

THE SIN OF SEX PLEASURE

The Bible never countenances the new Christian invention that sex is holy and good. The Bible and Christian tradition propound prejudice against sexuality and against women.

The insistence the Bible makes on what is natural implies that it wrong to have a fetish. But to cut a long argument short, if fetishes are wrong so is sexual pleasure. The God of Moses says a man must not wear an article that is proper to a woman. It says nothing about a man disguising as a woman. It is forbidding the fetish of dressing in women's clothing. By deduction then, it is a sin for a man to be only turned on by the feel of silk or rubber though these are far from transvestism. Anything but penetration in the missionary position must be a sin for anything else is a fetish of sorts. The fact that God failed to condemn many things that were more harmful indicates that God regards fetishes as very seriously sinful indeed. The religion of Moses and Jesus wants to stop sexual variety. This will have the effect of breaking up relationships and making many give up on sex. It seeks to dictate to people what they can and cannot do in bed. The Catholic Church has rigid views on sex which means that a man has to tell the priest in confession if he kissed a woman's belly or her nipple for he has to tell how serious the sin was. He is persecuted by being forced to make a pornographic confession.

The Bible says that the main reason sex outside marriage is wrong is because of the damage it does to the human personality and is not the risk of disease or pregnancy (page 93, Free to Do Right). In plain English, the Bible means that this sex makes you more selfish. It is hard to see how it could avoid saying the same thing about sex within marriage for it can be selfish too and often is for people don't stay in love forever. But nevertheless, the Bible is trying to reinforce the neurosis of altruism. Millions say pre-marital sex made them nicer people so what business has the God of the Bible and his Christians calling them liars?

The Catholic Church teaches that all wilful sexual pleasure that you fully consent to will result in eternal damnation in the torments of Hell. This is extreme cruelty. So a second of wilful masturbation will land you in Hell and saying something that hurts somebody's feelings will not. So hurting is better than having fun. The Catholic Church is bigoted and children should not be exposed to a cult that believes in damaging them. The guilt about sex will wreck their marriages because when you are told for years that any sexual activity outside marriage including masturbation is seriously bad that it becomes impossible to adjust to it in marriage for a long long time. The guilt will still happen. Christianity does its best to wreck the most important years of marriage, the first few.

The doctrine that sexual activity outside marriage denies the value of the human body and that the body is a temple of the Holy Spirit and that is why it is sinful is a trick that makes hatred of sexuality look like an awe-inspired respect for it. Everybody who has felt invigorated and respected and made happy by sex outside the boundaries of the Church knows that it is a deception. But the Church advocates narrowness for we are not even to consider what they say for Jesus doesn't err and that's that. Its really dogma that is valued.

Proof that the Church hides disdain of sexuality in the guise of treating sex with reverence is as follows:

A couple who believe that sex under certain restrictions outside marriage is not wrong and who avoid any harm happening and who love one another more than a married couple who are sexually active are condemned. It's all about rules not love.

If sex is to be so respected that you can't arouse anybody you are not married to then you should try to look plain and not sexually appealing. What kind of respect for the body involves hiding it and trying to be a non-head-turner?

If engaging in sexual activity that is not allowed means you are denying the value of your own body then that is one of the worst sins possible because unlike other sins it attacks the value of your body and your being. The sin of suicide would be a close relation to this sin. But why sexual sin? Why is it not a sin to turn the other cheek to an enemy and let them degrade you? Why is it not a sin to have your baby baptised as if he or she were an object to be possessed and brainwashed by the Church?

Is it not sick to accuse a couple who love each other and who would marry if they could like a gay couple or a couple one of whom was married before and divorced of a sin as bad as suicide, which like forbidden sex also leads to everlasting damnation, if they have sexual relations?

The Church and most religion in general tend to be brutal regarding sexual relations. When they give out about declining morals they usually have sexual "sin" in mind. They should be bothered about themselves grabbing loads of money to maintain Churches only a few go to and even less really want to go to instead of helping the poor. There are loads of other things that could be condemned and are not obviously the message is that sex is the ultimate sin next to heretically

opposing Church sexual morality. Driving cars does more harm than sexual sin and they don't care about that (page 2, Practical Ethics). Cars for instance have a lot to do with the disastrous state of the environment and their unnecessary use increases death. The tendency of the Church to condemn sex means that any sex it allows does not deserve to be called ethical when engaged in by people who agree with the Church. It's not ethical for the same reason a white man thinks it is okay to be with his white wife but that it is a sin or revolting for a black man to do the same with his black wife. It's selfish. It's taking what you would deny another if you could. The good Catholics or Christians condemn much sexual activity when there are more harmful things they leave alone and then indulge in sex.

A subtle way of inferring that sex is always impure, is the Catholic idea that sex that is not expressive of a full lifelong union and full commitment and love and loyalty which it says, only happens in marriage, is wrong. So it is turned into the wife and husband fully sacrificing themselves to each other. From this it follows that only sex between saints is right and even saints cannot manage to be that good for the Church says that the saint has teeny sins. It must be a sin for a man who is in the state of mortal sin and rejected by God to engage in sex with his wife for the Church says that full union requires that both husband and wife be friends of God. You cannot love your wife if you don't love the God who loves her so much. Observe also how sectarian all this is for the Catholic Church thinks the height of holiness can only be attained in the Church in communion with the pope for it is the true Church and has special blessings.

Genesis may say that God made Eve as a companion for Adam but that is nothing like saying that sex is for man and woman to feel complete and fulfilled and loved. That can be done without sex and the Bible wants it like that for it says we should be God-centred and find all our joy in him alone. That leaves sex just primarily being for babies or perhaps even only for babies. Rape seems to be justified in God's eyes if it leads to a baby.

The Law of Moses decreed that sex was unclean or dirty so the man and woman had to wash and be unclean until evening (Leviticus 15). God said that to Moses and Aaron. Christians would say that this law is only about hygiene not about saying that sex is disgusting. But then it would say that they should have washed before having sex. And why be dirty until evening unless the law was not about hygiene but about cleanness in the sight of God. Sex was dirty to God because God did not like people doing it - it was a necessary evil. God wants us to be prudes.

The Song of Solomon is full of erotic delights but it is not said that God approves of its attitude. God could have inspired it like he inspired the vicious psalms without approving of the malice in them.

St Augustine taught that sex is only sacred and good when it is for procreation but he held that since we are so bad we cannot do it without contracting venial sin (page 447, Vicars of Christ). Augustine surprisingly taught that a man can sleep with a barren wife because it keeps him from sleeping around (page 447, Vicars of Christ) which implies the sex urge should be tolerated until it is uncontrollable. St Paul would agree for he said that to avoid fornication each person should have his wife or her husband. I wonder why Augustine didn't suggest severe penance instead. If sex without procreation is a sin and should be allowed then a man who wants to have pre-marital sex with one lady should have it in case he sleeps around as well or he should employ masturbation. It was bigotry of him not to think that a gay man should have one partner for the same reason. Presumably, it does not matter if gay men commit the sin of promiscuity and go to Hell forever because of it.

Pope St Gregory the Great who was supreme pontiff from 590 to 604 AD taught that all sex pleasure is evil and sinful and even when it makes babies in marriage for it spreads the evil of original sin. The baby is guilty of sin though it has never sinned because Adam has sinned for it long ago. If sex causes sin then sex must be evil. When God told Adam and Eve to procreate it was when they were sinless not sinners.

It is thought that when Revelation says that the 144,000 saints "have not defiled themselves by relations with women" for they are virgins (14:4) that sex is being condemned. But a person who believes that sex is sacred could say that such and such a person is chaste and is not defiled by men or women for she or he is a virgin without implying that virginity is the only acceptable route. But nevertheless, since it was only virgins who were allowed into this group it indicates for sure that the Lord prefers virginity over being sexually active.

The Christian God said through Paul that whoever gets married does well but he who stays single does better (1 Corinthians 7). He said that a person with strong lusts should get married to avoid sexual sin and that a man and his wife should not refrain from sex too long in case it results in adultery - he is careful to state that this is only a suggestion not a command so he would prefer if they gave it up altogether if they could control themselves. None of this says that sex is sacred. Its grudging permission for it suggest that it is sinful. It is made a necessary evil - that is, it is only sinful when it does not have to be indulged in and though it is bad it is not sinful when the husband and wife cannot control themselves. When Paul says that it is good to marry he does not have the sexual side to it in mind. His dislike of sexual activity shows that he did not have it in mind. When Paul wrote that the father who gives his daughter in marriage does well and that the father "who does not give [her] in marriage does better," he pronounced celibacy superior to marriage. This was strange for marriage was terrible in those days especially for women and Christianity likes to see people suffer. But Paul certainly commanded

fidelity and babies in marriage – which is not the same as commanding sex for he saw it as something that should just happen thanks to natural urges and not be planned - so it was the sex pleasure that he despised. Paul felt that marriage distracted people from God, which it does more easily when it is a sexually happy marriage. Many would say that Christianity is just a minority of clergy trying to use and manipulate everybody who does not know any better when you see the inconsistency of the Church encouraging marriage while the scriptures do not. Radio Replies 3 defended the Catholic doctrine that though marriage is holy celibacy is best and is for those who are called to a greater holiness than marriage (Question 1171).

The Council of Trent on November 11th 1563 stated that if anybody said that marriage is better than virginity and that it is not more blessed and holy to be celibate and virginal than to be married then they are to be anathema (page 590, Vicars of Christ). Anathema is the curse that is put on anybody who defies the gospel so this teaching is being declared a part of the Roman Catholic Gospel.

Cardinal Newman's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, Part 1, defends the view that celibacy is superior and gives Bible quotations in support for instance the one where Jesus said that some people make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven. It argues that monks and nuns are practicing Christianity better than anybody else for being celibate. The Council of Trent reiterated the Church teaching that marriage was a sacrament. Given its attitude to sexuality, marriage was a sacrament only in so far as it was a husband and wife walking together with the children they will have in daily life towards God and the Church's ideal of holiness. The sexual side gets no sacramental help and it cannot when virginity is the ideal. When the Church says virginity is best it only means that it is better not to get married for the sake of staying a virgin. But if you do get married it is a sacrament. It is a concession made by God to make the best out of an imperfect situation. If marriage is really a sacrament and sex is at the heart of marriage then why does God not teach the couple how to have rampant delightful sex? Most people are terrible at sex and depend on books to improve their skills. Obviously, their version of God does not want to think about sex at all! God never encouraged couples to learn about their bodies and forbids masturbation which is an essential for knowing your body and how to have sex that satisfies you! The Church says grace is enough, it will sort it all out. This God must help those who will not help themselves. And this is the God who condemns sloth! He should want us to help ourselves instead of expecting him to expend his energy for us.

Jesus said that the motive for all our actions must only be the love of God, they must be sacrifices for God. So instead of husbands and wives really loving one another they must use one another to please God. Jesus turned sex into something cold and clinical. Sex is no better than rape when not done out of real respect. It would be a sin to enjoy being exploited so sexual pleasure would be sinful.

Jesus forbade sexual desire and it was to be tolerated in marriage.

Jesus said that whoever looked at a woman lustfully commits adultery with her (Matthew 5:28) and adultery deserves a cruel death (Deuteronomy 22:21 – this commands the execution by stoning of a woman who was found to not be a virgin on the wedding night so you can imagine what she would deserve if she committed adultery after the wedding!) and eternal torment (Galatians 5:19-21). He meant any woman by woman for if he meant somebody else's wife he would have said. He meant that if you allow this feeling of lust or wilful sexual desire to occur in your bosom then the pleasure is what matters to you mostly or partly or entirely. It would be the same if the woman is married hence it is adultery in the heart even if she is not married. You have the heart of an adulterer.

Jesus said he didn't come to do away with the nasty and harsh Jewish Law given by Moses which sought for adulterous people to be put to death but to interpret it correctly and to toughen it up (Matthew 5:17-20).

The fact that religion is so strict and hung-up about sex and it is not in other things proves that sex must be dirty if it should do that. Jesus for instance declared sex outside marriage to be always wrong and unloving but he did not do the same with walking into death like he did. This implies that illicit sex is worse than suicide or pulling your death upon yourself. A religion that denigrates sex denigrates people in doing so. I would not like to go to it for any kind of advice.

We are better off without any religion like Catholicism that teaches that it is better to commit one act of murder than three acts of sex outside marriage. It argues that with the murder you kill the grace of God in your soul the once which is better than doing it three times. Also with murder you kill your own soul but by having the sex you kill somebody else's as well. We are better off without a religion that says it is better for a man to literally go insane with uncontrollable lust and rape a woman than for them to freely go to bed together. With the first, the couple are not sinners and with the second they are. It will also hold that it is better for parents who will instruct their child to have pre-marital sex to have no child at all. It will secretly wish that God had made them sterile or that the child had been miscarried. The Church says this for it holds with the Bible that it is better for the likes of Sodom and Gomorrah to be destroyed by agonising fire from Heaven (Genesis 18, 19) than for the inhabitants to have gay sex. This is fanaticism.

Christians argue that God made sex fun to make sure we do it to reproduce the race. We do lots of boring things so sex

could still have been made uninteresting and the race would be increased. It would be more godly if it were for then it would be closer to a sacrifice. Some say that it is hard to put the other person's pleasure before your own so sex has been made pleasurable for it is meant to be a sacrifice in the sense of one person giving another pleasure and forgetting their own. Then it wouldn't be a sin for the woman to want the man just to please her and the man to want the woman just to please him. One can only make the sacrifice by not letting the other sacrifice for them which would be sinful if love is sacrifice. Perhaps it isn't sinful. The person getting the pleasure has to wish that she or he were not getting it. They couple have to use the missionary position only which is the best for expressing the Bible doctrine that the woman is the man's servant and the Church likes the position for it increases the chance of having a child.

If sex were just for babies then the penis would only be able to gain pleasure from being inside a vagina and as for the woman there would be no need for her to have pleasure. The idea that sex is just for babies implies that women should not enjoy sex or that their pleasure is unimportant. Only the man's orgasm is important. Sex is naturally about togetherness and pleasure which is one reason why homosexuality is natural. The genital parts are there only if you want to and should have a baby. Since what is wrong is unnatural it follows that a man and woman having sex though they know any baby that results will die of a terrible disease is unnatural no matter who says it is natural.

It could be that sex is made pleasurable so that the pleasure will be renounced. Drink has the power to make you really happy and drunk but you are meant to renounce that delight.