reverence something as sacred. If you hate people enjoying themselves what better way to do it than to say fun is so holy and sacred that it can only be engaged in in very strict circumstances?

Christians don't mind a man sleeping with his wife even if he intends to leave her. They do mind him sleeping with her when he is not married though he intends to spend the rest of his life with her and feels the sex shows her that. Its not about people but rules. The rules are vile hypocrisy and the Church has always been good at being hypocritical.

You always know when you are telling a lie. If sex outside marriage is saying to a person that you will be with them forever and you cannot mean that unless you are married then you cannot have sex outside marriage with a good conscience. You lied in the sex and you knew it was a lie. The Church sees lying as a sin. Lying through sex is seen as a very serious lie and a grave sin. You will never be able to say that you believed the sex was not wrong. Even if you could sincerely believe it was right you would still be a bad person. A murderer who thinks he or she is doing right is still doing wrong. He or she is still a bad person.

The Church says we must hate sin but love the sinner. The Church says it is a sin to recognise sin but to fail to be angry at it. And it is worse to even condone it or laugh at it. When people do wrong, what they fear is people having condemnatory feelings for them not the people saying they are doing wrong. People do not fear people who don't care what they do or even laugh at their sins. It is not being judged to be doing bad or wrong that people fear but others feeling condemnatory towards them for what they do. God doesn't have feelings and we are expected to put God first so it would be surprising if the God concept ever genuinely managed to stop anybody who wanted to do evil from doing it. Rather it would encourage it for it says we should be worried not about the condemnations of others but about the wrongness of the evil we do. It says

worrying about the condemning feelings is a sin.

The Church likes to claim that if a couple live together before marriage, the marriage is more likely to fail. The argument is that as living together is wrong it will have bad consequences. In other words, the Church wants to think that cohabiting before marriage encourages the couple to break up after getting married. But think of it this way. Cohabiting as a kind of trial marriage should make the marriage stronger. If it doesn't, then it is not the cohabiting that is to blame but something else. Perhaps the couple got married because they were under some kind of pressure. Perhaps their living together reflects a suspicion about marriage that it doesn't work for most people. If a couple feel that way, even if they don't admit it, it could lead to problems if they get married. The Church has no right to accuse cohabitation of causing or helping to cause the marriage break-up - it is only a trick to get people to abide by its rule that sex must be confined to marriage. The nonsense it spouts plainly shows that it is lying when it says it loves the sinner and hates the sin. How could it be doing that when it falsely accuses cohabiters of endangering their future marriage by the mere fact they are cohabiting? It is like saying you hate a sin somebody has committed when the sin is in fact not a sin at all.

The Church says that looking at erotica is a sin even if there is no chance of you being titillated by it. It says that looking at it is giving the producers and participants a reason to sin. It is looking at sin when you should be repelled by sin and despise it. All that follows from the notion of sex outside marriage being wrong. Sexy erotic images have to portray the models as sexually available. They have to make you want to have sex with the models.

It is said that porn, even when it depicts loving healthy sex, is treating the person as a body and not a person. It is said that the goodness and virtue of the person does not matter. If that is true then it must be a sin to look after your beauty and for people to gaze upon it. People who see your beauty enjoy it because it is physical attractiveness and they admire that more than your goodness or virtues.

The Catholics warn about the dangers of lust and how Jesus said it will land you in Hell unless it is repented. Yet actors and actresses are allowed to kiss on screen even though attraction and “chemistry” are needed to make this look authentic. Many married actors and actresses will look forward to love scenes to enjoy kissing somebody without the stigma of adultery. The Catholics are hypocrites.

Ignore the Church. Ignore its Jesus. Have sex but have it responsibly.