

## Study for the Months January & February 2018

By Nathaniel Fajardo  
Whole Gospel Ministries  
PO Box 1764 Loma Linda, CA 92354  
Tel (951) 685-1956 (leave a message) email: [natfajardo777@yahoo.com](mailto:natfajardo777@yahoo.com)  
Web: [www.wholegospelministries.org](http://www.wholegospelministries.org)

---

### The 'Man of Sin' of Bible Prophecy and his activities and career

## ***'Sex, Birth Control and Eugenics' According to Roman Catholic Teaching***

#### QUOTE FOR THIS ISSUE:

*"If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of a hundred battles."*  
— Sun Tzu, Chinese military strategist

The words in quotes in the title of our study/report for this month is the title of chapter 7 of the book *American Freedom and Catholic Power* by Paul Blanshard, The Beacon Press, Boston 1949, pp. 132-142. We quote in full with notes for emphasis in brackets:

"NOBODY KNOWS WHERE THE ELABORATE SEXUAL CODE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HAS COME FROM. It has been developed by *accretion* [increase by external addition-Webster] over a period of nineteen centuries until today [ref. 1949], it is one of the most conspicuous parts of Catholic moral philosophy. Perhaps it could be called an anti-sexual code even though the Church teaches that 'a wife may not without sufficient reason deny herself to her husband' because the primary emphasis has always been upon the negative rather than the wholesome aspects.

"Austerity was identified with virtue by many leaders of early Christianity. Two popes, Clement VIII and Paul V, *declared that anybody should be denounced to the Inquisitors of the Faith who declared that kissing, touching and embracing for the sake of sexual pleasure were not grievous sins* (1). Father Henry Davis, in his *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, expresses a contemporary priestly view when he says that 'sexual pleasure has no purpose at all except in reference to the sexual act between man and wife . . . it is grievously sinful in the unmarried deliberately to procure or to accept even the smallest degree of true venereal pleasure.'

"Freud's wisdom was not available to the Popes and theologians who first imposed celibacy upon a reluctant clergy, and they could scarcely be held responsible for failing to appreciate the gravity of the effects upon human nature of suppressing the basic human instincts. [Paul warns the early church: "The Spirit expressly says that in the latter times some will depart from the faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their own conscience seared with a hot iron, *forbidding to marry...*" 2 Tim 4: 1-3].

“The anti-sexual emphasis of early Christianity came partly from the Orient, where certain ascetic cults glorified celibacy, masochism, and dirt, and thus gave lazy men of that time a chance to escape from family responsibility without condemnation. The cults spread westward at the time when [Apostle] Paul and his associates were building the early church. Paul himself seemed to be distinctly anti-sexual, and some of his followers developed his teaching to such an extreme that by the third century Origen achieved victory over his lower nature by castrating himself. The Church condemned castration early in its history, but for centuries choirboys were castrated in order to preserve their soprano voices for the choir of the Pope’s private chapel. Following certain tendencies in Eastern religions and certain primitive taboos, early Christianity exalted virginity as a status of perfection, and the Church finally imposed celibacy by elaborate disciplinary measures upon almost all of its nuns and priests (2).

“Cardinal Gibbons went so far in his *Faith of Our Fathers* as to suggest that *Jesus chose His closest disciples on the basis of their virginity, and that when He went to Heaven He chose a special band of 140,000 virgin angels for the same reason.* [such crude and weird speculation!]. Today [as of 1949 publication], Catholic theology, in pursuance of this theory of the exalted nature of virginity [Adam and Eve were perfect and married before they fell!], represents the mother of Jesus as a *perpetual* virgin who had no other children except the miraculously-conceived Christ Child (3), and Joseph also is represented as a perpetual virgin [!]. It seems to be a constant source of regret to catholic theologians that Peter, the putative founder of the Church, had a wife. Cardinal Gibbons interpreted an obscure and general passage in Matthew to mean that Peter ‘after his vocation did not continue with his wife’ (4).

“From primitive beginnings the celibate devotees of the Church have expanded and developed the Catholic sexual code until today it covers every aspect of sexual life from petting to homosexuality and rape. The Catholic moral manuals, in their specific descriptions of sexual matters, go far beyond any novel ever banned by government censors. One reason such frankness is permitted in print is that the most specific sexual descriptions are printed in Latin. The authors of these manuals are sure that *there is no sexual sin that a competent priest is not prepared to handle in confessional*; and for every sexual situation they contend that there is a specific Catholic answer. ‘We need not be afraid, whatever we have to confess, of shocking the priest,’ says the Rev. John C. Heenan in *Priest and Penitent . . .* ‘He must plumb the lowest depths of *human depravity* [how is the human priest exempt from this human depravity himself?], however unpleasant he may find the task, in order that, at no time, in his future ministry, can he be faced with a sinner whose particular difficulties he has not learned to solve. He must become in a sense hardened’ (3). **[Where are Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit in all these?]**

“The hardening is acquired by the modern priest *by assuming wide authority as sexual expert in the confessional*. If, for example, a Catholic girl is raped, the priest tells

her that she may remove the offending male sperm by mechanical means within the first ten hours and still remain a good Catholic, but she may not, married or unmarried, perform such an act of cleansing under any circumstances *without definite risk of hell*.

If, after being raped, she fails in her efforts to remove the sperm, '*once conception has taken place, nothing may be done*' (6).

"If a Catholic doctor is asked to test the potency of a husband who seeks medical advice in establishing a family, he may direct the man and wife to have intercourse and then remove the male sperm for testing immediately afterwards, but if the husband should secure such spermatozoa for the microscope-slide by other means, the both the doctor and the husband are guilty of *mortal sin* (7).

"One can imagine *the astonishment and bewilderment of Jesus if He returned to this mortal sphere and hear members of the Catholic hierarchy expounding these tortuous and detailed sexual regulations as a necessary part of His teaching*. The Biblical evidence is absolutely clear that Jesus NEVER said anything specific about birth control, large families, sexual perversion, masturbation or sterilization. He never established a celibate priesthood [True. In fact, priests were required to be married to *one* wife] or directed believers not to marry unbelievers [Not true. Through Paul, Jesus declared, "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers" 2 Cor. 6: 14-18]. His most celebrated comment on sexual ethics was a stinging rebuke to a group of PHARISEES in the presence of a woman taken in adultery: 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.'

"The absence of divine authority in sexual matters has not greatly embarrassed the Catholic hierarchy because the Church has developed its own techniques for plucking selected precedents out of history. Today, as the hierarchy gains strength in the genial and tolerant climate [in contrast to how the RCC virulently outlawed individuality of religion and the worship of God according to dictates of conscience as heresy deserving of the worst diabolical forms of persecution and excruciating death as "heretics"] the Catholic sexual code is being asserted with increasing aggressiveness. Sometimes it is adorned with all the latest clichés of science by earnest young Ph.D.'s who write theses supporting the sexual views of St. Thomas Aquinas. More often the code is imposed upon reluctant congregations by routinely schooled priests with a confidence that amazes Protestants and Jews. Non-Catholics can find no warrant for such doctrines in their own scriptures.

"An important corollary to the Catholic sexual code is that all sexual education should be under priestly control [Ahem!] The state is not competent to educate in such matters because it may disregard Catholic fundamentals. Hence, sex education in public schools is denounced as inappropriate, and *the priest is exalted as the most suitable director of sexual education for the child [have mercy of God!]* In general, the priests emphasize reticence and 'modest' in sex education and deplore frank speaking. They underscore the dangers of premature knowledge in the young, in spite of the fact that scientific

studies of the subject indicate that children acquire information or misinformation very early. The Kinsey Report was denounced vigorously by the National Council of Catholic Women in 1948 as ‘an insult to the American people.’

“One of the most noted writers of the Paulist Press, Father Martin J. Scott, says in his *Marriage Problems*: ‘It has always been a problem with good people what policy to pursue with regard to sex instruction. Modesty is the guardian of purity. [God’s law, the transcript of His character as revealed in Christ, “the express image of His Person,” written in the heart, is the Biblical guardian of purity and righteousness]. Modest people are ordinarily pure in thought and deed [excluding inveterate hypocrites, particularly the religious]. Knowledge of evil does not keep people from evil. . . . Our predecessors got along without all the sex instruction that is now ruining so many under pretext of educating them. *The purest and healthiest nations of the world* have been those least acquainted with sex knowledge’ (9). [What nations were/are these? What was the level of morality/immorality when the papacy controlled the consciences and personal choices of the then civilized world of Old Europe during the Dark Ages?]

“The Church opposition to co-education is entirely consistent with this attitude. Pope Pius XI declared that co-education was ‘false also and harmful, and that in general the rule against it must be ‘applied to all schools, particularly in the most delicate and decisive period of formation, that name, of adolescence’ (10).’ The gospel [which gospel? is respected Catholic colleges, where men and women are carefully segregated, but the Church has found it too expensive to put in operation in all high schools. “- Paul Blanshard, *Sex, Birth Control and Eugenics*, pp. 132-135.

## 2

“The Church’s opposition to birth control has now become the most important part of its sexual code. Perhaps Catholicism’s unrealistic attitude on this subject goes back in part to the negative attitude of celibate priests toward the enjoyment of married life. If sex is essentially sinful, then its enjoyment should be counterbalanced by certain obligations and penalties. In the Augustinian conception the sexual act was sinful in itself, and the essence of the original sin in the Garden of Eden was the concupiscence which accompanied the *act of generation* [that is, the necessary sexual act that initiates the natural process of procreation which God Creator placed in both man and woman’s biological systems that were “fearfully and wonderfully made” in order that they might “go forth and multiply and replenish the earth”---before *the fall* or “original sin” which had nothing to do with sex but their act of disobedience against the command “not partake of fruit of the tree on knowledge of good and evil.” Sex between God-fearing husband and wife was never “essentially sinful.” It is the *corruption* of this act, and every good thing God has endowed upon man “created in his likeness and image” that is sinful. Even temptation in itself is sin; yielding to it, is. For the priest the method of escape from this sin is perpetual virginity. [The Bible teaches that “our way of escape”

from all temptations, trials, and tribulations is in and through Christ alone, the Word.] Ordinary people compensate for their sin by fulfilling their obligations to create children. If this aim of producing children is not consciously held in the marriage bed, at least the possibility of procreation must be accepted as divine blessing by the dutiful Catholic. *The dutiful Catholic must not use medical or mechanical devices to avoid his duty. So runs the Catholic philosophy that lies behind the opposition to birth control.* Children come from God [the Father in heaven, not the Pope who claims to be God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit---on earth, sitting on the Petrine chair in the Vatican, claiming the exclusive prerogatives and powers of the Godhead]. *Sexual ecstasy comes from the devil*---at least that is the logical inference. [What? Who created into man and woman the gender-specific organs and hormones, and the mental and emotional reflexes that render the unique sensations and pleasure during the sexual act---exclusive only between husband and wife—not adulterous trysts with persons other than legit spouses, and the abomination of same-sex perversion! The “sexual ecstasies” experienced in the two latter illicit relationships, indeed “comes from the devil.”]

“Probably no policy in the history of the Church, with the possible exception of the systematic burning of *heretics* [as defined by the Roman Church, not God or the Bible], has excited more widespread opposition and defiance than the priestly prohibition of birth control. The present rigid policy seems to *have been adopted with some hesitation because of conflicting views among Church leaders.* As late as 1926 in Rome a high dignitary of the Church informed Dr. Robert L. Dickinson, noted American gynecologist, that opinion among officers of the Roman Curia *was about evenly divided* concerning recommendations to be made for or against birth control in general. ‘But I fear it will go reactionary,’ he said.

“The theologians have been reactionary on this subject for several centuries. In the thirteenth century St. Thomas Aquinas declared in his *Summa Theologica* that every carnal act from which generation [pregnancy to birth] cannot follow is a ‘vice against nature.’ (11). Like so many of the beliefs of St. Thomas, this doctrine of birth control was derived from dogmatic and theoretical speculation, not from any scientific observation of family life. [Neither is based on “the law and the testimony,” therefore “there is no light” of truth “in them.” Isa. 8: 20].

“Apparently the few Catholic colonists who came to America in the early days did not establish any tradition that Catholics should take a leading part in fighting birth control. The first American laws on the subject were not produced or noticeably influenced by Catholic pressure. [Note what prophecy and extant official Catholic literature as well as historical records that attest and reveal the papacy’s long-standing agenda targeting America as “the last frontier” to be conquered. The Jesuits have been foremost in past centuries to prosecute this kind of “evangelistic” activity and work. See Christian Edwardson’s *Facts of Faith*.] Of course, modern contraception was scarcely possible in the first part of the last century [nineteenth], since the vulcanization of rubber was not

discovered until the forties and Pasteur did not lay the basis for modern antisepsis until the fifties. Responsible discussion about birth control was scarcely known until the twentieth century, and there was no organized movement in its behalf in the United States until 1914. “- *Ibid*, pp. 135-136.

“In the seventies and eighties of the last century contraception was classed by most people with obscenity, partly because they did not quite what the concept meant. In the so-called Comstock law, a federal statute of 1873 that forbade the use of the mails for obscene, lewd and lascivious literature, contraceptive information and devices were *included almost by accident*. Alvah H. Sulloway, who has made a careful study (12) of birth-control history in the United States, points out that when the Comstock law was passed, there was not a word of discussion of contraception in either chamber of Congress. It was not even certain the Congress intended that the law’s *ambiguous wording* to forbid the giving of contraceptive advice by physicians to their patients.

“It was sixty-six years after the passage of the general obscenity statute by Congress before the federal courts in 1936 finally cleared up the interpretation of the law by permitting the shipment of birth-control supplies and contraceptive information in interstate commerce where needed for the ‘well-being of the patient.’ *The law should have been clarified fifty years earlier, but legislators at Washington were too cowardly to face the issue by rewriting the statute.* While Congress dawdled, many states put ‘little Comstock laws’ on their statute books, *repeating the ambiguous phrases* of the federal law. After the federal courts had interpreted the federal law, it took a long time for state courts to bring their interpretations of state law into line with new knowledge, and some of them have not yet passed on the chief issues involved. Today several states still have ambiguous obscenity laws on their statute books which *reactionary and Catholic-dominated courts* could twist into prohibitions against contraceptive advice. Nineteen states do not mention contraception specifically in their laws’ twenty-seven allow contraception as a legitimate feature of the practice of medicine either specifically or by necessary implication.

“Law or no law, contraceptive material is sold almost everywhere in the United States today. Sometimes it is sold under the obvious camouflage label, ‘For the prevention of disease only.’ The editors of Fortune estimated that the contraceptive industry did a pre-war business of \$250,000,000 a year in the United States and had 300,000 outlets for its products (13).

“Two states where Catholics are very powerful, *Massachusetts and Connecticut*, still interpret their statutes as forbidding doctors to give birth-control counsel to their patients. In these states, however, as many contraceptive devices are sold proportionately as in other states. *The only apparent effect of the adoption of the Catholic policy by the state governments* is to deny accurate information to the poor and uneducated.

“Although the Catholic Church did not play an important part in the opposition to birth control in the United States before 1914, it took the lead against Margaret Sanger as soon as she had launched a formal birth-control movement, and in 1930 the [papal] hierarchy became the world’s contraceptive enemy No. 1. Just why Pope Pius XI finally slammed the door on all kinds of contraceptives as late as 1930 is hard to understand. His pronouncements on the subject in December, 1930, was timed to collide directly with twentieth-century science at the moment of its greatest prestige. *In one respect Pius XI’s announcement was even more untimely than Pius IX’s edict on Papal infallibility in 1870, since it invaded a field of practical medicine unfamiliar to celibate priests.*

“In 1930 the aged Pius XI had just piloted *the Vatican to a Concordat with Mussolini* [Italian fascist]. He had indicated much sympathy with dictatorships in the economic and political field, as we shall see later. Perhaps he felt that the future belonged to the moral field also. Mussolini had urged Italians to increase and multiply, and had given newly-married couples free trips to Rome where they were received by the Pope and urged to produce large families of faithful Catholics. In fighting birth control Pius was not opposing Mussolini’s pattern for Italy. Whatever may have been his motives, he announced in one section of his famous encyclical on *Christian Marriage* that birth is ‘against nature’ and that ‘any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offense against the law of God and nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of grave sin.’ (14). He made an exception, whoever, in regard to periodic continence and intercourse during a ‘safe period,’ which he specifically permitted.

“Pius could find no Biblical authority for his extreme position on contraception except the story of Onan in Genesis xxviii that relates how Judah ordered Onan, his second son, to marry his brother’s widow and ‘raise up seed’ to him, and how Onan, not wishing to give his brother official credit for paternity under the system of Jewish law, spilled his seed [sperm] on the ground, whereupon ‘God slew him also.’

“If this story has any moral, it is that all men who refuse to marry their brothers’ widows should be killed. Indeed, that was the moral of the original story, since the Levite law laid down the rule for the Jews that a man inheriting his brother’s cattle and lands should also cohabit with his deceased brother’s wife or wives and raise a direct heir for his brother’s property. Onan’s primary sin was defiance of a property law of the ancient Jews, a law that was abandoned at least two thousand years ago. This interpretation of the story is supported by the *Jewish Encyclopedia* which points out that the law violated by Onan had a two-fold purpose, ‘to perpetuate the husband’s name and to prevent the alienation of the property. The widow is permitted to insult publicly and unwilling brother-in-law by loosing his shoe and spitting in his face.’ (15)

“Catholic theologians, lacking and scriptural authority [as in almost all their doctrines] for their extreme position on birth-control, have taken this ancient story of Onan, distorted its meaning by declaring that Jehovah slew Onan for his *coitus interruptus*, and inflated this interpretation into a whole system of social hygiene for the twentieth century. They have used their techniques of exegesis so skillfully that millions of American Catholics actually believe the statement that ‘God and Jesus Christ condemn birth control.’ During the 1948 election campaign over a birth-control referendum, Massachusetts was blanketed with billboards carrying the headline BIRTH CONTROL IS STILL AGAINST GOD’S LAW.

“If some curious believers should ever question the dicta of their priests sufficiently to examine the whole story of Onan in Genesis xxxviii, they would be sadly disillusioned. The unpublicized portion of the story tells how, after Onan had been killed for refusing to cohabit normally with his brother’s widow, the widow covered herself with a veil, sat at the side of the road as a harlot, and seduced her father-in-law, Judah, bearing him twins. Judah, however was not punished by Jehovah because he had mistaken the lady for a professional [prostitute]. Catholic theologians have never explained why the ethical standards of the second part of this story should be any less binding upon the United States in the twentieth century than the moral deductions from the first part.”- *Ibid*, pp. 135- 139.

### 3

“As soon as Pius XI gave the signal with an official pronouncement, the celibate theologians of the entire world increased the fervor of their attack on contraception. It would be hard to imagine a worst thing for the [papal] hierarchy to have done from the point of view of intelligent non-Catholics in the United States. Since the early days of the birth-control movement when **Margaret Sanger was sent to jail for her principles**, birth control has won both acceptance and respectability in the United States. Almost all well-to-do people in the country practice it to some extent, including well-to-do Catholics. In fact if the Catholic hierarchy, acting as a *Roman* [not Christian!] pressure group, did not block legislative reform in many states, the idea of birth-control would formally accepted in everywhere in America. The **Planned Parenthood Federation** now lists [as of 1949, that is] 557 clinics in the United States that give child-spacing services, of which 58 offer services to improve the fertility of married couples. .Some six states include birth-spacing in their public health services. The right of married couples to receive birth-control counsel from their physicians is endorsed by the Federal council of Churches of Christ, the Central conference of American Rabbis, the American Medical Association, and more than ninety-six percent of American doctors who answered a questionnaire (16).”

“It is now generally recognized that *scientific birth control offers the best hope of reducing the enormous number of criminal abortions* performed each year in the United States. ‘To fail to provide birth control is to foster abortion,’ says Dr. R.L.



Dickinson in his *Control of Conception. The Cyclopedia of Medicine and Surgery* estimates that today [as of 1949] more than one-third of all the pregnancies in the United States are ‘purposely interrupted,’ and it declares: ‘More women die from criminal abortion than from labor and its complications.’ (17).

“Intelligent Catholics know these things and are rebelling against their hierarchy’s *medieval attitude* on the subject of birth control. The Catholic author, Harry Sylvester, in his novel *Moon Gaffney* has a liberal Catholic say: ‘I think what I mind is the relish with which *the clergy, many of whom do not understand the meaning of their own chastity, tell their people they must fill their three-room flats with their children on their twenty-eight dollars a week.*’

“This attitude of Catholics is reflected in the independent opinion-polls on the subject of birth control, and in the use of birth-control clinics. In the clinics of the Planned Parenthood Federation, Catholic women use the facilities in about the same proportion to their numbers in the community as do non-Catholic women. National public-opinion polls have demonstrated that Catholic women do not follow their priests on birth control. When the Ladies’ Home Journal asked its women readers in 1938 if they believed in the right to disseminate birth-control information to married couples, 51 per cent of the Catholic women answering the poll said ‘Yes.’ When *Fortune* posed a similar question in 1943, 69 per cent of the Catholic women said ‘Yes.’ The conclusion of an opinion-poll published by the *Woman’s Home Companion* in July, 1948, was that almost 80 per cent of the Catholic women had accepted the belief that ‘birth-control information should be made available to some extent; only one-fifth think it should be legally forbidden to everybody.’ Since the hierarchy will not permit a free vote on birth control within the Church, these unbiased polls constitute the real index of Catholic sentiment on birth control; they show that the hierarchy is losing ground steadily in its extreme dogmatism.” – *Ibid*, pp. 139-141.

“The growing defiance by Catholic women, as well as men, has driven the priesthood into a corner. In self-defense the priests have resorted to systematic vilification of the birth-control movement. Sometimes they pretend, with assertions without medical backing, that birth control is likely to cause cancer, that it lowers or destroys the vitality and health of married women, and that is a form of abortion. They frequently pretend that advocates of birth control do not want children, whereas their usual desire is for properly spaced children. They ignore the fact that the overcoming of infertility has now become one of the most important collateral services of the planned-parenthood movement. Their *crude misrepresentations* do not deceive many legislators, but their *political power* is still sufficient in several states to block the dissemination of birth-control information to those classes in the population that need the information most [the uneducated and poor].

“One of the leading **Jesuit** writers of the United States, Father Daniel L. Lord, *classes American wives who use contraceptives with prostitutes* and calls them ‘*daughters of Joy*’ in his pamphlet, *Speaking of Birth Control*, which went into its 22<sup>nd</sup> printing in March, 1946. ‘The advocates of birth control,’ he says, ‘are thorough materialists, to whom a child is just a little animal without any destiny than the grave or any relationship with the one whom Christ called our Father.’ (18). Father Dominic Pruemmer, in a widely circulated pamphlet published under the imprimatur of Cardinal Hayes, said: “Birth control is nothing else than mutual masturbation or unnatural lust.” (19). Many similar frenzied expressions on this subject can be found in official Catholic literature.

“When *Look* magazine, in its issue of April 1, 1947, published a sober, factual review of the clinical work of the Planned Parenthood Federation, the top-ranking layman of the Archdiocese of New York, under Cardinal Spellman, wrote a reply in the issue of May 6<sup>th</sup> in which he accused the planned-parenthood leaders of advocating ‘*education in animal functions completely divorced from morality and ethics*,’ and declared that such education meant training people ‘to be sexually promiscuous with least risk of pregnancy or venereal disease.’ ‘*The planned parenthood program*,’ he wrote, ‘*assumes that the cure for beastliness is to teach juveniles how to get away with acting like beasts*.’ This philippic, it should be noted, was directed against many of the most respected clergymen and rabbis of the country who are formally associated with the Planned Parenthood Federation. Naturally, such an attack produced a critical reaction among liberal Catholics who did not wish to be associated with such hysterical misrepresentation. [The RCC is battling and paying settlements in the hundreds of millions for lawsuits in revolting pedophilia cases of their prelates and priests, many more which will never come to light and justice on earth but will be revealed in full detail in the Judgment day]

“Faced with increasing skepticism and revolt among their own people, the priests have turned to a Catholic birth-control formula of their own that is technically permissible under one interpretation of the general phrases of Pius XI’s encyclical, *Casti Connubii*. Originally the formula was sponsored in this country by the very prelate, Cardinal Hayes, who had been responsible for directing New York Catholic police to break up a birth-control meeting arranged by Margaret Sanger. The new ‘discover,’ published in official pamphlets, (20) is called the *rhythm method*. It is based upon the finding that conception takes place midway between menstrual cycles, about fourteen days before the next period. Catholics, according to this formula, *may avoid pregnancy without sin* by refraining from intercourse during a part of each month so long as they are submissively receptive to the arrival of an unwanted soul in case there is a miscalculation. The theologians call this rhythm method ‘natural’ because it involves no medicine or contraceptive device.” - *Ibid*, pp. 141,142.

(To be continued March 2018)