

we often hear it said that the church should change its teachings on sexuality. Various reasons are given. In the time of sexual abuse by priests the argument is that we should make our teachings more lax. I think the first thing to note is that rather than question the faith of someone holds that position, we should question their intelligence. We have been through a 50 year tests of the theory that was believed up until now almost universally if not completely universally then almost universally in society: the theory that a functioning family is necessary for society; that is, the theory that holding up the family as the norm for sexual behavior is necessary for society, because it is necessary for the health of the family. And the family is necessary for the health of society.

We just finished the first and probably only in the history of mankind 50 year test of that theory on a society wide basis, not just on the basis of certain segments of society especially the elites. If we don't know now that the experiment has failed, if we don't know now that the experiment has shown what happens has shown that what happens when we don't support the family is deleterious to society seriously deleterious society, when are we ever going to know? The list of horrors goes on and on. At either the end of that list or the beginning depending upon your strategy, is the millions of human beings we have had to kill to support that experiment. You don't have to raise abortion as proof for the failure of the experiment. But abortion is more than sufficient proof. Because the experiment was the experiment in a sexual revolution, and the sexual revolution depends on having a 100 percent effective form of birth control. The only 100 percent effective form of birth control is to kill the baby.

January 19th 2003 continuing the last note.

So we have to question the intelligence of those who challenge the church's teaching before we question their faith. But I'm sure many of them would score perfectly well on IQ tests. So the failure of intelligence in this case, the demonstrable failure of intelligence in this case, has to be traced to something other than a low IQ or a low level of education. It has to be traced to the human propensity for self deception. It has to be traced to the infinite human capacity for self deception. But what this particular kind of self deception shows is how great is the capacity for self deception when it is motivated by the desire for sexual laxity.

A perhaps minor example of the effects deleterious effects of sexual revolution would be the number of women think that they need to get breast implants isn't this a result of the fact that the sexual revolution was pornography driven? I realize that the biggest contributor to the sexual revolution was the birth control pill. But Playboy and the other pornography magazines and the pornography industry began before the birth control pills.

Another comment on the evidence that abortion presents evidence that the church should not change its sexual teachings: even if you're one of those who is personally opposed to abortion, or should say "personally opposed" to abortion, and therefore does not think that abortion should be outlawed, still if you really are personally opposed to abortion, you should be horrified by one million or more than one million babies killed every year. And if you are horrified, even though you don't think it's right to outlaw abortion, you should want to do what you can to remove the causes of abortion to minimize the number of abortions by minimizing the causes of abortion whether or not its outlawed. Well the sexual revolution is the cause of abortion. Therefore you should biggest sexual revolution and therefore you should not think the church should change is teaching, if you have any intelligence that is.

November 14, 2003

A child, a human child, has a right to an upbringing in which the child learns just by being in a particular environment that the meaning of her existence is that persons such as her are worthy of committed love from beings with rational knowledge. In other words, she has a right to learn from the fact that her parents are committed to one another in love and the fact that the relation of her

parents is where her existence comes from that her existence is the existence of something worthy of committed love from a rational being.

Committed love means to be loved as something that is irreplaceable. It is to be loved for one's own sake not for the sake of replaceable functions that one performs. We owe love to every person as something irreplaceable. We do not owe it only to our spouses our children our relatives our siblings. But we do not love all the entities that are worthy of love for their own sake and are worthy of love as irreplaceable in the same way. The way we show love to them, the way we love them, is determined by their needs. Not all human beings need from me the kind of love I show in loving my spouse. At most one other human being can need that love from me. Cause the love that is so needed is the unique love of one spouse for another. And that is the love from which the child learns its value as a person and therefore learns the value of all persons as such.

March 29, 2004

A short way of stating why contraception, artificial contraception, is immoral. Persons are that for the sake of which everything else exists. Persons are the absolute value to which everything else is relative. The abortionist who uses the slogan "every child a wanted child," is implying that the value of a child depends on whether or not child is wanted. If the value of a child's existence depends on whether or not child is wanted, the existence of a child is not the existence of the absolute value, of that for the sake of which everything else exists.

Likewise, when we are deciding for artificial contraception, we are saying that a faculty for producing that the sake of which everything else exists will be prevented from doing so while achieving some other sort of end. We are achieving some other sort of end precisely to the exclusion of achieving the end of the existence of a person. We are giving our person making ability the value of achieving a relative end precisely by excluding it from achieving an absolute end.

But the value that a means as in our system of values derives from the value that the end for which we are or not using the means has in our system of values. If our person making ability has the value of, not just achieving a relative end, but of achieving a relative end precisely by excluding it from achieving the absolute end, then we have put the relative end higher in our system of values than the absolute end. We have given the relative value a higher place than an absolute value.

Therefore we are not truly valuing persons as that for the sake of which everything else exists.

The existence of a new person comes from the attraction of one person for another a desire of one person for another. Likewise a musical duo might come from the attraction of one person for another for example Brubeck and Desmond or Ellington and Strayhorn. In the latter cases the attraction of one person for another is for the sake of the other persons music making ability. I and the result of the attraction is the making of music.

In the case of the conception of a new human person, the attraction for the other person is based on the other persons person making ability. the attraction is for the other person in so far as the person has a person making ability.

And the making of a person is precisely an exercise of that desire the conceiving of a new person is an exercise of the attraction. The conceiving is an exercise of that desire. So we can ask what is the meaning of the new person is it just the result of a physical desire. Is it just the result of A. physical attraction? or must it be the result result of the committed love of a person for another person for the other persons own sake? The answer should be clear. Since it is the person

making ability that we are attracted to the other person for, and since it is the exercise of that attraction that is that the source of the existence of a new person, then the attraction should be exercised in the context of committed love for a person and only in such a context. Because the result, a new person, is worthy of committed love and is not merely the product of physical a desire. The new person is worth more than being a porduct of a physical desire a new person is worth being the product of committed love of a person for another person because of each others person making abilities.

The above paragraphs were recorded on November 9, 2,000 and four