

GEORGE LORING, S.I.

“I am with you

# TO SAVE YOU”

*Jer. 30:11*

First Edition

George Loring, S.I.

Copyright @ 2005 by St. Paul's Publishing Co.

112 S. Herbert St, Los Angeles, Ca. 90063

Recommended for readers 16 years of age and older

“I am with you,  
TO SAVE YOU”  
(Jeremiah, 30:11)

“How beautiful upon the mountains  
Are the feet of He who brings good news,  
Who announces peace and happiness,  
Who proclaims salvation”  
(Isaiah, 52.7)

“Work out for your salvation”  
(Philippians, 2.12)

“Run, so that you may receive the prize”  
(I Corinthians, 9:24)

“Brothers, if any of you strays from the truth and another person brings him back, be sure of this: he who brings the sinner back from the wrong way will save his soul from death and win forgiveness for many sins.”  
(James, 5:19)

“The people are entitled to an explanation in full of the fundamentals of Christian faith, without ambiguities or reductions.”  
(John Paul II)

“Do not deform your conscience, call good, good; and evil, evil.”  
(John Paul II, to the youth at Santiago de Compostela.

“Atheists study our Catholic Religion to combat it. Why don't we study it to defend it?”  
(Sarda and Salvany)

Why was I born? To save myself!  
That I must die, it is certain.  
To stop seeing God and condemn myself  
A sad thing it shall be, but possible.

Possible! Do I laugh, sleep, and wish to relax?  
Possible! And do I love all material things?.

What do I do? What is my work? What charms me?  
I must be mad, for I am not a Saint!

Pedro de los Reyes O.F.M.

## GOD

### *Origin of the Cosmos*

Things are not made by themselves; someone has to make them. The table and the house, as well as the Sun, the Earth, and the stars have been made. The table has been made by the carpenter; the house has been made by the mason.

#### 1.- THE SUN, EARTH AND STARS HAVE BEEN MADE BY GOD.

1. If you walk along the beach one day after ebb tide, you will recognize, by the imprints on the sand, if that which walked before you was a man, a dog or a bird.

We shall do the same in order to search for God. We cannot see God because He is Spirit<sup>1</sup>, and a spirit cannot be seen by human eyes. "No one has seen God"<sup>2</sup>.

But we are going to know God through the **evidence** He has left in creation. **Paul** says we can at least discover Him through His works.<sup>3</sup>

You know that those imprints have not been made by themselves. Well, look at the sky. Can you count the stars? The Atlas of the Heavens, which they have begun to publish, will consist of twenty volumes, in which there will be five hundred million stars. The total number of stars in the Universe is calculated to be some 200,000 trillion stars, a number with 24 digits!<sup>4</sup>

The sun has ten planets: Mercury, Venus, Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune and Pluto. The nine known and the tenth just discovered: Planet X<sup>5</sup>, located by the Pioneer probe in 1987; we have known of its existence for 20 years.

Our galaxy, the Milky Way, has one hundred thousand million suns<sup>6</sup>. And there are about one hundred thousand million galaxies such as ours<sup>7</sup>. Andromeda's Nebulosa consists of two hundred

---

<sup>1</sup> John 4:24

<sup>2</sup> John 1:18

<sup>3</sup> Romans 1:20

<sup>4</sup> ANTONIO DUE, S. I. *Vida y Muerte del Cosmos, II* Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>5</sup> YA Newspaper, 6-22-88, pg. 23

million stars. Well, if some holes in the sand could not have been made by themselves, would the millions of stars in the heavens make themselves?

**Someone has made the stars.** That being, the Primary Cause of the whole Universe, we call GOD.

2. The moon is 384,000 km from Earth. The Sun is 150,000,000 km away. Pluto is 6,000,000,000 km distant<sup>8</sup>. Beyond our Solar System, Sirius is 8 light years away, and Arthur is 36 light years distant.

Light which travels at a speed of 300,000 km per second, in one year covers a distance equivalent to 200 million times around the earth. Measured in kilometers, it is about 10 billion of them<sup>9</sup>. In order to have an idea of what a billion is, let us consider that a billion seconds are equal to almost 32,000 years.

The speed of light according to the laws of physics cannot be surpassed<sup>10</sup>. The speed of light is the maximum speed which can be attained as demonstrated by **Einstein's** equation of  $E=mc^2$ , speed at which mass would become infinite<sup>11</sup>.

Outside our galaxy, Andromeda's Nebulosa, which is nearest to our galaxy, is 2 million light years away<sup>12</sup>. The Coma of Virgo is 200 million light years and the Cumulus of Hydra is 2,000 million light years distant<sup>13</sup>.

This is the limit for optical telescopes<sup>14</sup>. Radio telescopes can probe deeper.

The farthest away a star has been detected is Quasar PKS 2,000-330 which is 15,000 million light years distant<sup>15</sup>. Quasars are radio stars which emit Hertz waves. They were first detected in 1960<sup>16</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Manuel Carreira, S. I. Professor of Physics and Astronomy at Cleveland University (USA); Antropocentrismo Científico y Religioso. Ed. A.D.U.E. Madrid 1983

<sup>7</sup> Manuel Carreira, S. I. Metafísica de la Materia. VIII Universidad de Comillas. Madrid. 1993.

<sup>8</sup> Bernard Lowell Director of the Jodrell Bank Radioastronomy Observatory. *Conocimiento Actual del Universo.* // Ed. Labor. Barcelona. 1975

<sup>9</sup> MANUEL CARREIRA. S. I. *El Creyente Ante la Ciencia* // 3. Cuadernos BAC. n. 57. Madrid. 1982

<sup>10</sup> INVESTIGACIÓN Y CIENCIA Magazine, n. 45 (VI-80), Pg 78

<sup>11</sup> STEPHEN W. HAWKING: *Historia del Tiempo.* // Ed. Critica. Barcelona. 1988

<sup>12</sup> STEPHEN WEINBERG *Los Tres Primeros Minutos del Universo*

<sup>13</sup> FRED HOYLE: *El Universo Inteligente n 169* Ed. Grijalbo. 1984

<sup>14</sup> PASCUAL JORDAN: *Creación y Misterio, I.2.* EUNSA. Pamplona. 1978

<sup>15</sup> INVESTIGACIÓN Y CIENCIA Magazine nº 80 (5-83). pg. 61

<sup>16</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid 8-14-95. pg.42

3. It is possible that there are other **inhabited heavenly bodies**, but we do not know this, since God has not told us anything and we have not been able to contact them.

The existence of intelligent extraterrestrial life is somewhat probable, and this poses no difficulty, either to Science or to Religion.

But in spite of all efforts made so far, scientists have been unable to receive any clear signal from intelligent extraterrestrial beings.

When I was in Puerto Rico, presenting a conference at the University of Ponce, I visited the radio telescope in Arecibo<sup>17</sup>, which is the largest in the world. It has one thousand feet in diameter (305 meters), and is able to detect the flame of a candle on the moon<sup>18</sup>; from there signals are sent every year searching for extraterrestrial civilization. Although these signals can be detected from outer space, we have not had a response<sup>19</sup>. The message has been sent in a binary code which is of common use in computers. This message describes some characteristics of life on earth, of what Man is and of the radio telescope that emits the message. In my visit to the observatory I was given a copy of this coded message, which I still hold in my possession.

Professor **Heinrich K. Erben** of Bonn University, has drastically reduced the possibility of intelligent life in another part of the Universe<sup>20</sup>. Twenty five years after the project **OZMA** was started, we have not been able to capture a trace of intelligent life originating in another planet<sup>21</sup>.

We have no worthy information on the existence of intelligent life beyond the solar system. But it is a fact that scientific opinion has evolved in the last twenty years in the concept that it is harder to find conditions that conjoined in our planet that could have occurred elsewhere, and which decisively influenced the development of life up to Man<sup>22</sup>. Therefore, it seems that there is no intelligent life in any other part of our galaxy<sup>23</sup>. And therefore, it seems highly unlikely to find intelligent life in another planet in the solar system<sup>24</sup>.

**Juan Oró**, a world renowned biochemist, Professor at the University of Houston (USA), and one of the main researchers for NASA, has said: "We have no evidence of intelligent life outside of that on Earth". "Scientific opinion regarding extraterrestrial life has changed in the last 10 to 20 years. From an optimism which hoped to find inhabited planets in the entire Universe, almost around each and every star, we have gone to a more pessimistic realism. It seems difficult to hope that all conditions could appear at the precise moment and in the exact form so that life might appear elsewhere and have the possibility of developing itself as it did here on Earth<sup>25</sup>".

4. There are millions of stars **much larger** than Earth in the heavens.

Earth is a sphere with a perimeter of 40,000 km. The sun is one million three hundred thousand times larger than Earth. The star Antares, from the Scorpio constellation is so large that its size is the

---

<sup>17</sup> ISAAC ASIMOV: EL DIA Newspaper, San Juan de Puerto Rico-19-89, pg. 60

<sup>18</sup> BLANCO Y NEGRO Magazine, 10-4-92, pg. 71

<sup>19</sup> IBÉRICA de Actualidad Científica magazine, n. 202 (7-79), 277

<sup>20</sup> YA Newspaper, Madrid, 1-6-86, pg. 6

<sup>21</sup> YA Newspaper, Madrid, 3-24-85, pg 12

<sup>22</sup> MANUEL CARREIRA, S. I. Professor of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Cleveland (USA): *Metafisica de la Materia. IX* Universidad de Comillas. Madrid. 1993

<sup>23</sup> MUNDO CIENTÍFICO Magazine: 42(12-84). 1,997

<sup>24</sup> MUNDO CIENTÍFICO Magazine: 42(12-84). 1,991

<sup>25</sup> MANUEL CARREIRA, S. I. Professor of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Cleveland (USA): *Antropocentrismo Científico y Religioso* Ed. A.D.U.E., Madrid, 1983



equivalent of 115 million suns<sup>26</sup>. Alfa of Hercules, which is 1,200 light years away, and is the largest of all known stars, is eight million billion times larger than the sun<sup>27</sup>.

In order to understand the enormity of these celestial bodies, we can say that the orbit of the moon around the earth fits inside the Sun, and that the radius of Antares is equal to the diameter of earth's orbit, that is about 300,000,000 km, and that the diameter of the orbit of Pluto which is 12,000 million km, is a tenth of the radius of Alfa of Hercules.

All of the data mentioned above was calculated for me by an astronomer.

The largest known radio star is DA/240 which has a diameter of six million light years<sup>28</sup>. The diameter of this radio-star is sixty times greater than the diameter of our galaxy, the **Milky Way**, which is only about one hundred thousand light years.

#### 5. These gigantic objects travel at **great speeds**.

Earth travels at one hundred thousand kilometers per hour, which is about thirty kilometers per second<sup>29</sup>.

The Sun is traveling towards the Constellation of Hercules at a rate of 300 km per second.

The Constellation of Virgo is moving away from us at a speed of one thousand kilometers per second<sup>30</sup>.

The Cumulus of Boyero is leaving us at a speed of one hundred thousand kilometers per second<sup>31</sup>.

Because of the speedy motion towards the red ray spectrum we can calculate that there are stars that are moving at a rate of 276,000 km per second, or about 92% of the speed of light.

6. The movement of the stars is so exact that one can make an almanac years in advance. An almanac lists the rising and the setting of the sun every day, the eclipses which will occur during the year, the day they will take place, the hour, minute and second, how long they will last, what part of the Sun or the Moon will be hidden, from what point on Earth they will be visible, etc. etc.

On June 30, 1973, all of Spain was engrossed in the partial eclipse of the Sun which the press had been talking about for several days.

On October 2, 1959, a total eclipse of the Sun was visible from the Canary Islands. This occurred at 12 noon, just as had been predicted eons before. Because of this they installed on Punta de Jandía in Fuerteventura, an observation post where scientists from all over the world gathered.

The previous eclipse of the Sun which was seen from the Canary Islands occurred on August 30, 1905 and it is known that "we will have to wait until the XXII Century has passed before we see another total eclipse of the Sun from within our borders"<sup>32</sup>.

In July 1985, the Astrophysical Observatory of the Canary Islands was inaugurated. It is the most important one in Europe and one of the best in the world. It will study the Sun and the stars.

In 2005, we can observe an annular eclipse from Cadiz, Spain<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> IGNACIO PUIG, S. I. *Astronomía Popular*, v. 6.

<sup>27</sup> IBÉRICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine, n. 371 (2-15-58), 156

<sup>28</sup> YA Newspaper, Madrid 10-15-75, pg.41

<sup>29</sup> STEPHEN WEINBERG *Los Tres Primeros Minutos Del Universo, II Alianza Editorial. Madrid, 1980*

<sup>30</sup> STEPHEN WEINBERG *Los Tres Primeros Minutos Del Universo, III Alianza Editorial. Madrid, 1980*

<sup>31</sup> COLIN A. ROMAN: *Secretos del Cosmos. V.2*.Ed. Salvat RTV. Madrid

<sup>32</sup> M. LOPEZ ARROYO, Astronomer at the Madrid Observatory: YA Newspaper, Madrid, 6-26-73

<sup>33</sup> YA Newspaper. 7-11-91, pg 44

Halley's Comet (so named in honor of the astronomer **Edmund Halley**, a friend and contemporary of **Isaac Newton**) as had been foreseen in the nineteenth century, passed close to us in 1910. It again passed near Earth (486 million km.) in March of '86 as had been predicted. All news media in the world spoke of the comet.

**Halley** (1646-1742) who observed the comet in 1662, calculated its orbit and predicted that it would appear every 76 years, and it has so happened<sup>34</sup>.

It will be seen again in the year 2062. When it passed close to the Earth in 1986, it was photographed by the European probe named Giotto which approached the nucleus of the comet at a distance of 500 kms<sup>35</sup>. The length of the comet's tail is 50 million kilometers and is formed by rarified gasses<sup>36</sup>.

When I was in Santa Cruz de Tenerife, on the occasion of some conferences I gave at the Palo Alto Residence, in January of 1991, I had the opportunity of visiting the Astrophysics Observatory at Teide, where we have the most sensitive microwave telescope in the world, and where the Sun's oscillations are studied, etc. I established a friendship with British astronomer **Mark Kidger**, a specialist in the study of Halley's comet. He gave me some interesting facts and figures.

The nucleus of the comet is formed by solid gasses at a temperature of 100 degrees Celsius below zero. The comet's dimensions are 7'50 by 8'5 by 18 kilometers.

The Chinese already knew about the comet a thousand years before **Christ**. It has gone around the sun thousands of times, and it will finally consume itself, as each time it approaches the sun, it loses weight when heated by the sun, and part of the nucleus's solid gasses evaporate. The comet's tail does not go backwards, as the wake of a jet plane, but because it confronts the solar wind, it appears to be going towards the sun, somewhat like an old fashioned locomotive, whose smoke went sideways when encountering a strong side wind..

7. All of this would be impossible to know if the order of the movement of the stars were not mathematically calculable..

For this reason **James Jeans**, illustrious mathematician, President of the Royal Astronomical Society of England and Professor of the University of Oxford, as well as one of the greatest contemporary astronomers, in his book, "The Mysteries of the Universe"<sup>37</sup>, affirms that the Creator of the Universe had to be a great mathematician, and **Einstein** says "Nature is the realization of the mathematical ideas of God."<sup>38</sup>

**Paul Dirac** Professor of Theoretical Physics at the University of Cambridge and one of the most outstanding scientists of our generation, stated in the Scientific American journal: "God is a top-level mathematician"<sup>39</sup>.

8. All this marvelous order requires a **great intelligence** to direct it. What would happen in a square where there is a great deal of traffic - such as Times Square in New York - if the drivers

<sup>34</sup> GEORGE GAMOW: *Materia, Tierra y Cielo, XVIII*. University of Colorado (USA)

<sup>35</sup> IBÉRICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine, n. 274 (2-86), 54

<sup>36</sup> JUAN LUIS RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *Alma y Cerebro*. COMUNIO Magazine, III, 87. pg 223

<sup>37</sup> JAMES JEANS: *Los Misterios Del Universo*, pg. 175

<sup>38</sup> DESIDERIO PAPP: *Einstein. 3<sup>rd</sup>, XIII*, 7.Ed. Espasa Calpe. Madrid, 1979

<sup>39</sup> INVESTIGACIÓN Y CIENCIA Magazine, V, 1.1963, pg 53

suddenly became paralyzed and the vehicles, without any intelligence, were abandoned to their own motion? why mayhem would occur!

9. The more complicated and perfect an order is, the greater the organizing mind must be. It is assumed that you require more intelligence to build a clock than to build a wheelbarrow.

If you are shipwrecked on the high seas and grasp onto a floating object, and arrive at a deserted island, even though you find no trace of man, not a shoe, not a piece of clothing, nor an empty sardine can, nothing; but if you wander through the island and find a shed, you immediately realize that there was another person present before your arrival. You comprehend that the shelter is evidence of man's intelligence. You realize that the shelter did not happen by itself, that those stakes driven into the ground, and those branches that form the roof and the swivel door are the fruit of human intelligence.

If a few branches that form a shed require human intelligence, should not intelligence be required in order to align the millions and millions of stars that float through the heavens with mathematical precision?

**Isaac Newton** (1642-1727) and **Johannes Kepler** (1571-1631) discovered the mathematical rules which govern the movement of the Universe, but one must remember that they did not establish said rules, as stars had been in existence for many years before **Newton** and **Kepler** were born.

Therefore, one must surmise that someone authored those rules in the beginning.

That is why astronaut **Borman** said while on the moon: "We have arrived here thanks to laws that were not made by man". And Newton said: "The universe could not have been born without being projected by an intelligent being"<sup>40</sup>. "It is sufficient for me," said **Albert Einstein**, Physics Nobel Prize winner, "Reflecting on the marvelous structure of the Universe, and to humbly attempt to penetrate in at least an infinitesimal part of the wisdom which is manifested in Nature"<sup>41</sup>. He also said: "GOD does not play craps"<sup>42</sup>.

The intelligence which puts in order the movements of the stars in the skies and directs with such great perfection the machine of the Universe is God's intelligence.

That is why the Bible says: "The heavens declare of the glory of God."<sup>43</sup>

Creatures are fingers that point God to me. But there are people who just stare at the finger, see no farther and don't see past it.

10. **Astrology** and **Astronomy** are not the same. Astronomy is a science, and astrology is fiction. That is the opinion of **Shawn Carlson**, a physicist of the **Lawrence Berkeley** laboratories (California) and **Andrew Fraknoi**, who is head of the Pacific Astronomical Society<sup>44</sup>.

Recently, two hundred and fifty eight scientists from all over the world have signed a manifesto to the press in order to open the eyes of the credulous people who trust Astrology, basically because of the great advertisement coverage in the media. Amongst other things the manifesto states:

"It is simply an error to imagine that forces emanating from the stars and planets at the time of your birth, can, in some form, determine your future. It is also not true that the position of the celestial

<sup>40</sup> ISAAC NEWTON: *Scholium Generale* of his *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*.

<sup>41</sup> ANTONIO DUE, S. I. : *El Cosmos En La Actualidad Científica*, I, 5. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>42</sup> MAX BORN: *Ciencia Y Conciencia De La Era Atomica*, I<sup>st</sup>, IX. Alianza Editorial, Madrid, 1971

<sup>43</sup> Psalms, **19:2**

<sup>44</sup> YA Newspaper. 6-22-88, pg 23

bodies can influence so that certain days or time periods can be more favorable to start some type of activity, or that the sign under which you were born determines compatibility with other people”.

“We have arrived at the time to vigorously reject the pretentious affirmations made by charlatan astrologers. Those who continue to have faith in astrology do it even though there is no scientific basis for their beliefs and there is however a strong evidence to the contrary”<sup>45</sup>.

Proof that the stars and planets do not determine the future of the person is confirmed with the fact that identical twin brothers, born under the same star can have entirely different lives, one may have a tragic death as a young child, and the other can have a long, happy and fruitful life.

Professor **Stanley L. Jaki** of Seton Hall University in New Jersey (USA) has manifested that astrology lacks scientific fundament.<sup>46</sup>

11. The **photographic camera** was a transcendental invention for the culture of mankind. Formerly, one could only know what one saw with one’s own eyes. Since photography was invented it is possible to know landscapes, monuments, and works of art and the great personalities of the whole world without leaving the place where one was born.

The invention of the camera presupposes a great intelligence, and it took mankind many years to invent it. It was not invented until the nineteenth century.

Nevertheless, a long time before man invented the camera --from the beginning of humanity-- the human eye had already been invented, a marvelous photographic machine, which takes 10 photos per second; it is not necessary to develop the roll of film and furthermore, it has auto focus because of the marvelous constitution of the crystalline lens.

The invention of the eye infers an even greater intelligence than that required for the invention of the camera. **Dr. Pierre-Paul Grassé**, member of the faculty of the School of Sciences at the University of Claremont Ferrand and that of Paris, and the President of the Academy of Science of France, in 1967 proved in a documented study that the eye cannot be the result of chance, but rather the fruit of a disciplined intelligence<sup>47</sup>.

One of the great improvements in modern aviation is the **automatic pilot** with which an airplane can fly without a pilot at the controls.

But as of today man has not invented, nor will he ever invent, an airplane which will not only fly without a pilot, but also find its own fuel, construct its own hangar, and what is more important make other airplanes like itself, which will in turn make other airplanes, and so on and so forth.

This marvelous airplane, which seems impossible to ever be invented, has existed since time immemorial: it is the bird.

The bird is an airplane which flies by itself, finds its own fuel (food), makes a hangar (nest), sometimes with branches and other times with cement (a swallows’ nest).

And how was this wonderful airplane made? Just by warming an egg! By placing a hen’s egg at a 40 degree centigrade temperature for 21 days and out comes a baby chick jumping and chirping.

Look at the fried egg which is served for breakfast. Can you tell me where the beak and the eyes and feathers are? How is all of this formed in the chick? Just by heating the egg a bit?

What a marvelous invention the egg is! What a great intelligence must be involved to invent the egg!

<sup>45</sup> ANDRÉS BRITO: *Ciencia “versus” Astrología*. La Gaceta de Canarias, 9-9-90, pg. 39

<sup>46</sup> YA Newspaper. 1-3-92, pg 23

<sup>47</sup> IBÉRICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine. La Evolución Y El Azar, n. 163 (1-76), 18

In the egg, the same as in all of Nature, there are laws which govern its evolution. But men do not know how to invent an artificial egg which when placed in an incubator will produce a chick, and in turn will lay other eggs from which new chicks will be born, and so forth. Man does not know it, but God as the inventor of Nature, knows.

The hummingbird can fly backwards; it approaches the flower to suck the nectar from its flowers with its long beak, and then backs up and flies away. Our airplanes cannot fly backwards!

In 1966, I was lecturing at the Vasco-Leonesa Coal Company, and there I saw an IBM computer which could carry out 3,000 instructions per second<sup>48</sup>.

Today, a computer can perform more than a million instructions in a tenth of a second.

New computers which can carry out 22 million instructions per second are becoming available<sup>49</sup>.

But a computer does not have intelligence. The intelligence is the inventor's. Although the machine appears to be intelligent, nevertheless, it does not operate by itself, it is not conscious of its own acts. The machine does not know what it is doing, nor why it has to do it in this fashion and not in another manner<sup>50</sup>. The machine can only resolve the type of problems for which it has been programmed in advance by an intelligent being.

A robot cannot program itself<sup>51</sup>.

**D. Salvador de Madariaga** says: "A machine is the crystallization of a thought; I have never seen a machine that was not the consequence of a thought".<sup>52</sup> A **machine does not think** for itself, it does not develop any new information, it is incapable of creative thought, and it is limited to the execution of the instructions for which it has been previously programmed. Creative thought and thinking initiative pertain to man<sup>53</sup>. A highly perfected machine can do many things, but it can never replace man<sup>54</sup>.

The brain contains 14,000 million neurons.

In the human body there are about 60 billion cells,

All of these cells evolve according to a predetermined plan.<sup>55</sup>

"An electronic machine contains a series of programmed actions. The signal for the beginning of one action depends on the results of a preceding action. Animals "function" in a parallel manner. In response to a conditioned stimulus they execute a reflex movement.

An electronic machine operates according to strict and detailed programs that cannot deviate an iota. The only thing that a machine can do is to carry out its own program. No new creative element is introduced into the process."<sup>56</sup>

Today, we are improperly talking about **Artificial Intelligence**. **D. Ramon López de Mántaras**, doctor in Physics, Investigating professor at the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, who obtained the prize for the Best European Work on Artificial Intelligence, recognizes that "it is not possible to manufacture truly intelligent machines. For said reason, we must change the term "Artificial Intelligence"<sup>57</sup>

<sup>48</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid. 5-10-89, pg. 57

<sup>49</sup> LUIS MIRATVILLES: *Visado Para El Futuro II* 4. Libros RTV N° 3, 1969

<sup>50</sup> YELENA SAPÁRINA: *El Hombre, Animal Cibernético* V, 11. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona. 1975

<sup>51</sup> IBÉRICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine. n. 160 (10-75), 349

<sup>52</sup> SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA: *Dios Y Los Españoles 2nd, III* Ed. Planeta. Barcelona, 1975

<sup>53</sup> CLAUDE TRESMONTANT *El Problema Del Alma. II. 5.* Ed. Herder. Barcelona, 1974

<sup>54</sup> VINTILA HORIA: *Viaje A Los Centros De La Tierra. 2nd, II, 3.* Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona. 1971

<sup>55</sup> CLAUDE TRESMONTANT: *El Problema del Alma. II 1.f.* Ed. Herder. Barcelona. 1974

<sup>56</sup> YELENA SAPÁRINA: *El Hombre, Animal Cibernético* IV, 1. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona. 1972

<sup>57</sup> MUY Interesante Magazine, n.113 (10-90) pg.140

## 12. Animals have marvelous instincts.

According to the investigations of **Dr. Walter Frese** of the **Max Planck Institute** of Munich, carrier pigeons orient themselves in their flights through a kind of bio-magnetic compass which they possess<sup>58</sup>. Sharks orient themselves in their migrations by utilizing the earth's magnetic field<sup>59</sup>. Bees in order to orient themselves use the polarization of light and they can see the ultraviolet specter<sup>60</sup>. Elephants communicate through infra sounds. American investigators **Payne and Pool** have been able to determine over thirty different modulations in the communications between elephants<sup>61</sup>. Rattlesnakes possess a magnificent infrared ray detector of excellent sensitivity to detect the presence of its prey in darkness<sup>62</sup>. There are butterflies that see with ultraviolet rays, like our modern scientists. . Dolphins locate submerged obstacles in the water by means of an echo probe as in modern ships<sup>63</sup>. According to the German scientists **Ott and Schaeffel**, the chameleon's eye can measure how far away the prey is with the same precision as a modern telemetric device<sup>64</sup>. A bat without eyes can fly in a room with cables crossed in it without hitting any of them. How does it guide itself? The bat does not know since it has no intelligence: but God knows and it is He who has made the bat and has endowed him with a kind of radar which gives off ultrasonic waves, according to studies made by American scientists **Griffin and Galambos**<sup>65</sup>..

The Inventor of The Universe has a great intelligence!

13. – Nature is **full of wonders**. During their migrations, swallows travel some ten thousand miles. Geese fly over the Himalayas at over eighteen thousand feet. Spiders produce over two miles of web filament in a month. A butterfly has twenty thousand eyes. A queen bee lays three thousand eggs in a single day.

God is greater in the minute than in the magnificent.

In 1989, during the investigation of a team of engineers on the Oviedo Shroud, to confirm the authenticity of the Turin Shroud, I was in the laboratory for investigation of the Spanish Hydroelectric company, where these engineers work. There I could see an electronic microscope that can magnify an object up to two hundred thousand times. Looking at a grain of pollen, the hair of a fly marvelously formed, the eye of a mosquito, etc., etc. Truly impressive!

One does not know what to admire more, the great marvels or the small ones. Whether the speed of the stars, or the flight of the fly, beating its wings at a rate of 480 times per second; if the size of the planets or the constitution of the atom, made up of protons, neutrons, electrons and other subatomic particles of short life<sup>66</sup>; if the exactness in the movement of the stars, or the prodigious instinct of bees in making the hexagonal cells in their honeycomb with such perfection which might be calculated by the best of engineers. The hexagonal form allows maximum capacity with minimum material, joining resistance to the best possible use of space. The bees achieve in their honeycombs a difficult problem of stereometrics with more precision than that of the famous mathematician **König**

<sup>58</sup> IBÉRICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine. El Biomagnetismo n. 197 (2-79, ), 66

<sup>59</sup> MUNDO CIENTÍFICO Magazine, n.40 (10-94) 946

<sup>60</sup> MANUEL CARREIRA, S. I. Professor of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Cleveland (USA):*El Creyente Ante La Ciencia* BAC Booklets, n.57,1 ,1. Madrid, 1982

<sup>61</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid 3-6-91. pg.63

<sup>62</sup> INVESTIGACIÓN Y CIENCIA Magazine, V-82, pg.88.

<sup>63</sup> IBÉRICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine. n. 366 (6-65 ), 219

<sup>64</sup> ABC Cultural 173 (2-24-95) 55

<sup>65</sup> P. RIAZA, S. I. : Ciencia Moderna y Filosofía, n.54. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>66</sup> MANUEL M. CARREIRA, S. I.: *Metafísica De La Materia. VII I.* Universidad de Comillas, Madrid.1

who, when developing his calculations made a mistake, because of an error in the logarithmic table<sup>67</sup>.

The superb instincts of animals, and all the laws of the Universe are loudly voicing the fact that they have been made by a great intelligence.

Precisely, a new science has recently been born, Bionics which is concerned with the study of living beings in order to apply them to engineering<sup>68</sup>. The name Bionics is a contraction of biology and electronics.

Nature has achieved things of a technical superiority to those made by man. Man has not been able to duplicate the zigzag flight of the fly, nor the bioluminescence of some worms and of fishes who inhabit the great depths and who emit light from their bodies.

14. **Evolution** itself, which today is studied in different fields of science, correlates to some of the laws which govern this evolutionary process, and which harmonize all evolutions of the Universe. The basic reason of these laws is the intelligence of God.

Formerly, Nature was considered to be a direct and immediate work of God.

Today we consider Nature to be rather the result of some laws which God has placed in Nature itself, and which have governed evolution up to now.

**There cannot be laws** unless someone makes them.

Law presupposes an intelligent legislator, which is apart from it. All the merit of a law belongs to he who has devised it.

**Dr. Bermudo Melendez**, President of the Royal Spanish Society of Natural History and Professor of Paleontology of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, states in the magazine *Iberica*<sup>69</sup>, in an article entitled "The Present State of the Theory of Evolution": "The more we investigate the mechanism of the process of evolution, the more we understand the reality of an existence of an infinite intelligence capable of programming everything."

**Fr. Teilhard de Chardin**, who at present is the Jesuit with the greatest international reputation in the field of evolution, says that, "Evolution, like all natural processes, is a process which is subject to a law which points in one direction."<sup>70</sup>

**Newton**, speaking of the cosmos said: "One has to recognize the will and dominion of an intelligent and powerful Being."<sup>71</sup> And in another quote: "Where does all this order and beauty which we see in the world come from? Was the eye designed without any knowledge of optics? Is it not clear that there is an intelligent Being?"<sup>72</sup>

**Einstein** wrote in *The World as I see It*: "The law of the cosmos reveals an intelligence of such superiority that compared to it human thought is insignificant."

Physics Nobel Prize Winner, **Alfred Kastler**, stated in August 1968 that: "The idea that the world, the material universe, has created itself, appears to me to be absurd. I cannot conceive of a world without a Creator and therefore without God. For a physicist, a single atom is so complex, requiring such a great intelligence, that a materialistic universe lacks sense."

All organization presupposes an organizer. If in Nature there are organized beings, it is inevitable that we recognize the existence of an organizing intelligence.

<sup>67</sup> JESÚS SIMÓN, S. I.: *A Dios Por La Ciencia*, XIV Ed. Codesal. Sevilla.

<sup>68</sup> MIGUEL RUBIO *La Biónica*; *IBERICA* de Actualidad Científica Magazine, n. 16 (10-63) 400-402

<sup>69</sup> *IBERICA* de Actualidad Científica, Magazine, n. 138 (10-73) 551

<sup>70</sup> FOTHERGILL: *Evolución, Marxismo y Cristianismo en Teilhard de Chardin*, II Ed. Plaza. Barcelona

<sup>71</sup> ANTONIO ROMAÑA, S. I.: *Estado Actual de la Cosmología. Epilogo*. Publicaciones del Observatorio del Ebro. Tortosa. 1966

<sup>72</sup> ISAAC NEWTON: *Optics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. London. 1721, pg 344s

15. It is absurd to think that Nature has been created **without the intervention** of intelligence. Do you believe that it is possible for a monkey hitting the keys of a typewriter to write this book you are holding in your hands?

Well, this is much more probable than to suppose that no intelligence intervened in the formation of the human eye, (a marvelous photographic camera), the agility of a fly in the air, moving its wings at 480 times per second, or the photosynthetic function of chlorophyll in a green leaf, which is a true chemical laboratory.

Plants are sensitive to air, sun, light, darkness, electricity, magnetism, etc. etc.; they synthesize substances and make oxygen<sup>73</sup>. With the light of the sun, plants obtain oxygen from water, and absorb carbon dioxide in order to synthesize glucose.

In 1976, a group of Spanish scientists of the Universidad de Sevilla recreated in the laboratory what is done by plants.. In other words the phenomenon which occurs in plants is in accordance with determined reactions and laws. Where there is law, order and organization there is intelligence.

The fortuitous is never **repeated continuously**.

That which happens by chance cannot or is not repeated at will. (the First Prize in the lottery, for example). On the other hand, that which is the result of intelligence, can in fact be repeated at will.

Thus, the scientific facts can always be achieved from the same causes when they are put into operation

But that which comes out by chance cannot be repeated at will.

The letters which make up this book have required many hours of work so that they might say that which they express.

If I were to put all of these letters in a bucket and throw them onto the floor, there are thousands of millions of probabilities against one that the letters would come out in the same order as they have in my book. And naturally everybody understands that this could not be repeated 47 times in a row.

his book contains over one million letters not counting periods and commas.

Throwing them on the floor, they would not even fall face up and in a straight line.

In order for letters to form words, and for words to form sentences, one needs an ordering intelligence.

Evidently, the order the letters have in this book is one of many possible orders. But the probability that the letters should fall in this order is one against a number that contains **three million digits**. This was calculated using a computer. The number is so big that if we should call it by its proper name, few people would understand it: The number of variations is of five hundred thousand millions (500,000 groups of six figures). To write it with numbers the size of the letters of this book would require a roll of paper four miles long.

In other words, **the probability** that this book would come out upon throwing the letters out of a bucket onto the floor is **practically nil**.

The proof is that if someone would bet one million dollars that he could do it fifty times in a row, as all of the editions of this book, we would gladly accept the wager and we would be sure to win it.

Well then, if to make this book there needs to be an ordering intelligence, how then have the flies, the flowers, the birds and the cosmos of mathematical precision been formed without an ordering intelligence?

He who contemplates the world and only sees matter is like one who enters the National Library of Madrid and comes out saying that inside there are only papers stained with ink.

---

<sup>73</sup> SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA. *Dios y los Españoles*, 2nd. V. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona, 1975



**Salvador de Madariaga** says: "I believe that the attribution of the Universe and life to the coming together of chance with need is a foolishness of such a magnitude that there is no human intellect which has been moderately used that can support this idea seriously, and that the proof of the existence of a Creator is something within the reach of any healthy mind<sup>74</sup>."

Chance does not explain anything, it is only the reason of our ignorance. We call chance that happening which we cannot foresee<sup>75</sup>.

The fact that when we throw dice we are unable to foresee which side will be on top, does not mean that it is not due to a share of combinations of forces which we do not know beforehand, but which exist.

Because of this **H. Poincare** said: "Chance is no more than the measure of our ignorance"<sup>76</sup>.... And **Monod** recognizes that his thesis of chance is: "a declaration of ignorance"<sup>77</sup>.

16. We cannot dispute the fact that **Nature is governed** by some laws.

These laws of Nature form the basis of Science. "The man of Science knows that identical effects under identical circumstances presuppose identical causes"<sup>78</sup>. for without such premises, science would be impossible.

Although it is true that some times so many factors enter into play that it is very difficult to predict beforehand what will occur: whether it will land heads or tails when we toss a coin into the air. Then we have recourse to "calculate the probabilities" and statistics. From there comes **Heisenberg's** "principle of indetermination" in micro-physics of which we know so little about; but this does not deny the fact that the result is influenced by various laws.<sup>79</sup>

To admire Nature and ignore God is like admiring a machine for the perfection of its function and ignoring the intelligence of the designer of the machine..

Because of this the Bible says that those who do not know God through Nature are fools<sup>80</sup>. The Bible says, "*The fool says in his heart, 'There is no God.'*"<sup>81</sup> And in another place, "*The heavens declare the glory of God*".<sup>82</sup> "*For what can be known about God is perfectly plain to them since God himself has made it plain.....That is why such people are without excuse,*"<sup>83</sup>

The first Vatican Council condemns those who deny that human reason cannot clearly demonstrate the existence of God.<sup>84</sup>

**Carlos Rubbia** Physics Nobel Prize winner, Director of the European Laboratory on the Physics of Particles, states; "To talk about the origin of the world leads to thinking about the origin of Creation..... It is clear for me that this is not a consequence of happenchance"<sup>85</sup>

17. This Being **who is so intelligent**, who has made Nature and has placed in her these very marvelous laws which control its operation, **we call GOD**.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>74</sup> SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA: *Dios y los Españoles, Introducción*. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona

<sup>75</sup> JOSÉ M. RIAZA, S. I. Azar, Ley, Milagro, II, 1. Ed. BAC. Madrid, 1

<sup>76</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup>. CIURANA: *Pruebas Racionales de la Existencia de Dios*. V.C. Difusora del Libro. Madrid

<sup>77</sup> JUAN LUIS RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *Teoría de la Creación*, 2nd, VIII, 3, 3. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>78</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup>. RIAZA, S. I.: *Azar, Ley, Milagro*, X, 7. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>79</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *La Existencia de Dios ante la Razón*, 3rd,II, A, b. Ed. Box. Barcelona, 1976

<sup>80</sup> Book of Wisdom 13 1-10, Romans 1:20-23.

<sup>81</sup> Psalm 14: 1.

<sup>82</sup> Psalm 19: 2.

<sup>83</sup> Paul: Letter to the Romans, 1: 19ss

<sup>84</sup> DENZINGER: *El Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1785, 1806 Ed. Heder, Barcelona

<sup>85</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, n. 2498 (10-20-90) pg. 7.

After reading what has been said, the communist atheism propaganda seems ridiculous. In the book *Atheist Sputnik* (Moscow 1961, pg 365) states "After astronautics it is no longer possible to believe in the existence of God. The *Sputniks* have not found God in his heavenly abode."<sup>87</sup>

Did they think that they could detect God with the *Sputnik*? The *Sputnik* does not detect God, but our intelligence does. Spiritual realities are not detected through material instruments. The weave of a cloth can be detected by instruments, and the chemical composition of dyes also, but the diligence and glee with which a painting is done can not be detected.

Did they think they could detect God with the *Sputnik*? The *sputnik* does not detect God, but our intelligence does. Spiritual realities are not detected with material instruments. Man made equipment can study the weft of a weave and the chemical composition of a dye, but it can not detect the spirit and glee with which a painting was made.

God is not, as stated by **Feuerbach**, "an imaginative product of indigence and man's desire", but the affirmation of the existence of God is a consequence of the intellectual search of the man who investigates the sufficient reason of cosmic laws, which presuppose the existence of an intelligent Creator

Nothing exists without sufficient reason. If a stone which was on the street is seen to be on the top of a building, we know that it is not there without "sufficient reason": someone has carried it up there. Nothing exists without an adequate cause. This relationship of cause-effect is the basis for medicine and technology. God is the cause which explains the cosmos."<sup>88</sup>

It is not to try to prove the existence of God through science; as science is based on experimental facts, and God is not the result of laboratory work. But it is deduced from scientific facts. Philosophy reasons on information provided by science, and therefore we can reach the knowledge of God.

"The science of today gives modern man the materials so that he can believe in a reasonable fashion". (**Professor Taltavull**).

18. Besides the laws of Nature, Professor of the University of Madrid, **D. Juan Zaragueta**, says in the newspaper ABC, the **Laws of Conscience** which order us to practice good and avoid evil, also speak to us about the existence of God. "Since no one orders himself, but rather the conscience receives orders from a Being superior to it, and this precisely is God."<sup>89</sup> "

Moral law, the obligation of doing good and avoiding evil, is a universal law imposed on all men: only God is above man and can impose upon him the moral law."<sup>90</sup>

"Man discovers in the depth of his innermost conscience a law which he does not give to himself, but one which he must obey; and whose voice sounds in his inner self, guiding him to love always and to do good, and avoid evil: 'do this, avoid that' Because man carries in his heart a law written by God."<sup>91</sup> All men carry in their heart what GOD likes and dislikes, and witness to this, is the conscience.<sup>92</sup> A remorseful conscience is superior to oneself

**Remorse is proof of the existence of God** as it makes us aware of the existence of a superior Being which imposes upon us cognizance of what evil is. Because of this we have remorse for a murder although nobody knows about it, and no one can find out. Conscience is the voice of God which imposes upon me the moral imperative of doing good and avoiding evil.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>86</sup> PARENTE: *De Dios al Hombre, II, 4*. Ed. Atenas, Madrid.

<sup>87</sup> RUDOLF LIEBIG: *La Otra Revelación, II, B, b*. Ed. Sal Térrea. Santander. 1977

<sup>88</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y Problema Religioso*, pg. 303. Unión Editorial, Madrid, 1984

<sup>89</sup> ABC, January 1972

<sup>90</sup> JOSÉ M. CIURANA: *Pruebas Racionales de la Existencia de Dios, II, C. a*. Ed. Difusora del Libro, Madrid, 1977

<sup>91</sup> Second Vatican Council *Gaudium et Spes: Pastoral constitution on the Church in the Current World*, nº00. 16; Paul: Letter to the Romans, 2:15

<sup>92</sup> ABC, January 1972

<sup>93</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 1777

All men carry written deep in their heart what God commands or forbids, and witness to that is the conscience. .

19. We can also know God by faith. He tells us who He is, what He has done what He has given us, what He promises us, what He shows us, what pleases Him, what He wants from us, etc.<sup>94</sup>

## 2. NO ONE HAS CREATED GOD.

**God never began to exist.** He has existed always and He will never cease to exist. That is to say, He had no beginning nor will He have an end. God is eternal. **Boecio** defined eternity as: the complete possession, simultaneous and perfect of an interminable life. It would be absurd to say that there was a time when absolutely nothing existed. In this case, nothing could ever have begun to exist: beings of any kind would not exist. Not created by something else - since we have supposed that in the beginning absolutely nothing existed - nor created by themselves, since it would be absurd to say that something which did not exist could create something<sup>95</sup>.

Then if at some moment nothing existed, nothing would exist now; since the first being has no way in which to begin to exist<sup>96</sup>..Nothing would have begun to exist. As the well known French Philosopher **Claude Tresmontant** says: If at a given moment nothing existed, nothing would exist eternally. The absolute nothing cannot create anything<sup>97</sup>. If there was nothing, never has nothing could have begun to exist<sup>98</sup>

It is thus that we exist in a world and we are surrounded by beings of all kinds; then by logic from all eternity a Being has to have existed who had no beginning and who has been the origin of all the beings which today exist<sup>99</sup>.

This Being who has existed from all eternity and is cause of all that exists is G O D.

**Allan Sandage** assistant to **Hubble**, until the death of the later in 1953 and who today is working at the Mount Wilson Observatory in Pasadena, CA., says: “!God is the explanation that there is something instead of nothing<sup>100</sup>

2. God is the only eternal and increate Being who necessarily exists.. God is the Necessary Being who has always existed, who cannot cease to exist, who is eternal, because His essence is to exist, He does not depend on anyone in order to exist, and because of this He is increate.

Matter transforms itself continually, it is extensive, limited, complex and divisible, therefore the cosmos is limited in time and space, that is, it is contingent. Every limited being is contingent because all limitation presupposes a lack, and the contingent – as is demonstrated in Philosophy-is

<sup>94</sup> CARLOS M. BUELA: *Catecismo de los Jóvenes*, 1º, 1, 2.Ed.

<sup>95</sup> JOSÉ Mª CIURANA: *Pruebas racionales de la existencia de Dios*, IV. B. Difusora del Libro. Madrid

<sup>96</sup> CLAUDE TRESMONTANT: *Ciencias del Universo y problemas metafísicos*. I. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>97</sup> CLAUDE TRESMONTANT: *Como se plantea hoy el problema de la existencia de Dios*. Pg. 79. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>98</sup> JOSÉ Mª CIURANA: *La existencia de Dios ante la razón*, 2º, I, 1 Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1976

<sup>99</sup> JOSÉ Mª CIURANA: *Pruebas racionales de la existencia de Dios*. II. Difusora del Libro. Madrid

<sup>100</sup> EL PAIS Newspaper, 15-V-91, Future, pg. 4

metaphysically impossible to have been increate. Contingent beings are those, which can exist or not exist, exist before or afterwards, exist in one manner or in another. Everything that is born and dies, everything that changes in size, shape or place, such as man, a flower, or the Earth, is a contingent being.

And that which is contingent does not have in itself the reason for its existence. Contingent being owe their existence to someone else<sup>101</sup>.

For example, a year before you were born, you were nothing, and there was nothing you could do in order to exist. Since you were a contingent being your existence did not depend upon yourself. You were nothing and you would have remained being nothing for all eternity, if someone apart from you (your parents) had not brought you into existence: nothingness left to itself, always remains nothingness.

The same thing that has happened to you, occurred with your parents, your grandparents, etc., all received their existence from another. They could not exist by themselves.

Everything that does not have within itself a sufficient reason to exist must receive existence from another source. It is possible for a contingent being not to exist, because its essence does not demand existence. What is mutable is contingent, and all contingent beings demand as an ultimate reason a necessary being; God. It is undeniable that matter is essentially changeable, and so we affirm that the universe is contingent, and therefore created, because its existence must be received from a non-material Being<sup>102</sup>.

#### **God is the only Necessary Being.**

Necessary Being is the one that exists per se, who does not receive its existence from another, and who does not depend on anything in order to exist. It has always existed, without beginning or end. All existent beings are divided into necessary or contingent, according to whether they exist by themselves or on account of others

Since the contingent being is indifferent towards existence, it does not necessarily exist. Therefore, it needs reason in order to pass from a state of non-existence into one of existence. This sufficient reason cannot be an infinite series of contingent beings, since a lack cannot be remedied with other beings who suffer from the same lack: a collection of blind persons cannot see any more than one blind man alone. Do we really believe that by piling up zeros we can obtain a unit? The reason for the existence of contingent beings must be sought in a being who is not contingent, that is to say, a being that does not need any other being in order to exist, of a being which exists of itself, because its essence is to exist. This is God<sup>103</sup>.

3. Others have made the things that we see in the world. A man comes from another man, a flower from another one, and a star from another star. Each being which exists in this world is like a link in a chain. Each link connects with another link, which is its support, which has placed it into existence. If we climb through this chain of existent beings we shall reach the first link. Who supports the first link? It cannot be another link, since then it would not be the first, it would be the second. But the first link; is it hanging in the air? Then the whole chain would fall into the bottom of nothing. If the chain of beings which has come into existence does not fall into the bottom of nothing, it is because something sustains it which is outside of the chain and does not need another else in order to exist. This Being which sustains the chain of existent beings, which does not need another in order to exist and which therefore, has to exist for itself, is none other than God.

God sustains all beings in existence, in the same fashion that the Sun sustains life on Earth. If you extinguish the Sun, the light and heat on the Earth would disappear. Without the light of the Sun, the Moon also could not be seen, and the Earth would be in darkness: and without heat the waters of

<sup>101</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *La existencia de Dios ante la razón, 2º, I, A* Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1976

<sup>102</sup> MANUEL CARREIRA, S.I.: *Metafísica de la materia, VIII* Universidad de Comillas. Madrid. 1993.

<sup>103</sup> J HAAS, S. I.: *Biología y fe, II, 2* Ed. ELER. Barcelona

the rivers and the seas would not evaporate. Consequently, the clouds and the rains would disappear. The springs and the rivers would end up emptying themselves into the sea and they would dry up. The plants would wither for lack of water, and the animals would die of the cold. The air would become poisoned because there would not be plants to restore the oxygen. That is to say, that the Sun with its presence makes life possible on Earth.

The same thing occurs with God. It is He who sustains the whole chain of the existing beings.

If I see a jacket hanging on the wall, as **Sheed** says, even if I can't see the peg on which it is hanging, I wouldn't think that the jacket is defying the laws of gravity. I would understand that there must be a peg holding it up.

If you are sitting in your car at a train crossing and you see a long freight train go by in which one box car is pulled by another one, you understand that there has to be a locomotive which pulls the whole train even though you do not see it. In the same fashion: one has to think in an eternal first Being when we see beings making other beings, and therefore, all need another in order to exist, except for the first one who has to be eternal.

**God is this First Being** who does not need another in order to exist rather who exists for himself, that is to say, that its essence is to exist, who cannot stop existing, who exists necessarily, who always has existed and who will never stop existing. Because of this we say that God is this first Eternal Being. God is the only eternal being.

### 3. THE COSMOS IS NOT ETERNAL

"The cosmos cannot have existed for eternity"<sup>104</sup>.

It is a dogma of faith that the cosmos is not eternal, but that it was created by God from the beginning of time. **Paul** says; "*He is the Creator of all things, He exists before all things*"<sup>105</sup>

"**Marxist atheism** is based on the eternity of matter. It affirms that matter has existed since all eternity, and that in this way there is no need for a Creating God. But "the eternity of matter" is a statement and not a demonstration. Physically it cannot be verified, and philosophically it is unacceptable. But the Marxists who take pride in not admitting into their theoretical and practical doctrine only the facts which Science has proven to be true; this affirmation: "that the eternity of the matter" is admitted without any recourse.. They impose it as a basic postulate of their atheism<sup>106</sup>. Without further ado, Marxists-Leninists do not demonstrate the eternity of matter, and because of this they are unable to displace a need for a God, primary cause of all that is<sup>107</sup>.

"Almost everywhere"-Le Monde states, "dialectical materialism as an instrument for historical analysis is in regression. If we can say that **Marx** is already dead in the East, then Marxism is barely operative in the historiography of the West<sup>108</sup>."

"**Marx** was a rabid atheist, not through rational convictions, but rather because of emotional and psychological motives...The psychologist has to recognize that in Marx there is a personal hatred for Christianity which is almost identical to that felt by **Freud**... **Marx** and **Freud** - both Jewish - said that they rejected Christianity in the name of Science; but that which truly cannot be denied is that that rejection came from an emotional factor<sup>109</sup>." The Materialistic-Marxist idea of eternal matter

<sup>104</sup> PASCUAL JORDAN: *El hombre de ciencia ante el problema religioso III*, 12. Ed. Guadarrama. Madrid

<sup>105</sup> I Colossians, 1:16s

<sup>106</sup> CARLOS STAEHLIN, S. I.: *Ateismo marxista*, 4. EAPSA. Madrid

<sup>107</sup> B. ORTONEDA, S.I.: *Principios fundamentales del marxismo-leninismo*, pg. 712. Espasa Calpe

<sup>108</sup> PALABRA Magazine, n° 245 (XII, |1985) 31

<sup>109</sup> LEPP: *Ateismo en nuestro tiempo*, pg. 56-60 Ed. McMillan. New Cork. 1966

is totally anti-scientific. It is in self-evident contradiction with all of the data of modern Science<sup>110</sup>." On the contrary, "Modern Science denies to the Universe an eternal existence, neither in the past nor in the future<sup>111</sup>."

In actuality, as a consequence of new scientific discoveries, the principle of the eternity of matter has resulted in being completely false, as recognized, in a rare case of unanimity, by the same scientists who state that matter began at a determined moment some several million years ago<sup>112</sup>.

If the cosmos began it needed a being distinct from the cosmos in order to put it into existence. In the absence of matter, nothing can be created. This Being, the Creator of cosmos, we call God. This is why, materialistic Marxism is impossible<sup>113</sup>.

I heard **D. Angel Gonzalez Martinez**, Rector of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid and Professor of Metaphysics state in a lecture that: "The atheist affirms that God does not exist, but he does not have proof to demonstrate it because there is none. Atheism is a profession of faith in the non-existence of God." I heard D. Angel Gonzalez Martinez, Rector of the University Complutense of Madrid and Professor of Metaphysics state in a lecture that: "The atheist affirms that God does not exist, but he does not have proofs to demonstrate it because there are not any. Atheism is profession of faith in the non-existence of God."

**The non existence of God** has never been proven, nor will it ever be<sup>114</sup>.

Italian scientist, **Antonio Ciichichi**, stated in "Il Tempo" of Rome that: "Atheism is not backed by either Science or reason. Atheism is also an act of faith. The only difference is that the atheist has faith in nothingness, and the Christian has faith in God. He who wishes to profess his faith in nothingness, let him continue being an atheist; but not on the condition that he should pretend that his option is motivated by scientific reasons<sup>115</sup>".

The alleged principle of the **eternity of matter** is in open contradiction with the results which are offered to us by modern Science. He who wishes to be in agreement with the latest Scientific discoveries which point to an age in the existence of matter, has no other remedy than to deny the eternity of matter, because the proofs which scientists give are conclusive<sup>116</sup>."

There are some discrepancies between the dates which are given regarding the age of matter. But the important thing is that everyone is in agreement of accepting an age for matter, therefore it cannot be eternal<sup>117</sup>.

Before, when in the XVIII and XIX centuries, Science and Religion were at odds, we Christians were called retrograde and confused people Through a curious irony in time, these "loving" adjectives can now be directed with much more reason towards the staunch atheists, who really demonstrate signs of backwardness and ignorance, when they insist on continually defending the eternity of matter, in spite of the fact that modern Science, through testing, has clearly shown that matter has an age and a beginning of existence<sup>118</sup>.

The finite life of the cosmos is something scientifically proven. The scientist that can stand here and say that he knows nothing on origin of cosmos, is just plainly mentally lazy, as where physics does not reach, metaphysics does. All one needs is to be a human being with common

<sup>110</sup> MANUEL M. CARREIRA, S. I.: *Antropocentrismo científico y religioso*. Ed. A.D.U.E. Madrid. 1983

<sup>111</sup> ROBERT JASTROW: *Until the Sun dies*, pg. 30 Norton, New York. 1977

<sup>112</sup> CARLOS M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *En busca de las verdades fundamentales, Apéndice* Ed. Bosch. Barcelona 1988

<sup>113</sup> CLAUDE TRESMONTANT: *Ciencia del Universo y problemas metafísicos*, pgs. 33, 52,57 and 73. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>114</sup> EUSTAQUIO GUERRERO, S.I.: *Jesucristo, la mejor prueba de la fe católica, VII, 2*. Ed. Mensajero

<sup>115</sup> YA Newspaper, 31-III-87, pg. 6.

<sup>116</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *Fin del materialismo ateo, IV, C*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1974

<sup>117</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *Fin del materialismo ateo, IV, C, c*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1974

<sup>118</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *Fin del materialismo ateo, IV, E*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1974

sense to understand that the finite origin of the Universe must have an adequate cause outside of the Universe itself<sup>119</sup>.

This cause is none other than God.

The eternity of matter **cannot be demonstrated** because this is absurd. In effect, matter has a successive existence<sup>120</sup>, that is to say, a before and after; that is to say, measurable by time. The successive transformations of matter and the changes in Nature are measured through the passing of the days, the hours, and the minutes. And all that which can be measured by time, has a temporal and limited existence, and it is not eternal.

Time is the duration of movement<sup>121</sup>, and the eternal does not change. It does not have a beginning or an end. It is always in the present moment. It is not subject to the passage of time.

If matter in evolution were eternal this would mean that we have passed through an infinite series of successive moments<sup>122</sup>. And if we do not reach the boundary or limit from here to there, then neither can we reach from the there to the here, since the distance is the same.

Effectively, there is the same distance from a site in Madrid to a site in Barcelona, as vice versa. The same time exists from today to the first of January 1950, as from that date until today. However much we escalate up the ladder of time we shall never arrive at the beginning of the cosmos, neither would we arrive from the beginning of the cosmos until today, if this beginning were in eternity. If we have arrived till today in this cosmos in which we live, therefore, also from today, ascending the ladder of time, we can arrive, with an understanding, to the beginning of the cosmos, no matter how far away this may be. That is to say, that the beginning of the cosmos is not in eternity: the cosmos is not eternal.

**If the cosmos is not eternal**, it is necessary to have another Being who is eternal, for everything which has a beginning needs of someone else to begin to exist

**2. The only eternal Being is God**, because God is the only Being for who time does not pass, who is totally outside the measurement of time. Time is the duration of movement, and God is immutable, He is true actuality. In Him there is no before or after, He is omnipresent. All of this is demonstrated in philosophy.

“We live in time and we cannot conceive of a being who exists outside of time...We may be able to have some intuition of what it is to exist outside of time when we think of essences, for example, in the essence of a triangle: triangularity. It doesn't make sense to ask when it began to exist, nor how long it has been existing. Triangularity does not last, it simply is<sup>123</sup>”

All this can be difficult for persons who are not accustomed to philosophical problems.

It is like asking a mathematician to explain in two words the resolution of differential equations, or those elliptical integrals, the use of logarithmic tables, to someone who has not studied mathematics. This is impossible without first dedicating many hours, and even years, in explaining the multitude of indispensable preliminary concepts..

And of course, you should not seek in this an evidence, such as the axiom, “the whole is greater than its parts”. “Two things which are equal to a third are equal to each other.

**3. The aim is not to scientifically prove the existence of God**, because the study of God is not the object of Science, but rather of Theology. The object of science is not to study God, Science studies nature. God is studied by theology. That is why it doesn't make sense to look for scientific

<sup>119</sup> GIAN CARLO CAVALIERI: PALABRA Magazine, n 235(XI. 1985)32

<sup>120</sup> ANTONIO DÚE, S.I.: *Dios y la Ciencia*. XIII Granada

<sup>121</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 2<sup>a</sup>, III. 149 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>122</sup> FRANCISCO DE LA VEGA, S.I.: *Apuntes de Filosofía*, 5<sup>o</sup> curso. Colegio de El Palo. Málaga

<sup>123</sup> JUAN LÓPEZ PEDRAZ, S.I.: *Cuando se está perdiendo la fe*, III, A, 4. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander .

arguments to demonstrate the existence of God. Science is limited to responding to the “how” things happen. The “why” and “what for” belongs to philosophy. Science does, however, give us information that makes it reasonable to believe in God. John Paul II in his July 10, 1985 general audience, said this.

When one speaks of proof of the existence of God, we must underscore that we are not speaking of experimental scientific tests. Scientific tests, in the modern sense of the phrase, are only of those items that are perceptible to the senses, as only these can be measured by testing instruments used by science. Wanting to have a scientific proof of the existence of God, means that one must bring God down to the level of a human in our world, and therefore, methodologically err in what God is; science must recognize its limits and its powerlessness to reach the existence of God; it cannot affirm or deny this existence.

But one must not draw a conclusion that the scientists are incapable of finding valid motives in their scientific studies to admit the existence of God. If science as such cannot reach God, the scientist, who possesses an intelligence that is not limited to sensitive things, can discover in this world the reasons to affirm the reasons of a Being that is greater than he. Many scientists have made this discovery. He, who with an open mind, reflects on what is implied in the existence of the Universe, cannot impede arriving to the problem of the origin. Instinctively, when we are witnesses to certain events, we ask ourselves what the causes of the same are.

A scientific hypothesis such as the expansion of the universe, unveils the problem more clearly: if the Universe is in continuous expansion, should it not arrive in time, to the “initial moment”, in which it all started. ? Whatever theory is adopted as to the origin of the universe, that most fundamental question cannot be eluded. This Universe in constant movement, postulates the existence of a cause that giving it a being, has communicated this movement and continues to feed it. Without such supreme cause, the world and all movement that exists would remain unexplained and unexplainable, and our intelligence would remain unsatisfied. The human spirit needs to receive an answer to its queries of the existence of a God with all of its dynamics, and which continues to hold up in its existence.

In all of these indications on the existence of a God-Creator, some oppose the virtues of happenchance, or the mechanisms that correspond to matter. To speak on the virtues of casualty for the Universe that holds a complex organization in all its elements, and finalism in life so wonderful, means to renounce the search for an explanation of the world. In reality, this is equivalent to admitting effects without a cause. It is an application of human intelligence that would then renounce thought and look for a solution to its problems.

In conclusion, there are thousands of indications that move man, who tries to understand the Universe in which he lives, to seek and look towards the Creator. The proof of the existence of God are multiple and convergent. They help to demonstrate that faith does not hinder human intelligence, but it does however stimulate it to reflect and allows it to better understand all of the “whys” encountered in the observation of reality<sup>124</sup>.

On the simple plane of reasons and truths. We can say that the possibilities of the existence of God are incomparably larger than those of His non-existence; and men guess it thus. Their atheism is not a speculative atheism, but a practical atheism<sup>125</sup>.

When one is, consciously or unconsciously, interested in rejecting faith, one feels inclined to find more and more difficulties, and to be satisfied with the solutions given. One does not accept a reasonable faith and accepts an atheism which is non demonstrable. If God has given us reason, it is

---

<sup>124</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, nº 2.230 (20-VII-85)6

<sup>125</sup> IVES CONGAR, O.P. *Dios, el Hombre y el Cosmos*, XVI, 3.Ed. Guadarrama. Madrid



for us to use it. We must be well-formed believers that know what we believe and why we believe it<sup>126</sup>.

4. Some time ago there were talks about **Frederick Hoyle's** theory regarding the origins of the Universe. It was called "**Stationary Universe**".

**Sir Fred Hoyle** was the son of atheists and in his life there was no room for God. Nevertheless, in 1983, he surprised the world by publishing a sensational book: "The Intelligent Universe" where he pointed out the need for the existence of God. The North American magazine TIME, in **Arthur White's** article; "The Astronomer who has seen the LIGHT" (LIGHT in capital letters refers to God). The sub-title was: "According to Hoyle, a superior intelligence guides Nature<sup>127</sup>".

In this book, **Fred Hoyle** recognizes the difficulties of his theory to the point of abandoning it, as affirmed by **Donald H. Menzel**<sup>128</sup>, professor of astronomy at Harvard University. **Fred Hoyle's** theory of the stationary Universe did not depend on any kind of experimental proof up until the present<sup>129</sup>. Furthermore, "Today this model has been abandoned because of the insurmountable obstacles which have been encountered<sup>130</sup>. It is so abandoned that **Nigel Henbest**, British astronomer at Oxford University in his book "The Universe in Explosion" entitled one of the chapters: "The Death of the Theory of the Stable Universe<sup>131</sup>". **Fred Hoyle's** theory of the Stationary Universe must be abandoned. Almost everyone today supposes that the Universe started with the Big Bang....**Roger Perose** and this writer will show how the theory of general relativity developed by **Einstein** imbued that the Universe must have had a beginning<sup>132</sup>. **Robert Jastrow**, contemporary American investigator, astronomer and cosmologist states that "**Fred Hoyle's** theory of the Stationary Universe is practically eliminated, forcing us to accept the Big Bang theory<sup>133</sup>".

This is the **Big Bang Theory** or **The Universe in Expansion**.

The deviation towards the red of the spectrum of the light of the galaxies demonstrates that the Universe is in a continual state of expansion. This expansion of the galaxies, like the explosion of a bomb, leads us to think that these galaxies started at a common point<sup>134</sup>. This theory has in its favor so much experimental data that today it is accepted almost without exception by all of the contemporary physicists and astronomers<sup>135</sup>. It is also possible to do a regressing count to the moment when the Universe was born. "The majority of cosmologists are in agreement that the Universe began with a great explosion some 15,000 million years ago<sup>136</sup>."

Because of this the **majority of the astronomers** accept the Big-Bang, as the Anglo-Saxons call it. That is to say, the great explosion in the beginning of the cosmos.

After the Big Bang, radiation condensed into particles, and from this union protons and neutrons were formed, which afterwards formed atoms of hydrogen, helium etc.

"The theory that the universe was born of a giant explosion or Big-Bang no longer is a simple academic hypothesis, each time it is more difficult to disregard it if one wants to take into account the fundamental properties of the Universe as it is observed today. The extraordinary success of the Big-Bang theory is related with its powers of prediction and with the outstanding confirmations which the

<sup>126</sup> MONS CRISTIANI: *Nuestras razones para creer*, I. 2.Ed. Casali, Voll. Andorra

<sup>127</sup> Time Magazine 5-11-79

<sup>128</sup> DONALD H. MENZEL.: *Astronomy*, XVIII, 7. Ed. Canticleer Press. New York

<sup>129</sup> IAN G. BARBOUR *Problemas sobre Religión y Ciencia*, 3º, XII, Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>130</sup> INVESTIGACIÓN Y CIENCIA Magazine, 58 (VII-1981) 116

<sup>131</sup> NIGEL HENBEST: *El universo en explosión*. Ed. Debate. Madrid. 1982

<sup>132</sup> STEPHEN W. HAWKING: *Historia del tiempo*, pg. 75, 78 and 57 Ed. Critica. Barcelona. 1988.

<sup>133</sup> VINTILA HORIA: *Viaje a los centros de la Tierra*, 2º, II, 2. Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona, 1971

<sup>134</sup> JOSE Mª CIURANA: *En busca de las verdades fundamentales*, Appendix, B, b. Ed. Bosch

<sup>135</sup> MANUEL Mª CARREIRA, S.I.: *La creación del Universo en la Ciencia moderna*, 1983

<sup>136</sup> INVESTIGACION Y CIENCIA, 83 (VIII, 1983)58

observations have furnished to its predictions<sup>137</sup>. “The big-Bang theory has acquired the category of a science<sup>138</sup>.”

The Big Bang theory has matured from an outlandish hypothesis to a respected scientific theory, garnering the greatest distinction from today’s physicists<sup>139</sup>.

This theory is defended by the most reputable astrophysicists, such as **Allan Sandage** of the Mount Palomar Observatory (California), a specialist in the investigation of quasars and radio galaxies<sup>140</sup>. **Chushrio Hayashi**, Professor of Astrophysics at Tokyo University (Japan); **Arthur Code**, Director of Project OAO-II of NASA and **Jacob Zeldovitch** of the Academy of Sciences of Russia<sup>141</sup>. And also **Martin Ryle**, Professor of Radio Astronomy of the University of Cambridge, and Physics Nobel Prize Winner in 1974.

**D. Juan Oró** a Spanish scientist working for NASA, speaking on Spanish National Radio on October 7, 1983 at 7:30 at night on the program “*Directo, directo*”, that the Big Bang theory **is a confirmation** of God’s creation of the cosmos.

This theory of the origin of the Universe is accepted by the large majority of the scientific community, as it is the one that is closest to what one can observe in reality<sup>142</sup>.

“Practically all the astronomers today accept the theory that the Universe appeared in one instant of creation through a violent explosion of a ball of fire, some 15 or maybe 20 billion years ago<sup>143</sup>.”

**Hoyle’s** “Stationary Universe” also demands a beginning of matter (Creation); **Yakov Zeldovich** affirms that it is undoubtedly necessary to admit that the Universe had a beginning. The process from a void to an existence of matter can only be described with one word CREATION ....

To be able to start existing, one requires of a non-material agent of infinite power....A CREATOR<sup>144</sup>.

Physicists and astronomers have led to conclude that the Universe was created some 20,000 million years ago<sup>145</sup>. To put this into a time perspective, if history were reduced to a single year, the birth of **Christ** over two thousand years ago, would be recorded in the last minute of the last day of the year.

Astronomer **Phillip Morrison** confessed in an interview on the BBC in London: “I would like to be able to reject the theory of the Big-Bang, but I have to succumb before the evidence<sup>146</sup>.”

The Nobel Prize for Physics in 1978 was awarded to radio astronomers **Arno Penzias** and **Robert Wilson**, specialists in microwaves for having collected for the first time in history the echo that remains of the gigantic explosion, which took place in the beginning of the creation of the cosmos<sup>147</sup>. Professor of Theoretical Physics at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, **Alberto Galindo**, called this finding “one of the most important in astrophysics of the XX Century, concerning the beginning of the creation of Cosmos<sup>148</sup>”. Thanks to this background radiation, we know there was an instantaneous creation<sup>149</sup>.

<sup>137</sup> MUNDO CIENTIFICO Magazine, 34(III, 1984)326.

<sup>138</sup> MUNDO CIENTIFICO Magazine, 34(III, 1984)338.

<sup>139</sup> JULIO A. GONZALO: *Física y Religión en perspectiva*, V, 2. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1991

<sup>140</sup> PIERRE ROUSSEAU: *L’Astronomie*, XI, 12. Librairie Generale Francaïçe. Paris

<sup>141</sup> IBERICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine, nº90 (XII-1969)435

<sup>142</sup> JOSÉ MANUEL NIEVES. ABC Newspaper 8-IV-90, pg. 74

<sup>143</sup> TIME Magazine, 5-II-79, pg. 51

<sup>144</sup> MANUEL M<sup>o</sup> CARREIRA, S. I.: *Metafísica de la materia*, VIII. Universidad de Comillas. Madrid

<sup>145</sup> JULIO A. GONZALO: *Física y Religión en perspectiva*, V, 2: Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1991

<sup>146</sup> ROBERT JASTROW: New Cork Times Magazine, 28-VI-78

<sup>147</sup> MANUEL CARREIRA, S. I.: *El hombre del cosmos*, III, 2, Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander . 1997

<sup>148</sup> YA Newspaper, w-XI-78. pg. 17

<sup>149</sup> J.L. COMELLAS: *Astronomía*, XXIV. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1987

Royal British astronomer and director of the Jodrell Bank Observatory **F. Graham Smith**, has expressed that the cosmic noise that has been captured come from the Big Bang, the explosion which gave birth to the Universe<sup>150</sup>.

On April 23, 1992 an investigation team led by **Jorge Smoot** announced the discovery of fluctuations in the cosmic radiation background, detected by the COBE satellite (Cosmic Background Explorer). This background of radiation reflects the moment of the expansion of the universe when material and energy were joined<sup>151</sup>.

The same **Jorge Smoot**, astrophysicist at Berkeley University (California), expressed at a press conference of the American Society of Astrophysics in Washington: "What we have found is proof of the beginning of the Universe. It has been as if we had seen God"<sup>152</sup>.

The Big Bang theory is currently the most accepted one by scientists in order to explain the origin of cosmos, especially after the presentation made by **Jorge Smoot** of the photographic images of the "initial explosion", which can be considered as a picture of the Big Bang<sup>153</sup>. That is why **Jorge Smoot** has been called "the man who photographed the birth of the Universe with the COBE Satellite"<sup>154</sup>. This satellite has photographed with different colors temperature fluctuations of radiation situated some 15,000 million light years away<sup>155</sup>.

All of this confirms the theory of the expansion of the Universe, which was first set the Belgian scientist and priest, **George Lemaitre**<sup>156</sup>.

According to the scientific magazine *Science* the Universe continues to expand<sup>157</sup>.

In the last week of October 1990, I attended to a Symposium on Physics and Religion. One of the speakers was **Julio A. Gonzalo**, professor of physics at the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. He made the following statement: "The Big Bang has ceased to be a theory to become a scientific theory"

The observations of the COBE satellite indicate that there is no alternative theory to the Big Bang on the origin of the Universe<sup>158</sup>

Astronomer **John Mather**, during the annual reunion of the American Astronomical Society stated that the information obtained by the COBE satellite leaves no doubt that the Universe originated after a big explosion (Big Bang)<sup>159</sup>.

The theory of the **pulsating University**, of successive expansions and contractions, is a "pure birthing of the fantasy". It has no scientific confirmation. While the theory of the Big Bang of the Universe in expansion, has a multitude of scientific verifications<sup>160</sup>. In August 1985 I attended in León (Spain) a conference given by professor **Carlos Sánchez del Río**, who holds the chair of the Physics Department at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, where he said: The expansion of the Universe is confirmed by a multitude of experimental scientific data, but as of today, we do not have a single bit of scientific data to affirm that the cosmos, after an expansion will suffer a contraction.

<sup>150</sup> J.L. COMELLAS: *Astronomía, XXIV*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1987

<sup>151</sup> JULIO A. GONZALO: ABC, 6-XII-92, pg. 88

<sup>152</sup> DIARIO DE CADIZ, 25-IV-92. pg. 43

<sup>153</sup> DIARIO DE CADIZ, 8-IX-92. pg. 56

<sup>154</sup> YA Newspaper, 5-IX-92, pg. 20

<sup>155</sup> ENRIQUE BORREGO, S.I.: PROYECCION Magazine, 167, (X-XII-93)327

<sup>156</sup> JORGE GAMOW: *La Creación del Universo, II. 2*. Ed. Espasa Calpe. Madrid

<sup>157</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 8-IV-1996- Pg. 82

<sup>158</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 30-VI-1993, Pg. 75

<sup>159</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid,, 9-I-1993. Pg. 67

<sup>160</sup> VICENZO ARCIDIACONO: *La Creación del Universo, VI*. SILLAR Magazine, nº 24 (X-XII-1986)427

That a contraction will not come after the expansion, can be seen by following the steps given by the Director of the Armelini Observatory, which we could recap in the following way: "The galaxies will never fall back, as their escape velocity is three times greater than the critical velocity"<sup>161</sup> There are irreversible processes: a fried egg can never be a fresh egg again. It is physically without sense to talk about going to the past<sup>162</sup>

Astronomer **James Jeans**, one of the world's greatest geniuses today, says: "A cyclical Universe is in complete disagreement with the well established principle of the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which teaches us that the cyclical Universe is impossible. When going back in time, we will necessarily reach the moment in which the current Universe did not exist"<sup>163</sup>

Besides this, the hypothesis of the "pulsating universe" does not exclude the idea of creation, as in these successive expansions and contractions, there is always a loss of energy, in other words, sooner or later it will reach the end.

When in the XX century, the theoretical geniuses and testers discovered the need to admit a **beginning of the Universe**, the materialistic wise men toiled as true devils.... As they well know that if they manage to impose the thesis of the beginning of the Universe, the end of materialism will have arrived<sup>164</sup>. If astrophysics leads to admit that the Universe has started at some point in time.... Then Atheism will not be admissible<sup>165</sup>

Science explains how the origin of the cosmos took place. But, "in the instant before the Big Bang, there is no Universe, the object of the Physical Science did not exist. Therefore, this science cannot understand what is foreign to its jurisdiction. As is said by **Cloud...**" where could the ball have come from, whose explosion gave origin to the Universe, is a question that transcends the limits of Science.... It belongs to Metaphysics and to Theology<sup>166</sup>. Among many, there is a scientific book that deals with the origin of the cosmos. It is entitled "*Los tres primeros minutos*"<sup>167</sup> (*The First three minutes*; it is a modern view of the origin of the Universe, written by **Steven Weinberg**, professor in Sciences at Harvard, Nobel Prize in Physics in 1980, After reading this book, the Physics Nobel prize winner **T. D. Lee** :said "This book presents this subject with clarity and great scientific precision" And an editor of the *New Yorker*, affirms: "When before it was believed that it was crazy to think about creation, after reading this book, what seems irrational is to not accept the creation"

**Robert Jastrow**, scientist and internationally recognized author, who is the founder of the Goddard Institute for Special Studies of NASA, Professor of Astronomy and Geology at Columbia University, and professor of Sciences of the Earth at Dartmouth College, and who has been a relevant figure in the American Space Program from its inception, and was the president of the Lunar Exploration Committee of NASA, says: "The sudden birth of the Universe is a proven scientific fact"... It was literally the moment of creation<sup>168</sup>. And in his book "*Dios y los Astrónomos*", he says: When the astronomer reaches the summit of his knowledge on the origin of the cosmos, the theologians who were there for centuries before. welcome him. Theologians have always said what astronomers say today; that the cosmos began with the act of creation . **Fr. Antonio Romana, S. I.**, Director of the Astrophysics Observatory of Ebro for more than thirty years, a Jesuit institution, told me and I later on quoted him on Televisión Española<sup>169</sup>": "Today in astrophysics no one excludes the idea of creation". It is evident that the Universe has had a beginning<sup>170</sup>... In science, as it is in the

<sup>161</sup> JOSÉ M. RIAZA, S.I.: El comienzo del mundo, nº 87.K Ed. BAC. Madrid . 1957 pg. 575s

<sup>162</sup> MANUEL M<sup>a</sup> CARREIRA, S. I.: *Metafísica de la material IX*. Universidad de Comillas. Madrid. 1993

<sup>163</sup> IGNACIO PUIG, S.I.: *Como y cuando acabará el mundo, I*. Ed. Betis. Barcelona

<sup>164</sup> CLAUDE TRESMONTANT: *Ciencia del Universo y problemas metafísicos*, pg. 32 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>165</sup> ANGEL SANTOS RUIZ: *Vida y espíritu ante la ciencia de hoy. XIX* Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1970

<sup>166</sup> JUAN LUIS RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *Teología de la Creación, 2<sup>a</sup>, VIII, I, 2*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>167</sup> STEVEN WEINBERG: *Los tres primeros minutos del Universo*. Alianza Editorial. Madrid. 1980.

<sup>168</sup> ROBERT

<sup>169</sup> Televisión Española, Second Network. LLAMADA

<sup>170</sup> ROBERT JASTROW: *Dios y los astrónomos. VI*. Ed. Norton. New Cork. 1978

Bible, the cosmos begins with an act of creation.... All efforts to talk about an eternal Universe with eternal matter, is confronted with the scientific data<sup>171</sup> It is not a fallacy to affirm that time began with the Big Bang together with the space that our Universe occupies<sup>172</sup>.

**Ian Barbour**, professor of sciences at Carleton, teaches that the Big Bang of the Universe is a divine form of creation<sup>173</sup>.

The Big Bang is the cry of the universe at birth.

That the Universe had a beginning at a given moment is confirmed by the greatest particle accelerator of the world (LEP), inaugurated on November 13, 1989, in order to simulate the conditions that gave origin to the Universe<sup>174</sup>.

5. Another of the arguments that are used to demonstrate that matter is not eternal; it is the transformation of some radioactive elements into other elements. If matter were eternal, there would no longer be potassium-40, nor rubidium-87, nor uranium-235, as they would have already transformed into argon-40, or strontium-87, and in lead-207 respectively<sup>175</sup>.

Because radioactive bodies have a **disintegration** point, we can affirm that matter is not eternal, if it were eternal, they would already have transformed themselves completely. If in today's world we still have radioactive potassium and uranium, it is because the thousands of years necessary for their transformation into argon and lead respectively have not gone by. It is a known fact that half of the uranium that a rock has, will transform itself into lead after 4,000 million years. It is also known that if there is still some uranium today it is a sign that it does not exist for an eternity, because if this were the case it would have converted into lead and there would not be any uranium in the world<sup>176</sup>. Matter had to appear at a given time, says the well known French physicist **Jean E. Charon**<sup>177</sup>, **and he goes on to say:** "The radioactivity in nature gives us a very precise method to date the birth of matter."<sup>178</sup>

Hydrogen, which consists of a proton and an electron is the base of all other more stable elements than it is. It is impossible that the Universe be eternal; there would be no hydrogen<sup>179</sup>. It is a known thing that hydrogen converts to helium in a continuous and irreversible process. If this were to happen from all eternity, the hydrogen that is burned in the stars would have been consumed by now<sup>180</sup>, as the amount of hydrogen in the universe is limited, and what is spent is not replaced.

This was the explanation that was given by Russian astronomer **Fessenkov**, at the Academy of the International Astronomy Union, in which he took part in Rome in 1952, talking about the origin of stars: They cannot be eternal, but they had to be produced at a given moment. Modern science finds new evidence on a daily basis that **confirms** the Catholic doctrine, that the cosmos is not eternal. Using radioactive methods, you can calculate the age of aerolites that have fallen on earth. It has also been calculated that earth is about 4,500 million years old<sup>181</sup>. In nature, nothing is created nor is it destroyed; everything is transformed. But this supposes a prior creation by Nature. The conservation of the matter-energy duo, is a law of Nature that makes no sense before the creation of the cosmos.

<sup>171</sup> ROBERT JASTROW: *Until the sun dies*. Norton and Co. New York. 1977

<sup>172</sup> NIGEL HENBEST: *El Universo en explosión*. Ed. Debate. Madrid. 1982

<sup>173</sup> ABC Madrid, 27-XII-91, pg. 53

<sup>174</sup> YA Newspaper, 14-IX-89. pg. 19

<sup>175</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *En busca de las verdades fundamentales, Appendix, B, a*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1988.

<sup>176</sup> CLAUDE TRESMONTANT: *Ciencias del Universo y problemas metafísicos*. Pg. 55 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>177</sup> JEAN E. CHARON.: *Los grandes enigmas de la Astronomía*. Pg. 46. E. Plaza. Barcelona

<sup>178</sup> JEAN E. CHARON.: *Los grandes enigmas de la Astronomía*. Pg. 37s. E. Plaza. Barcelona

<sup>179</sup> MANUEL CARRERIRA, S. I.: *El hombre en el cosmos, III. 1*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander 1997

<sup>180</sup> INVESTIGACION Y CIENCIA Magazine, (V, 1983)64

<sup>181</sup> P. RIAZA, S. I.: *El comienzo del mundo n° 57 and 76*. Madrid.

The **law of energy conservation** is understood from the sum of energy of all sorts which the cosmos encloses; mechanical, chemical, electrical, caloric, etc. But the caloric is considered a degraded energy because it cannot be integrally transformed into another energy. Mechanical energy can be completely transformed into caloric energy, but not vice versa. Caloric energy continually grows in the Universe, and, in its greater part, is not apt to produce a new useful work, it is that the usable energy decreases incessantly. This process of degrading of the energy, is called entropy. Entropy grows without interruption until it reaches the thermal death of the Universe<sup>182</sup>. Well then, it is evident that if the Universe must end, then it must have begun, because if the Universe had existed from all eternity, all energy would have been transformed and we would already have reached the end<sup>183</sup>.

**Paul Davies**, Professor of Mathematics at *King's College* in London, says that: "The end of the cosmos is calculated to come within the next hundred million years"<sup>184</sup>

This continuous degradation of the energy, expressed in the entropy law, has caused that scientist abandon the theory of the pulsating, Oscillating, cyclical pendulum of the Universe. Others say, among them **Jean E. Charon**, a French scientist; There is no cyclical evolution. The evolution of the Universe is linear<sup>185</sup>.

Just like the water that comes down in a waterfall produces energy (moving a waterwheel), that same water can no longer go up by itself.

A fried egg can no longer be a fresh egg.

**Arthur Eddington**, considered as one of "the greatest astrophysicists of recent times"<sup>186</sup>, narrates in his book *The Nature of the Physical World*, of the thermal death of the Universe: The Universe is discharging... I find no difficulty in accepting the consequences of the current scientific theory as regards to the future: The thermal death of the Universe. It may be in billions of years, but the hourglass spills sand slowly but inexorably. We must set its contents at some time... The beginning of the world process presents insurmountable difficulties, unless we agree to consider them as supernatural<sup>187</sup>.

Professor of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Cleveland **FR. Carreira, S. I.**, says: We have a perfect concordance between modern science and the Christian and biblical idea of the creation. The Universe begins with creation. The concept of creation is in perfect accord with Modern Physics and Astrophysics<sup>188</sup>. Modern science leads naturally, through experimental measures, and also through the theoretical development of Astrophysics, to the idea of a created Universe. Modern science affirms, as scientific information, that the Universe has a limited age, that there is a maximum age of the structures that we observe, and that before there was no material structure that can be described by physical laws<sup>189</sup>.

During a gathering of scientists of the world, on November 22, 1951, **Pope Pius XII** said: "Today's science has confirmed the exactitude belonging to the physical tests: that our Universe is the work of a CREATOR"<sup>190</sup>.

<sup>182</sup> MANUEL M<sup>a</sup> CARREIRA, S.I.: *Dios, el hombre y el Universo*, VI. Madrid. 1976

<sup>183</sup> ANTONIO ROMANÍA, S. I.: *Origen del mundo ante la Ciencia y la Fe* Ed. Litúrgica Española. Barcelona

<sup>184</sup> PAUL DAVIES: *El Universo desbocado*, X. Ed. Salvat. Barcelona.

<sup>185</sup> JEAN E.CHARON: *De la material a la vida*. Pgs. 167, 172, 313 and 404. Ed. Guadarrama. Madrid

<sup>186</sup> P. RIAZA. S.I.: *Comienzo del mundo*. Pg. 636 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>187</sup> ARTHUR EDDINGTON: *The Nature of the Physical World*. pgs. 89-9. 1947

<sup>188</sup> MANUEL M<sup>a</sup> CARREIRA, S. I.. *El hombre centro del Universo* .A.D.U.E. Madrid, 1983

<sup>189</sup> MANUEL M<sup>a</sup> CARREIRA, S. I.. *El hombre centro del Universo* .A.D.U.E..Madrid. 1983

<sup>190</sup> Apostolicae Sedis Act, 25, I. 1952. pg. 31

6. Physics Nobel Prize winner, **C. Rubbia**, says: We have discovered a precise image of our world. It is clear for me that this cannot be a consequence of chance. There is evidently someone doing things as they are<sup>191</sup>.

In 1973, the head astronomer of the Observatory of Paris, **Jean Heidmann**, published a book titled *Introducción a la Cosmología*, in which, after many pages of mathematical formulas, he ends up speaking on the origin of the matter and expresses this phrase: "This is in all its simplicity the *"fiat lux"* a biblical expression of the moment of creation"<sup>192</sup>. During the XXI Congress of Nobel Prize winners in Lindau (Germany), professor **Paul Dirac**, (Cambridge University), who passed away in 1984<sup>193</sup>, one of the most highly thought of physicist of the XX century, paraphrasing the also famous British scientist *Fred Hoyle*<sup>194</sup> spoke: He is considered as one of the founders of the ondulatory mechanics and discoverer of the anti-matter, when he included through intuition the existence of the positron (positive electron), which was later discovered by **David Anderson**<sup>195</sup>, also a Nobel Prize winner. Later on, another Nobel, **Emilio Segre** discovered the anti-proton (negative proton)<sup>196</sup>.

**Dirac** affirmed that it is necessary to admit the existence of God in the creation of the Universe, because to attribute it **to chance**, is not being scientific.<sup>197</sup> Today many educated men who are involved in scientific research, consider that religious faith is not irreconcilable with scientific facts<sup>198</sup>.

It is false to believe that faith is something that belongs to the most remote past of our civilization. I would uphold the contrary. Nowadays, the vast majority of scientists, starting with the practicing nuclear physicists, have a very respectful attitude towards religion, or they themselves are practicing Christians. **Bernard Lowell** the Jodrell Bank astronomer, told me that no one dares this day and age to formulate theories of the positivist or materialist type on the origin or end of the Universe<sup>199</sup>.

Spanish born **Dr. Pascual Jordán**, professor of Atomic Physics at the University of Hamburg, several times candidate to the Physics Nobel Prize<sup>200</sup>, specialist in cosmologic and biophysics matters, collaborator to **Einstein** and **Max Plank** in the theories of relativity and quantum mechanics, is nowadays one of the most prestigious scientists. He has recently published a book in which he affirms that "Modern physics can no longer uphold the materialistic concept of the Universe based on the negation of the existence of God"<sup>201</sup>.

**Max Plank**, Nobel Prize in Physics, Professor of Theoretical Physics and Director of the Institute of Physics of the University of Berlin, and undisputable patriarch of Physics in our century<sup>202</sup>, and called, with reason, the father of modern physics<sup>203</sup>, says: What we have to look at as the biggest wonder in the world is the fact that the convenient formulation of this law produces, in any impartial man, the impression that Nature was ruled by an intelligent will<sup>204</sup>.

<sup>191</sup> YA Newspaper, 20-VII-85. pg.8

<sup>192</sup> JEAN HEIDMANN: *Introduction a la Cosmologie*, pg. 231 Presses Universitaires de France

<sup>193</sup> YA Newspaper, 24-X-84, pg. 34

<sup>194</sup> FRED HOYLE: *El Universo inteligente*, pg. 176. Ed. Grijalbo. Madrid. 1984

<sup>195</sup> PIERO PASOLINI: *Las grandes ideas que han revolucionado a la Ciencia en el ultimo siglo*, II, 3. Ed. Ciudad Nueva. Madrid

<sup>196</sup> ABC Cultural, 219(12-I-96)50

<sup>197</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, n 1 554(14-VIII-71)30

<sup>198</sup> IGNACIO LEP: *Psicoanálisis del ateísmo moderno*, IV. Ed. Lohle. Buenos Aires

<sup>199</sup> VINTILA HORIA; YA Newspaper. *El ateísmo político*.

<sup>200</sup> VINTILA HORIA: *Fe cristiana y Cultura Humana*, II. Ed. A.D.U.E. Madrid. 1983

<sup>201</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, n 1.208 (5-IX-64)29

<sup>202</sup> PEDRO LAÍN ENTRALGO: *Alma, cuerpo, Persona*, 2ª, IV, 5, 2. Ed. Galaxia. Barcelona. 1995

<sup>203</sup> PIERO PASOLINI: *Las grandes ideas que han revolucionado la ciencia en el último siglo*, I. Ed. Ciudad Nueva. Madrid. 1981

<sup>204</sup> MAX PLANK: *Religión y Ciencias Naturales*, pg. 24. Leipzig.

Man can know how the origin of cosmos was, but the explanation of “how” does not exclude the “why”. That is to say, it is always necessary to have an Intelligent Being, Author of the laws of the cosmos. All this happens as if this universe of ours were the work of a composer<sup>205</sup>.

**Albert Einstein**, who died in 1965, the best known physicist and mathematician of our time, Physics Nobel Prize in 1921, and who mathematically demonstrated that the speed of light is the maximum speed and that it cannot be surpassed<sup>206</sup>, and he was a believer<sup>207</sup>. He recognized his humble admiration towards a superior and unlimited spirit<sup>208</sup>. He would affirm that “the man of science must be profoundly religious<sup>209</sup>. He frequently would say: “Science without religion is lame, and religion without science is blind<sup>210</sup>”.

**Edmund Whittaker**, professor at Edinburgh University, converted to Catholicism as a fruit of his investigations on the origin of the Universe<sup>211</sup>

7. I dispense with luminaries of the antiquity, such as **Saint Augustine, Saint Tomas** or **Michelangelo**, who always kneeled in prayer before starting to work on his masterpieces.

The same as **Newton, Kepler** was also a believer. **Leverrier**, discoverer of the planet Neptune, was a fervent Catholic. **Laplace** died a fervent Christian, assisted by a priest. Even **Galileo**, his lamentable process notwithstanding, died a good Christian in 1642. **Copernicus** (to whom we owe the heliocentric system) and **Lemaître**, died in 1966, (author of the theory or the expansion of the Universe, in vogue today) were priests. An outstanding historian –**Deunert**- has only found in the field of Natural Sciences about 2% of well known scientists who declare themselves to be materialistic and atheist. Among the wise men listed in the *Dictionnaire des Sciences Exactes* there are 8,847 names cited by **Poggendorff**, where the majority of them are believers, and some 10% of them are either priests or belong to a religious order<sup>212</sup>

**Werner Heisenberg**, died in Munich in 1976, aged 74 years. He is considered as the greatest Physicist of all times<sup>213</sup>, won the Nobel Prize for his investigations on Nuclear Physics. He mathematically formulated the unifying theory of the energetic, gravitational, electromagnetic and nuclear(Strong and weak); this was not attained by **Einstein**, in spite of his efforts<sup>214</sup>. In April 1969 he came by Madrid. In an interview he gave to the press, he said among other things: “What I do believe in is God, and that everything comes from Him”. Atomic particles have an order that must have been imposed by someone. **Heissenberg** told **Vintila Horia**: “The theory of a created world, is more probable than the contrary, this from the point of view of Natural Sciences. The majority of men of Science that I know have managed to reach God<sup>215</sup>”.

On a Sunday issue of the ABC newspaper, I read that **Werner von Braun**, father of astronautics and “brain” of the space flights who have taken man to the Moon, manifested that he was a believer and that he prayed to God every day<sup>216</sup>. He said: “Man has the need of faith as he has

<sup>205</sup> CRUSAFONT: *La evolución en las ciencias positivas*, pg. 48. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>206</sup> PIERO PASSOLINI: *Las grandes ideas que han revolucionado la ciencia en el ultimo siglo, III, 4*. Ed. Ciudad Nueva. Madrid. 1981

<sup>207</sup> IBERICA de Actualidad Científica,

<sup>208</sup> ANGEL SANTOS RUIS: *Vida y espíritu ante la ciencia de hoy, XX*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 19780

<sup>209</sup> MIGUEL CRUSAFONT: *Ciencia y síntesis*, III Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>210</sup> DR. VENANCIO GARCÍA RODRIGUEZ: *Hombre, material, evolución y vida, XXXVIII, 5* Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona

<sup>211</sup> ANTONIO DÚE, S.I.: *PENSAMIENTO Magazine*. 11(1965)190-194

<sup>212</sup> ANGEL Mª ROJAS, S.I.: *Espiritualidad del estudiante, II, A, 2, 5*. EDAPOR. Madrid. 1984

<sup>213</sup> VINTILA HORIA: *Fe cristiana y cultura humana, III*. Ed. A.D.U.E. Madrid. 1963

<sup>214</sup> JOSÉ LUIS COMELLAS: *Astronomía, XXIV,C*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1987

<sup>215</sup> VINTIA HORIA: *Viaje a los centros de la tierra, 2ª, I, 3*. Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona. 1971

<sup>216</sup> ABC Newspaper, 18-V-1969.



the need of water, air. We have the need to believe in God<sup>217</sup>. **Salvador de Madariaga** says that “the most eminent men in the vanguard of science did not see anything in their scientific attitude that would prevent them from believing in God”<sup>218</sup>. And **Alexis Carrel**, who died in 1944, Nobel Prize in Medicine, said: “I believe all that which the Catholic Church wants us to believe in.” and, in order to do this, I find no difficulty, as I do not find in the truth of the Church any true opposition to the facts of science<sup>219</sup>.

**Fr. Manuel M<sup>a</sup>. Carrerira, S. I.**, Doctor in Physics and professor of Philosophy of Science at the University of Cleveland, says: “Nor for being a priest have I had to corrupt a scientific reasoning, nor was it necessary that I close my eyes to Science to maintain my faith”<sup>220</sup>.

Nobel Prize winner **Paul Sabatier**, who died in 1941, has said: “To oppose science with religion is only done by people with little knowledge in either subject”<sup>221</sup>.

**Dr. Juan Oró**, born in Lérida, Spain, who is one of the most prestigious biochemists of the United States and who works for NASA, affirms: “There is no contradiction between faith and science”<sup>222</sup>.

Professor **Baltasar Rodriguez-Salinas**, who is the dean of the Theory of Functions at the Faculty of Mathematical Sciences of Madrid, in a speed he gave at the Academy of Sciences, he began with a quote from the mathematical genius **Cauchy**. “I am a Christian, in other words, I believe in the divinity of **Jesus Christ** together with **Tycho-brahe, Copernicus, Descartes, Newton, Kepler, Fermat, Leibniz, Pascal, Grimaldi, Euler, Gauss, Guidin, Boscovich, Gerdil**, with all of the great astronomers, all of the great physicists, all of the great mathematicians of past centuries. I am also a Catholic, as are the majority of them, and if you ask me the reason, I will tell you that my convictions are the result, not of birth prejudices, but of a deep examination”<sup>223</sup>. Many other scientists are Catholic, such as **Pasteur, De Broglie, Schrödinger, Pauli** and **Max Plank** who converted to Catholicism at the end of his life, as was affirmed by professor **Stanley L. Jaki**, Hungarian, Professor at several Universities in the U.S., while at the Congress on Physics and Religion, which took place in Madrid, October 1990<sup>224</sup>.

**Angel Santos Ruiz**, Professor of Biochemistry at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, says: “No Scientific fact, duly confirmed, has ever been rejected for being in contradiction with the revealed doctrine”<sup>225</sup>. As a fact, no physicist, biologist, chemist, etc., has ever had to renounce his convictions about God, the soul, the Moral Law, and the supernatural, because they were incompatible with his science<sup>226</sup>. On August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 1985, I heard the rector of the University of Santander and Professor of Physics, **D. Francisco González de Posada** say in some conferences which he gave in Laredo, Spain: “The science of today does not give the atheist any information that confirms his atheism”

**D. Santiago Ramon y Cajal**, Nobel prize winner in 1906, “never doubted the existence of God” paraphrasing his brother **Pedro**; who also affirms that if he had gotten there in time, his brother **Santiago** would have died with the sacraments<sup>227</sup>.

**Leonardo Torres Quevedo**, who died in Madrid in December 1936, aged 84, was an engineer and mathematician, in 1895 he invented a machine to calculate equations, which is a precursor of the modern electronic computer. In October 1906, in the river of Bilbao he made an unmanned small

<sup>217</sup> PALABRA Magazine, 95(VII-73)35

<sup>218</sup> SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA: *Dios y los Españoles*, 2<sup>a</sup>, IV. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona. 1975

<sup>219</sup> PALABRA Magazine, 95(VII-73)33

<sup>220</sup> MANUEL M<sup>a</sup> CARREIRA, S. I.: *Dios, el hombre y el Universo*, I, 1. Madrid. 1975

<sup>221</sup> MUY Interesante Magazine, 55(XII-85) 13

<sup>222</sup> YA Newspaper – Sunday – 8-I-87, pg. 20

<sup>223</sup> YA Newspaper, 6-XII-84, pg. 10

<sup>224</sup> Several Authors *Física y Religión en perspectiva. Appendix 4*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1991

<sup>225</sup> ANGEL SANTOS RUIZ: *Vida y espíritu ante la ciencia de hoy*, XX. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1970

<sup>226</sup> MARIANO ARTIGAS: *Ciencia, Razón y Fe*, VI, 6. Libros M. C. Madrid. 1985

<sup>227</sup> GARCÍA DURÁN *Cajal*, 2<sup>a</sup>, I, 1 Institución Fernando el Católico. Zaragoza

boat perform several maneuvers with the use of hertzian waves, thanks to the **telekino**, which he manned from the terrace of the yacht club. The boat advanced, went back, turned around, went past other boats in the harbor and arrived to the staircase of the steamship Elcano, where the official representation was watching<sup>228</sup>. The telekino is the precursor of the remotely directed rockets of today.

On February 10, 1916, an inauguration took place, that of the Funicular, whose project and design was done by **Torres Quevedo** after having won an international bid. The Funicular is still in operation today.

The Municipality of Camargo (Santander, Spain) organized an exposition in August 1991, to celebrate the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Niagara Funicular, a project of **Torres Quevedo**, born in Santa Cruz de Iguña, Cantabria) on December 28, 1852. In this exposition I saw a replica of this Funicular, which in 75 years of operation has not had an accident, not even a serious malfunction. In the United States they call it the "Spanish Aerocar". It is held in place by six cables and counterweighed anchors, with which the tension of the cables is maintained constant, notwithstanding the weight of the passengers aboard, giving it a high safety coefficient. Before building it on the Niagara, he installed it on the Monte Ulía in San Sebastian, in 1907, in order to test it. It was the first aerial tram in the world. In 1914, he invented the mechanical chess player, who always wins. It is the precursor of today's robots. It is exhibited at the Escuela de Ingenieros de Caminos school. In 1951, it was presented by **Gonzalo Torres Quevedo**, (son of the inventor, assistant and collaborator), in Paris, at an International Colloquium on Cybernetics, and gave **Tartakower**, who at the time was a world champion, a check mate. The machine announces through a loudspeaker, when the opponent is either cheating or making a mistake. It will only allow three such instances, then, it gets mad and stands up<sup>229</sup>.

[In 1978 I was in Toledo, preaching Lenten conferences, and then I had the satisfaction of getting to know **Valentina Torres Quevedo**, daughter of the inventor, who allowed me to see the newspaper clippings that I have quoted. She told me that her father died a good Christian, as he had lived: he took communion on every first Friday of the month.

According to "one of the better informed commentators in our country on international events, the great majority of investigators and technicians on space navigation, not only of the United States, but also of the Soviet Union, confess, that when the conversation has reached a level of certain candidness, there is a surge in their faith in God. What's more, almost without exception, they admit and add that their faith rises as a consequence of their own scientific investigations<sup>230</sup>.

Two thousand three hundred members of the American Scientific Association admit to being believers<sup>231</sup>.

**Carlos Rubbia**, Nobel Prize in Physics and Director of the European Center for Nuclear Investigation (CERN), who has discovered a new form of generating energy through fission, which is cheaper, clean and safe, and is not able to be used as raw material to manufacture atomic bombs<sup>232</sup>, and has recently invented a destruction method for high activity atomic residues<sup>233</sup>, has said: "The most advanced science approaches religion<sup>234</sup>. And **Pius XII**: "Modern science discovers God behind each new door it opens<sup>235</sup>". **John Paul II**, said at the University of Madrid: "Science and Faith are not opposed, but converge in the discovery of integral reality, which has its origin in God."

Profane realities and those of faith have their origin in one same God<sup>236</sup>.

<sup>228</sup> YA Newspaper, 28-XII-52

<sup>229</sup> 70 Years of ABC

<sup>230</sup> SEMANA Magazine, 30-I-51

<sup>231</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1295 (11-VI-1966) 4

<sup>232</sup> ABC Madrid, 27-XII-91, Pg. 53

<sup>233</sup> BLANCO Y NEGRO Magazine, 2-I-94. Pg. 46

<sup>234</sup> ABC Madrid, 14-III-97. Pg. 77

<sup>235</sup> Apostolicae Sedis Act, 44 (1952) 31

<sup>236</sup> ANGEL SANTOS RUIZ: *Vida Y espíritu ante la Ciencia de hoy*, XX. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1970

A quote from the First Vatican Council: “No true dissension can ever be had between faith and reason, because the same God who reveals the mysteries and instills faith, places in the human soul the light of reason; and God cannot deny Himself, and truth can never contradict truth<sup>237</sup>.”

In an interview with the German Magazine *Der Spiegel* in 1966, the German contemporary philosopher **Martin Heidegger** said: “Contemporary literature, for the most part, is destructive. Only God can still save us. In the absence of God, we will sink<sup>238</sup>.”

**Boris Yeltsin**, President of Russia, declared: “communism tried during 70 years to impose atheism, but has not succeeded<sup>239</sup>.” **Alexander Solzhenitsyn** a well known Soviet Nobel Prize winner in 1970 who studied Mathematics and Physics at the Rostov University and then went on to study Literature at the Russian Institute of Philosophy of the USSR, manifests to be a believer. The prayer he wrote is very well known: “How wondrous it is to live with you, Lord! How easy it is for me to believe in You! You send me the clear certainness of Your existence<sup>240</sup>.”

**Chabbanis**, after interviewing several atheist thinkers, affirms: “I thought I would find in them a rigorous and well founded atheism, but what there was in reality, was the absence of the search for Absolute Truth<sup>241</sup>”.

**Paschal** states: “Many are always willing to deny all that they do not understand.”

The nonbelievers have their origin in their religious ignorance. No one can be convinced of something he knows nothing about. I cannot have an opinion of the food in Kenya, as I do not know what is eaten there. It would be interesting to count the pages that that atheist has read about his profession, and those that he has read on religious culture. Surely the difference is enormous. What would be his professional information if we were to invert the numbers. Would we be surprised by his religious ignorance?

8. Atheism **leaves unsolved** many more things than all of the mysteries that are accepted by the faith. That is why **Alexis Carrel**, Medicine Nobel Prize, said: “I am not sufficiently credulous, to be incredulous”

According to a survey of the Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 75% of all Spaniards believe in God<sup>242</sup>. And in another by Gallup, 94% of Americans believe in God, and 58% believe in Hell.<sup>243</sup>

As said by **Berdiaef**, “man is an incurable religious being”. And **Max Scheler**: “Man either believes in God or he creates an idol. This idol will be the race, the State, a woman or money; but man cannot live without adoring something<sup>244</sup>”. The agnostic escapes through an “I don’t know”, as he does not want to recognize how reasonable a God-Creator is.

Faith complements reason in the same manner that the telescope complements the eye. With the telescope I can see stars that are not visible to the naked eye. With faith I get answers to many things for which Science has no answer. What is the sense of man’s life? Where does he come from? Where is he going? What is there after death?

The roads that lead towards atheism could be:

- a) The rebellion against evil in the world.
- b) Religious ignorance

<sup>237</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n°: 1797 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>238</sup> YA Newspaper, 10\_III-1977. Pg. 25.

<sup>239</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2560(26-XII-91) 20

<sup>240</sup> IBERICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine, 103 (I-1971) 41

<sup>241</sup> YA Newspaper, 7-IV-1991. Pg. 6

<sup>242</sup> YA Newspaper, 2-X-88, pg. 21

<sup>243</sup> EL MUNDO Newspaper, San Juan de Puerto Rico, 19-III-89, pg. 27

<sup>244</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA. *La verdad del Cristianismo*, I, B, c. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1980. A magnificent book to demonstrate that the Catholic Church is the only one founded by Christ-God.

- c) An infantile religious formation
- d) A disorderly fondness for material pleasures
- e) The bad example of some believers
- f) Hostility towards religion
- g) An unfounded fear of God that does not know divine mercy and kindness<sup>245</sup>.

It is much **more reasonable** to believe in God than to be an atheist. The atheist can not only not demonstrate that there is no God; but from Atheism, you cannot resolve the great questions of life. Where does it come from? Where is it going? What happens after death? What sense does life have? How to satiate the appetite of happiness?, etc. etc.. An atheist condemns himself to live in anguish, in doubt, in desperation, unless he prefers to cease being a man and to live with his back to all transcendent thought. An animal cannot ask himself any transcendent questions. Man can. And only with God does he find answers.

And as was stated in the Second Vatican Council <sup>246</sup>, without God, there is no answer to the oldest questions of humanity, as are the sense of life and death, of guilt and pain. And these problems are unavoidable. And there is no one, who at one time or another in his life has not had them.

Materialism says that everything that exists is material, because everything you see, you touch, you measure, etc., is material. This is as simple as the fisherman who denies that there are fish smaller than the ones he catches in his nets, because the smaller ones escape through the net<sup>247</sup>.

The fact that there are so many men of science who are believers is proof that Science is not an obstacle to believe. If it were, all scientists would be atheists, and, as we have seen, many men of science have declared themselves to be believers. The fact that there are some atheist scientists has to be explained in other ways, but not by the fact that they are scientists<sup>248</sup>.

Evidently science does not prove the existence of God., as science studies the laws of Nature, not God. Theology studies God.

But science gives information that supports the faith of the believer.

Science does not prove the existence of God-Creator, but it does establish the foundation for a metaphysical reasoning that logically leads to Him<sup>249</sup>.

The problem facing modern man is the fraudulent and persistent manipulation to which he is being subjected by the materialistic rationalism, which insures that "Science" has proven the non existence of God<sup>250</sup>. There is no scientific argument that demonstrates that there is no God<sup>251</sup>. Quite the contrary, there are many bits of information that confirm the faith of the believer; from what the astronomers say on the origin of the cosmos (see nº 3), to the scientific studies carried out on the Shroud of Turin<sup>252</sup>.

On October 13, 1988, the result of the **carbon-14 analysis on the Shroud of Turin**, was made public, and it infers that the weave is of the Middle Ages, in other words, that the Shroud of Turin could not have covered the body of **Christ** in the first Century, and therefore is false. This information was rejected by all specialists on the Holy Shroud. The previous investigations in the fields of History, Medicine, Biochemistry, Numismatics, Paleontology, Archeology, etc., could and should not be ignored, as they confirmed the authenticity of the Holy Shroud. As a matter of fact, two

<sup>245</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 29

<sup>246</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes* Constitution on the Church in the Current World.. n.21

<sup>247</sup> MARIANO ARTIGAS: *Ciencia, Razón y Fe, III, 2*. Libros M.C. Madrid,1985

<sup>248</sup> JUAN LÓPEZ PEDRAZ, S.I.: *¿De veras que el cristianismo no convence?*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>249</sup> MANUEL M<sup>o</sup> CARREIRA, S. I.:*El hombre en el cosmos, VI, 2*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1997

<sup>250</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y problema religioso*, pg. 305 Unión Editorial. Madrid. 1984

<sup>251</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y problema religioso, IX,, 3. A*. Unión Editorial. Madrid. 1984

<sup>252</sup> JORGE LORING, S. I.:*La autenticidad de la Sábana Santa de Turin*. Invalidez de la prueba del CARBONO-14. Madrid. 1990

International Scientific Congresses have been held , one in Paris, in September of 1989 and the other in Cagliari (Italy) in April 1990, where the carbon-14 tests on the Shroud of Turin have been invalidated. In the closing words in the Congress of Cagliari, **Dr. Baima Bollone**, President of the Centro Internacional de Sindonología de Turin: “The general feeling of the Congress has been the non acceptance of the Carbon-14 test on the Shroud of Turin.

There were twenty seven investigation papers presented at this congress. I had the honor of presenting one of them, a paper on behalf of the Centro Español de Sindonología, which was very well accepted, as expressed by the chairman. In the sixth edition of my book on the Holy Shroud I present a summary of this Congress and on the investigative work presented there by Spain.

All in all, we must not overvalue the experimental scientific knowledge. Historical and metaphysical knowledge is also valid. The experimental scientific knowledge is not the only way to know. There are realities that escape the experimental knowledge. Philosophical reasoning is not scientific. When **Descartes** says: “I think, therefore I am”, he is making a valid reasoning, but it is not scientific, but philosophical. Science does not explain all. There are things that escape it. The same way that an open net cannot capture small fish, but that doesn't mean that there are no sardines.

There are some **unreachable things** for experimental science. Science is not good for demonstrating the existence of God., as it also does not help to demonstrate the love of a mother or the faithfulness of a husband, even though all of this is a reality. However, there is no doubt that Science gives us valid information that confirms the existence of God<sup>253</sup>.

Science explains “how” nature works, but it does not reach the “why”. This is the object of philosophy<sup>254</sup>.

The reasons to believe are sufficient, but not evident, as an axiom; as God wants man to freely accept and not by force. The truths of faith are reasonable and certain. We can firmly believe them, but they are not imposed upon us with an overwhelming evidence<sup>255</sup>, because if this were the case, it would have no merit, and God has ordered that we be meritorious with the virtue of the faith. To say that the whole is larger than the part, is so evident, that to accept it has no merit whatsoever.

The obscurity of the faith is absolutely necessary so that the act of faith be free. And the freedom of the faith is essential in order to be able to talk about the religious values in it<sup>256</sup>. Faith is sufficiently obscure so that adherence to it is free; and at the same time, clear enough so that said adherence is reasonable<sup>257</sup>.

Faith is secure and obscure at the same time. Secure because it is based on the word of God, and obscure because of the limits of our understanding. That is why **Santa Teresita del Niño Jesús** used to say: “Lord, I don't understand You, but I believe all You say, because I trust You..

**Agnosticism** is in fashion these days, agnostics are people who do away with God. They are not interested in God. They install themselves in the world as if there were nothing on the other side of death. The first thing that has to be said, is that to deny God is not to destroy Him, and he who thinks that there is nothing after death, will soon find out after he dies. Things are as God has said they are, not as we think they should be. And if God has said that we will continue to live after death, it is that way even if there is someone who does not accept it.

Some think that by not accepting hell, they are freer. But it is not so. What they really are is more unconscious. To close your eyes before truth does not make man richer, it makes him poorer.

<sup>253</sup> MANUEL M<sup>o</sup> CARREIRA, S. I.: *El hombre en el cosmos*, VI, 2. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander 1997.

<sup>254</sup> RENÉ LAURENTIN: *Creo EN Dios*, vi. Ed. San Pablo. Madrid. 1995 Ed. San Pablo. Madrid. 1995

<sup>255</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y Problema religioso*, pg. 304. Unión Editorial. Madrid. 1984

<sup>256</sup> CÁNDIDO POSO, S.I.: *Valor religioso del acto de fe*. V. Universidad de Granada.

<sup>257</sup> FIRST VATICAN COUNCIL: *Constitution Dei Filius*, II. DENZINGER-S. n.3.004; 3.026

Prudence is not to ignore a risk, but in studying it and preventing it. To close one's eyes to a risk is a sign of unconsciousness.

Faith is to accept what one does not understand because one trusts the one who tells it to you. But faith is reasonable. If it weren't we faithful would be foolish. That is why faith is not a jump into the void, recklessly. It is very reasonable to accept what one does not understand, if I can trust the one who does understand it and tells me.

**Faith in God is perfectly reasonable.** There are many reasons to believe that God exists rather than to doubt His existence. But one must reject **rationalism**, which only accepts that which can be proven (mysteries are not demonstrable) and **fideism** which scorns reason and pretends that faith become a "leap into the void", without any reason of credibility.

If faith did not have a motivation of a rational type, it would not be responsible nor human. That is why Catholic theology has always defended man's natural capacity to arrive with the light of reason to know the existence of the God-Creator. It is so defined by the First Vatican Council<sup>258</sup>.

The Holy Mother Church upholds and teaches that God, Beginning and End of all things, can be known with certainty through the natural light of human reason, starting with the things created<sup>259</sup>. **Paul** said: *The invisibility of God, from the creation of the world, can be seen in the intelligence through his works*<sup>260</sup>.

However, even if reason indicates that there are serious motives to believe reason does not cause faith. It is only when the human heart gives itself up to the grace in an act of humility and simplicity, when faith is born. Reason has to be accompanied by humble prayer. It is necessary to have a clean heart to believe in God. We must not forget that God will only manifest Himself to the meek<sup>261</sup>.

Science, who has as its objective, to expose the reasons of credibility, in other words, the reasons and arguments that demonstrate that faith is reasonable, is called **Apologetics**<sup>262</sup>. **Cardinal Newman**, who was a protestant, converted to Catholicism through pure reasoning. **Cardinal Daneels**, Archbishop of Malinas, says: "the suppression of all healthy apologetics is an ill timed service to the cause of evangelization"<sup>263</sup>. In May 1935, **Marchant**, Minister of Public Instruction of Holland converted to Catholicism. When questioned by a left wing member of the Senate, he replied: "I believe, because I question"<sup>264</sup>.

But it is not a matter of convincing anyone based on proofs, but to make him understand how reasonable it is to believe. To enlighten the truths of faith. Such is the role of the Apologetics. But let us not forget that the conversion is not born **only** after having been convinced, but after the illumination or the understanding and adhesion to the will of God, receiving the revealed truths, and placing my whole being in this enlightenment. The motives of credibility constitute a rational preamble of faith. The act of faith essentially constitutes an agreement to these truths because God has revealed them. And of course, it is not enough to **agree** with the accepted truths revealed by God; it is necessary to **live** in accordance with them. To he who has faith, a thousand objections will not make him doubt; and to the one who does not have faith, a thousand reasons will not convince him.

**Man is convinced through reasons**, but it is the will that elects the reasons which it wants to convince it. That is why it is not enough to give reasons that only go to the understanding. We must present values that move the will: kindness, beauty, importance, usefulness or need to the man as such.

<sup>258</sup> First Vatican Council: : Constitution *Dei Filius*, II. DENZINGER-S, n.3.004; 3.026

<sup>259</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 510; DENZINGER: Magisterio de la Iglesia, n°; n° 1785

<sup>260</sup> Romans, 1:20

<sup>261</sup> JOSÉ A. SAYÉS: *Dios existe*, V, 3, Ed. EDAPOR, 1982

<sup>262</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Jesucristo y la vida Cristiana*, n.66. Ed. BAC. Madrid 1961

<sup>263</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, n°2251 (4-11, I. 86)37

<sup>264</sup> KOLB: *Sin Cristo*, VIII. Ed. Euramérica. Madrid. 1958

A man can “know” that tobacco is bad for his health; but as long as the pleasure of tobacco is a greater value than the harm it can cause his health, he will not cease to smoke. Faith is reasonable, but the reasons are not sufficient in order to believe. An act of will is missing. And the will does not decide for logical reasons, but for reasons and values<sup>265</sup>. It is not the same to be convinced than to be converted. Man, besides reason, has a heart, and frequently, it commands over reason. Works come out of the heart, more than from reason. It was already said by **Jesus Christ**: “Indeed, it is from the heart that evil desires come”<sup>266</sup>.

If one considers Christianity as a negative value because of the sacrifices it demands, it is very difficult to believe. But if one considers Christianity as a superior value to any sacrifice because it guarantees eternal happiness, it begins to set the foundation of a possible faith, if at the same time, it has the opportunity to know sufficiently of the reasons in which the credibility of Christianity is supported.

A man who wants to be healthy, will eagerly accept the medicine that offers him a reasonable hope of cure. But to refuse taking it because there is no absolute certainty of its efficacy, is absurd.

Christian faith places in our life: clarity, security and invincible fortitude<sup>267</sup>.

An atheist is like the one who is in a closed room with the window shut, and can only see what is poorly illuminated by the light bulb of his work table. If he were to open the window, the radiant sunshine would enter, and everything would be illuminated. That is the difference between the atheist and the believer.

I quote **Ortega y Gasset**: “The barbarism of the specialist is that he is very knowledgeable in one subject, but allows himself to issue an opinion on matters that he ignores, with the same authority as in the field in which he is a specialist”<sup>268</sup>

**Don't be dazzled** by those affirmations that one hears sometimes from lips which are ill documented: “Modern science contradicts faith”. You can be sure that true science has never contradicted, nor will it ever contradict the Dogmas of Faith, because God, truth itself, is the Author of Science and of Faith, and He cannot contradict Himself. Effectively, science is the knowledge of the laws that God has placed in Nature which is the base of science, and Faith is the knowledge of the truths that God has revealed to us. God, infinite wisdom, is Author of both the scientific truths as well as the religious ones: therefore these principles can never be incompatible to each other. When it seems that there is incompatibility, it is because men who have surpassed or erroneously interpreted the truths of science or faith.<sup>269</sup> The Second Vatican Council says: “Profane realities and the realities of faith have their origin in the same God”<sup>270</sup>. One must take into account that the working hypothesis of a scientist is not indubitable science. In the same way, the Revealed Truth is not the personal theory of a theologian. When I speak of science, I speak of indubitable science, not of the working hypothesis of a scientist. And when I speak of Faith, I talk about dogmatic truths, not of a disciplinary norm of the Church, as it happened in the case of **Galileo**. But between undisputable science and dogmas of faith there has never been a contradiction, nor will there be in the future, because of what I have just said.

**Many of the difficulties** that some seem to find in apparent contradictions between Faith and Science, that stem from having taken as a truth revealed the affirmations which,

<sup>265</sup> JUAN LÓPEZ PEDRAZ, S.I.: *Cuando se está perdiendo la fe*, 2º, XII. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>266</sup> Matthew, 15:19

<sup>267</sup> MONS. PEINADO; *Exposición cristiana de la fe*, 2ª, II, 26. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1975

<sup>268</sup> YA Newspaper, 26-XII-88- Pg. 13

<sup>269</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes* Constitution on the Church in the Current World.. nº 36

<sup>270</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes* Constitution on the Church in the Current World.. nº 36

when once properly examined do not enjoy such a guarantee, or they come from looking at scientific truths as things that have been acquired definitely, which later on will be no more than simple hypothesis or theories, which with time, will require a bit of touching up<sup>271</sup>. Not only are there no contradictions between Science and Faith, but they mutually help and complement each other<sup>272</sup>.

Physics has changed tremendously in the last hundred years, and the radically materialistic positions of some physicists of the XIX century are today non sustainable. Many influential ideologies, however, have remained anchored in the past, and many years must go by until anti religious prejudices, supposedly scientific, which were propagated by the wise men of the XVIII century, disappear<sup>273</sup>. **Max Plank**, Nobel Prize in Physics, said: "There is absolutely no contradiction between Religion and Natural Sciences; both are perfectly compatible<sup>274</sup>". **Rudolf Kippenhahns**, Director of the Max Plank Astrophysics Institute of Munich, says: They ask time and time again during my conferences, that if in the scientific conception of the Universe there is still place for God.. The more I think on it, the less I understand that the scientific knowledge must suppress the ideas of faith<sup>275</sup>.

As was stated by the professor of the Universidad de Navarra and doctor in Physical Sciences, **Mariano Artigas**: "Science has never opposed Religion, and can never be opposed, as there is no true contradiction". What's more, he added: "Today we can affirm as true fact that the greatest scientists, practically without exception, are in agreement that there is **no true opposition** between Science and Religion<sup>276</sup>".

True Science is not only **not opposed** to Religion, but confirms it more each time through its new discoveries.

That is why **Pius XII**, in his discourse at the Pontifical Academy of Sciences in 1951 said: "True Science finds God behind each new door that is opened"<sup>277</sup>

What's more, History teaches us that when a theory opposes to what faith upholds as true and certain, this theory is false. Sooner or later it will be debunked by a new theory. This has always happened. And it is natural, as this theory comes from a man who can be wrong; on the other hand, Faith comes from God, who cannot be wrong.

God cannot be wrong, because He is infinitely wise; and he cannot deceive us as He is infinitely good.

But men **to whom religion is a burden**, anxiously grasp these badly demonstrated theories as if they were dogmas of faith, to reject the true dogmas of faith that are in their way. Not because in the dogmas of Religion there are mysteries –as we said before, life is full of mysteries, and no one finds it strange–; what they have against Religion are not scientific difficulties, but prejudices and moral difficulties.

If Religion did not hold passions at bay, no one would have difficulties with Religion.

And if moral precepts depended on the truths of physics, many would deny physics instead of denying Religion<sup>278</sup>.

<sup>271</sup> ANTONIO ROMANÍA, S. I.: *Estado actual de la Cosmología. Appendix*. Publicaciones del Observatorio del Ebro. Tortosa. 1966

<sup>272</sup> MANUEL M<sup>a</sup> CARREIRA, S. I.: *El Creyente ante la Ciencia, II, 4*. Cuadernos BAC. n.57. Madrid

<sup>273</sup> DENZINGER: Magisterio de la Iglesia, n<sup>o</sup>: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n<sup>o</sup> 1799*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>274</sup> Several authors. *Física y Religión en perspectiva: Introducción* Ed. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. Madrid. 1991

<sup>275</sup> WERNER HEISENBERG: *Diálogos sobre Física Atómica. VII*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1972

<sup>276</sup> MARIANO ARTIGAS; *Física y Religión en Perspectiva, Appendix 4*, Ed. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1991

<sup>277</sup> PASCUAL JORDAN: *El hombre de Ciencia ante el problema religioso, III. 15*. Ed. Guadarrama. Madrid 1972

<sup>278</sup> STAUDINGER: *La vida eternal, I, 1*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona



There is nothing more blinding than to be obstinate in sin. This was said by **Jesus Christ** : “whoever does wrong hates the light”<sup>279</sup>.

**Bacon**, has said: “Only those who benefit from His non existence deny Him.

And **J. Jacob Rousseau**: “Hold your soul in the sate to desire that God exists, and you shall never doubt Him”<sup>280</sup>. All in all, it is convenient to notice that atheism is losing ground.

**Paul Paupard**, President of the Pontific Council for the non-believers, said in Madrid that technical atheism is diminishing in the world. In Spain, only 7% of citizens declare themselves to be atheists<sup>281</sup>

It is not to be denied that an atheist can be honest, but evidently he is lacking motivation. When man tears God away from his life, he turns against his brothers. That is what **Hobbes** with this crude phrase: “*Man is wolf for man*” If he does not respect God, what else could he respect? In the long run, consequences are few.

Unfortunate. If you cut the roots of a tree, it would have some reserves, but for a short time. It will dry up and fall. The root of our people is in Christianity.

Pope **John Paul II** said in Ljubljana (Slovenia): “A world built without God, ends up rising against man”<sup>282</sup>.

**Fideism** is absurd, as it pretends that we believe in God without a rational foundation of faith. The First Vatican Council says<sup>283</sup>: “We can know God through natural reasons” It is a certainty that excludes all reasonable doubt, but it is not axiomatic evidence. Faith is an act of the will, after the exam, through reason, of the motives for credibility. That is why reason prepares the faith, it does not impose it. To take this step forward, the grace of God is necessary. That is why we must ask God for the gift of faith. Faith is a gift in the sense that God helps us so that our reason is not hampered by psychic obstacles; moral, cultural, environmental, etc., which will impede its proper functioning. The foundations of faith make faith reasonable.. Faith replaces reason, it does not destroy it.

Reason is not the cause of faith, that is a pure gift from God, but it is an indispensable condition so that faith be responsible, human and non-arbitrary. If faith were not reasonable, we believers would be stupid<sup>284</sup>.

The reason to believe does not lie in the fact that the revealed truths appear as true and intelligible under the light of natural reason. We believe because of the authority of God who reveals and cannot deceive Himself, nor deceive us. However, God has wanted to give us motives of credibility that show that the acceptance of faith is not a blind movement of the spirit<sup>285</sup>.

Fideism, which is to believe without proof, has a strictly protestant root (**Barth, Bultman**). Has influenced some Catholic theologians who have forgotten **Peter’s** mandate<sup>286</sup> to give reason of his hope. Consequences have been inauspicious. You cannot

<sup>279</sup> John, 3:20

<sup>280</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Dios y su obra, 1º, 1ª*, n° 40 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>281</sup> YA Newspaper, 6-VII-92, pg. 22

<sup>282</sup> ABC Madrid, 19-V-96. pg. 63

<sup>283</sup> DENZINGER-SCHRON, N° 3004

<sup>284</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYPES: *Cristología fundamental, VIII, 2, b*. Ed. CETE. Madrid. 1985

<sup>285</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 156

<sup>286</sup> I Peter, 3:15

establish faith over doubt and insecurity. Today it is fashionable to talk of “risk” of faith, the tunnel, etc. But there cannot be a convincing pastoral if you do not reason the faith<sup>287</sup>. No one likes to jump into a void without guarantees. In important matters we all want security. No one puts his money in a bank that is teetering on bankruptcy. No one will eat spoiled food, risking intoxication.

As **Fr. López Pedras, S. I.** says: “The evidence for each one is the final result of an effort: attentiveness, interest, will, which precedes a clear admission. Would we admit the sincerity of he who justifies his disinterest with the pretext of not being able to clearly see from the beginning? At the root of not seeing, the lack of will can be found. In such a case, obscurity does not excuse, it accuses, and the final blindness is guilty. Voluntary blindness can get to constitute the greatest sin against the Holy Spirit, against which all luminous manifestations will collide, even those who are more in conformity to the taste of the interested party. It is necessary to clean the eyes. It is not enough to want to see; many Jews wanted to see and ended up not seeing. Availability and receptiveness are required for whatever shows up, without interposing conditions which will cloud the vision. Purification of prejudices. Purification of sentiments. How many times do we not dedicate the proper attention to a person or matter because it has a smack of sympathy or antipathy, either obscurely born in us or in the environment, that do not allow us to see clearly or to interest us in seeing? If a miner, trapped in the collapse of a mine, in the dark, alone, oppressed and in the painful trance of asphyxia, sees, through a fracture in the rocks, a vague luminosity, no matter how faint it may be, it is sufficient for him, as he will be alert to that which comes from the other side of the rocks, where there is more light, and announces the possible salvation. He will make himself be heard to communicate his presence to his possible saviors. If he had withdrawn himself and said: “this is not enough, I will not do anything until I can see more light and clearer signs”, he could be buried forever.

**9. It is also necessary to pray.** How can an atheist pray? When he knows that there is no God. Could he be willingly blind for not praying? Is this an inadmissible paradox? No, who is lost in a forest, not knowing what is on the other side, will scream asking for help. Who does he scream to? To anyone, to anybody. He screams in case there is someone. Well then, no Atheist, will consciously eliminate, on the least, the suspicion that there is someone<sup>288</sup>.

**Pascal** has said: “There are no more than two classes of people who seek God with their whole heart because they do not know Him<sup>289</sup>”

Religiousness is a necessary dimension, part of man. It is not something accidental or optional, as can be the hobby of playing tennis or butterfly collecting. The non-believer, without doubt, is a psychologically mutilated being. Man cannot be unconcerned about God without guilt.

But it is not less true that believing is an authentically human act<sup>290</sup>. In faith, the intelligence and human will cooperate with the divine grace<sup>291</sup>

<sup>287</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYÉS; *Cristología fundamental. Introduction.* 2. Ed. CETE. 1985

<sup>288</sup> Mons. GUERRA CAMPOS: *Ateísmo hoy.* 3º, III, 2. Ed. Fe Católica. Madrid. 1978

<sup>289</sup> PASCAL: *Pensamientos, nº 11*

<sup>290</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 154

God gives a definite and overabundant answer in matters that man queries on the sense and finality of his life<sup>292</sup>

Religious ignorance is a shame. Faith is the most important thing in life, because it is the only thing that responds to the fundamental truths. Any rational being, sometime in his life, will logically ask: himself: what sense does life have?. What will be of me after death? The agnostic will not know how to answer. On the headstone of an atheist you can read: "I have lived in the midst of doubts, and I die in uncertainty. I do not know where I am going.

What good is it to me to know the number of my chromosomes, or the vibration of ultraviolet light if I do not know the sense of my life? Only faith has an explanation for pain and suffering. For the atheist, there is only desperation and darkness. Faith gives rectitude, hope and cheer. Man has a religious dimension that cannot be shut down. Man desires the religious. Seventy years of militant atheism in the Soviet Union have not been able to curtail the faith of the Russian people, which has resurged with strength while the heads of **Stalin** and **Lenin** have rolled on the floor.

The human soul naturally tends to God, and it is impossible to go against nature.

If you throw a stone upwards, when the impulse ceases, it will fall to the ground.

If you blow on a fire so that the smoke descends, when you stop blowing, the smoke will rise.

A ship tends to float. It will only go to the bottom of the water if it is punctured.

The soul that does not feel its destiny upwards is that it is broken, destroyed. That is why it sinks like a punctured vessel. He who has faith sees God behind all mundane things.. Just like the one who knows that the sun is behind the clouds.

**10. Faith is a gift from God<sup>293</sup>.** It is a grace from God which we should ask for unceasingly. Even he who thinks that he does not have faith, must pray. At least he could say: "Lord, if you exist, grant me the gift of faith" And as it is true that He does exist, he will be heard and will obtain the faith. **Carlos de Foucauld** (1858-1916), a French army officer found his faith at the age of 28, after living a disorderly life, repeating: "My God, if you exist, let me know you"<sup>294</sup>. God always comes out to encounter the one who is sincerely seeking him<sup>295</sup>. "*God is near those who call on Him*"<sup>296</sup>.

God never rejects he who does all he can to get nearer to Him<sup>297</sup>

Faith is a supernatural gift from God. To believe, man needs the internal assistance of the Holy Spirit<sup>298</sup>. With it, we can deepen the knowledge of Religion and can see things that are unsuspected for the one who does not have faith. It is the difference between contemplating the score of a concert made by a profane or by a great composer. The spirit of faith makes us judge all things according to the norms of faith from God's point of view. This illumination must be asked from the Holy Spirit. Faith illuminates the night, but it does

<sup>291</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 155

<sup>292</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 68

<sup>293</sup> Ephesians, 2:8; New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 153

<sup>294</sup> ANDRES LEONARDO: *Razones para creer*, IX, 3. Ed. Herder. Barcelona 1990

<sup>295</sup> Canon IV of the Mass

<sup>296</sup> Psalm, 145:18

<sup>297</sup> ANOTNIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 1ª, IV, 1. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>298</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 179

not suppress it. Like the lights that illuminate the landing field for the pilot, they show him the way, but they do not illuminate the darkness. We can see as we go forward. Like a flashlight that we use to indicate our way.

Faith illuminates truth. It lets us know unsuspecting things, and it takes us to accept the truth and lets us adhere to the Person who transmits it. It adheres to it like to rivers flowing into one. It is an option for someone and for something. God does not impose himself. He wants to be freely chosen. God offers himself in a statement of love and awaits my answer. Faith adheres us to God, and motivates us to adhere ourselves more perfectly to Him through grace. He lets us know that in reality we can only be united to Him if we are in Grace.

11. In faith, man delivers himself totally and freely to God, he offers the homage of his understanding and will, freely accepting what God reveals<sup>299</sup>. Faith must not be intellectual, cold, dry, without vital signs. It must be happy, optimistic, and ardent, that it gushes out from the inside of the spirit, and that it vivifies our whole being and our performance. Faith that is illuminated by the head and warmed by the heart. Faith grants optimism to carry on in this life so full of calamities. It is like the bird who hears the branch on which he is perched croak when buffeted by the wind, he is not afraid, he has wings.

#### 4. GOD HAS CREATED THE COSMOS OUT OF NOTHING<sup>300</sup>.

1. To make something out of nothing is to create. To create is to give existence; to make a being to begin to exist<sup>301</sup>.

Nothing exists without sufficient reason, it is a philosophical reason. **J. A. Wheeler**, a renowned physicist<sup>302</sup> asks himself: Why does SOMETHING exist instead of NOTHING? The answer is evident. Because an ETERNAL BEING created out of NOTHING all that exists.

The question of why the being exists and not the nothing, seems to have been first brought up by **Leibniz**. Christian faith responds: *the world has been created by God*<sup>303</sup>. We must understand as *world* everything that exists outside of God.

**Creation** is the act by which God gives existence to everything which is not within Him<sup>304</sup>. Before creation, nothing existed outside of God. That is why, God created everything out of nothing. Because nothing and no one existed before the creation of the Universe, with the exception of God. That is why we say that God made out of nothing what exists out of Him.

The Bible says: God is the Author of all that exists, and therefore is before all creation. The Universe is God's work.

<sup>299</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum* Dogmatic Constitution of the Divine Revelation, n.5

<sup>300</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1805 Ed. Herder. Barcelona, First Vatican Council

<sup>301</sup> KAROL WOJTYLA. *Spiritual Exercises for the young*, 1ª, Ed. BAC POPULAR Madrid 1983

<sup>302</sup> MANUEL CARREIRA, S. I.: *El hombre en el cosmos*, VI, 1. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. Santander, 1997

<sup>303</sup> JUAN LUIS RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *Teología de la creación*, 1ª, IV, 1, 1. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>304</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 290

The Hebrew word “bara” means creation out of nothing. That is why in the bible it is applied only to God, because as men, we do not create, we only manufacture, transform matter.

The Bible says: God is the Author of all that exists, and therefore prior to all creation<sup>305</sup>. The Universe is God’s work<sup>306</sup>. God is the first cause of all that exists<sup>307</sup>.

God is the creator of all that exists. This is what the “creed” wants to say with the words “Creator of Heaven and Earth”

## 5.- Men cannot make things out of nothing<sup>308</sup>

1. To make things out of nothing is to **create**. The only one who can create is God<sup>309</sup>. Man cannot create, because to do something he requires of raw materials, the carpenter needs wood, the baker, flour, etc. Man only transforms the matter. Sometimes, these transformations are so original that we call them “creations”, but this way of speaking is not adequate.

God has created the Universe, because He has made it out of nothing

## 6. God made some beings by using others that already existed.

1. The same way a carpenter uses a saw to cut wood and make a table. Parents are mere instruments of God. They do not know if the child will be smart or dumb, tall or short, hale or sickly. Normally, rather than making things directly, “God has them happen”<sup>310</sup>. “Creation was not fully finished when it left the Creator’s hands!”<sup>311</sup>.

The expression “in the beginning” does not suggest that the world, as we see it today, had been completed when it left God’s hands at a given moment. There is no objection to admit a slow evolution of the beings in their apparition, and a continuous progress to forms that are more perfect as time goes by. What is affirmed is that at the beginning of time, the initial start, is in God. That moment in which you go from the existence of nothing of which we see, to the first existence of things, is what is called creation. The idea of creation has a very precise shade which distinguishes it from similes such as “production” or “construction”. It is making something completely new and original, starting from naught, in which nothing preexisting is presupposed, but it is the Maker Himself. There is no previous matter, there are no instruments, there is only the pure possibility. On this possibility God’s loving conduct is overturned, which makes it possible to bring this world to light. The evolution that follows

---

<sup>305</sup> II Maccabees, 7:28

<sup>306</sup> Genesis, 1:1

<sup>307</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 300

<sup>308</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 317

<sup>309</sup> ANTONIO DÚE, S. I.: *La Acción de Dios y la Ciencia, I, 2*. Ed. Escelier. Cádiz

<sup>310</sup> SANTIAGO LOREN, *Del electrón a Dios, VI pg. 416* Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona

<sup>311</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 302

is also God's work. With this difference: in the first moment, all is creation, in later moments it is a development, a display of the initial creation<sup>312</sup>.

2. Besides this visible world, there is also an invisible world to which the creative action of God is also extended, as we profess in the Creed. In the *Creed of the People of God* by **Paul VI** it is explicitly explained under the title of "things unseen". It must also be understood that "pure spirits which also receive the name of angels", confirming the traditional interpretation<sup>313</sup>. The First Vatican Council spoke of two orders of creatures, corporal and spiritual, as equivalents of world and angels<sup>314</sup>.

Jesus mentions angels as real and active creatures<sup>315</sup>. That is why the existence of angels is Dogma of Faith<sup>316</sup>; it was expressly defined by the Fourth Council of Lateran<sup>317</sup>.

The existence of angels is witnessed by innumerable passages of the Holy Scriptures, although we know little of their functions and nature. They are "messengers" of God in extraordinary moments of the History of Salvation. We know some names related to the function to which they were elected, such as **Michael, Raphael, Gabriel**. It is understood that they are many in number, distributed in hierarchies. In the beginning they were subjected to a test. A few succumbed to the test, having declared themselves in mutiny against God: they are the demons that were condemned to hell. Since then their existence seems to be concentrated in hating God and tempting men<sup>318</sup>. Amongst good angels, is the "Guardian Angel" that God gives each person in this world to guide him through the path of good<sup>319</sup>.

It is reasoned from the Sacred Scripture, according to the interpretation of the Holy Fathers, that God has given each man an angel for his particular defense and protection<sup>320</sup>.

The Bible says: "God has commanded His angels to keep you in all ways"<sup>321</sup>. In the Gospel<sup>322</sup> we find this testimony: **Jesus** said: "See that you do not despise any of these little ones, for I tell you: their angels in Heaven continually see the face of my Father"<sup>323</sup>.

3. **Sertillanges** says that the master work of **Satan** is to make men believe that he does not exist<sup>324</sup>. **The existence of Satan is a dogma of faith**<sup>325</sup>. It is defined in the Council of Lateran IV<sup>326</sup>. This has recently been confirmed by the church<sup>327</sup>.

<sup>312</sup> Libro Básico del Creyente Hoy, II, 2. Ed. PPC. Madrid. 1970

<sup>313</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 350

<sup>314</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1783 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>315</sup> LEON-DUFOUR, S.I.: *Vocabulario de Teología Bíblica. Voice "angels"* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>316</sup> MICHAEL SCHMAUS: *Teología Dogmática n° 119*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid

<sup>317</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 428 Ed. Herder. Barcelona.

<sup>318</sup> Matthew, 13:38ss

<sup>319</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 336

<sup>320</sup> FELIPE CALLE, O.S.A.: *Razona tu Fe. XZIV*, 3. Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid

<sup>321</sup> Psalm, 91:11

<sup>322</sup> Matthew, 18:10

<sup>323</sup> Libro básico del creyente de hoy. II, 3. Ed. PPC. Madrid. 1970

<sup>324</sup> LUIS CREUS VIDAL: *Introducción a la Apologética*, 2ª, 32. Ed. La Hormiga de oro. Barcelona

<sup>325</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 326

<sup>326</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia* n° 428 Ed. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>327</sup> Document of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith; ECCLESIA Magazine n° 1753 (16-III-75) 1057

The Bible says that God created the angels, and that some sinned and were cast out forever<sup>328</sup>, these are the demons. “Demons are fallen Angels<sup>329</sup>

A demon is an intelligent being, not human, who induces men to the bad or evil<sup>330</sup>.

A demon is portrayed with horns and a tail, but it is now understood that the devil does not have horns or tail, as he is spirit. He is represented in this fashion to express that he is a bad spirit.

The existence of the devil is clear in the bible, when **Eve's** temptation, in the tests of **Job**, etc., and above all in the Gospel<sup>331</sup>. **Christ**, upon hearing **Peter's** advice to escape from the cross tells him: “Get behind me Satan<sup>332</sup>”. This is to say that **Christ** assumes that **Satan** is somebody<sup>333</sup>. If not, this way of speaking would make no sense. The devil is a person<sup>334</sup>. This is how **Christ** considers it as He supposes that the devil has desires: He tells **Peter** that: “Satan wants to sift us like grain<sup>335</sup>”. And **Peter** calls **Satan** our adversary and affirms that he is looking for the way to harm us<sup>336</sup>.  
On another occasion **Christ** affirms that He expelled the devil<sup>337</sup>.

The existence of the devil as a personal being cannot be eliminated from the Bible without altering the very essence of the Christian message<sup>338</sup>. **D. Salvador Muñoz Iglesias** Professor of the Holy Scripture at the Seminary in Madrid, on the TV program “The Pulse of Faith”, stated: Whosoever denies the true existence of **Satan** has to admit that **Christ** either was wrong or He lied to us. If a Christian cannot admit any of these two things, he will have to accept the true existence of **Satan**” If there is anything clear in the reading of the New Testament it is that for **Jesus Christ** and the Apostles, the demon is a reality, a live reality and not a simple figuration or a ghost<sup>339</sup>. The devil “is the tempter who seeks our disgrace and wants to close the doors of the kingdom of heaven<sup>340</sup>”.

The Bible says that the devil tempts us because he is envious of us<sup>341</sup>, even though human nature being inferior to the angelic, we can save ourselves and he can't. That is why he wants to impede our eternal salvation<sup>342</sup>.

And in order to tempt us, he deceives us. **John** calls him: “liar<sup>343</sup>”.

There are over one hundred quotes of “devil” in the New Testament<sup>344</sup>.

<sup>328</sup> II PETER, 2:4; Jude, 6

<sup>329</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 414

<sup>330</sup> Matthew, 13:38s

<sup>331</sup> MICHEL SCHMAUS: *Teologia Dogmatica*, 2º, 2º, I. Ed. Rialp. Madrid

<sup>332</sup> Matthew, 16:2

<sup>333</sup> Declaration of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. ECCLESIA Magazine, n° 1 753 (16-23, VIII, 75)

<sup>334</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2851

<sup>335</sup> Luke, 22:31

<sup>336</sup> I Peter, 5, 8

<sup>337</sup> Matthew, 12:29

<sup>338</sup> MONDEN: *El milagro, signo de salud*. Pg. 127 173

<sup>339</sup> JOSÉ LUIS MARTIN DESCALZO: *Vida y misterio de Jesús de Nazaret*, 1º, XV, 1. Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca. 1987

<sup>340</sup> German Episcopal Conference. *Catecismo Católico para Adultos*, 1º, III, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>341</sup> Wisdom, 2:24

<sup>342</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 1º, III n° 64 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>343</sup> John, 8:44

<sup>344</sup> JOSÉ A. SAYÉS. *El Pecado Original*, IV, 3. Folleto. J.A.C. n°13 EDAPOR. Madrid. 1988

4. We are very interested in knowing when the world was created, in what time man appeared, which was the cradle of Humanity, but none of this is told to us in the Bible, as it is not a scientific book, rather a religious one, and the only thing that It is interested in telling us is that the world is God's work, and that God intervened in a special way in the creation of man<sup>345</sup>.

**Fr. Antonio Romaña, S. I.**, in his speech delivered when he was admitted to the Real Academia de Ciencias de Madrid, quoted this phrase from **Saint Augustine**: God in the Bible has not wanted to show us how heaven is going, but rather how you are going to heaven<sup>346</sup>.

The Holy Scripture does not have as a fundamental goal to communicate teachings on profane sciences, but to guide men to their eternal salvation<sup>347</sup>.

All in all, archeological discoveries confirm the biblical tales.

**Kenyon**, who was the director of the British Museum in London, states that the modern archeology investigation has corroborated the truth of the Scriptures<sup>348</sup>. I can categorically affirm that no previous archeological find has ever refuted a biblical reference. Dozens and dozens of archeological finds made up to date have come to affirm historical asserts of the Bible<sup>349</sup>. In 1957, **Alejandro Diez-Macho**, professor at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, discovered the **Codex Neophyti** at the Vatican Library, this is a manuscript of the Pentateuch in Aramaic, which was the language used in the times of **Jesus**. This manuscript has been edited in five volumes by the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas<sup>350</sup>.

5. The Bible tells us in the book of Genesis how God created the world. But in our way of talking, modern and occidental is different from that of the Bible, primitive and oriental, to which God in His revelations felt more comfortable with, The Bible expresses itself in a simple and figurative style, adapted to the mentality of that time. The theologian has to distinguish the content of the message revealed, the context in which it has been expressed. One must take into account that what the Bible is pretending is to transmit a religious teaching. Its mission is not to teach science or history<sup>351</sup>.

The bible did not propose any scientific end. Therefore, we should also not look in the bible for a scientific solution to the problems that modern science sets forth<sup>352</sup>. In the manner of speaking is where one can accommodate the way of thinking and expressing of the people which you are addressing. It is not the same to say one thing, than to affirm it. When saying it, I adjust myself to the way of speaking. When affirming it, I want to show it. When a child is told that the stork has brought him a little brother (although this manner of speaking is not recommendable), it is not affirmed that such is the way of making children, it is a

<sup>345</sup> LUIS ARNALDICH, O.F.M. *El origen del mundo y del hombre según la Biblia, 1*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid

<sup>346</sup> ANTONIO ROMAÑA, S. I.: *Estado actual de la Cosmología*. Ebro Observatory Publication

<sup>347</sup> ANGEL SANTOS RUIZ: *Vida y espíritu ante la Ciencia hoy, XVIII*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1970

<sup>348</sup> Sir FREDERICK KENYON: *The Bible and Archeology, pg.2791*. New York

<sup>349</sup> NELSON GLUECK: *Rivers in the Desert, pg.31*. New York

<sup>350</sup> ALEJANDRO DIEZ MACHO.: *Neophyti Manuscript, 1*. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. Madrid

<sup>351</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y problema religioso, IX, 2, B*. Unión Editorial. Madrid

<sup>352</sup> LUIS ARNALDICH, O.F.M. *La Biblia y la evolución, 1* Ed. BAC. Madrid



metaphoric and figurative way of speaking, erroneous and wrong, but the one who uses it considers it as the most adequate to make himself understood<sup>353</sup>.

**6. There can be no contradiction** between science and Faith, as both come from God. Science is the knowledge of the laws that God has put in Nature and Faith is the knowledge of the religious truths that God has revealed. All in all, one must take into account, that science looks at creation from the point of view of natural causes and that is why it is directly interested in its development in time and of the exact order of that development. The Bible, on the other hand looks at creation from God's point of view, as the primary and Universal cause, that is why it does not narrate anything pertaining to the objective temporary development, but it is fully attentive to the affirmation of the divine cause in each one of the elements of creation. And as far as the order and duration of the creative process, it selected a means of speaking that is suitable to what apparently was taking place in heaven – as it is contemplated from earth--, and to a truth that it is desirous to instill: the divine wisdom in creating, which is shown by proceeding in an ascending order, that is to say, from the most imperfect to the most perfect<sup>354</sup>; even though the evaluation is done according to the sensitive appearance and to the common way of speaking of these things in that time. The most important thing in the Bible is the message it wants to convey and not the way of speaking that it uses to teach it.

You have to take into account the **simple and popular** language it uses. Relative to the people to which it was addressing<sup>355</sup>. That is why the order it follows in the first chapters, as not in a few others, is not precisely chronological, but a determined logical order, and seeing things from Earth. It speaks in a popular way, according to appearances, not to scientific purposes<sup>356</sup>. That is why it states that a bat is a bird<sup>357</sup>, and it is a mammal, and that the sun goes around the earth, as it was **Joshua** who ordered the sun to stop, and the sun stopped in the middle of the sky<sup>358</sup>. Even today, even in scientific books is said that the Sun rises and the Sun sets, as if it were the Sun that goes around the earth. And we all know that the Sun, does not rise, nor does it set, but it is the Earth that, in its rotation, presents the sunrays in different parts of its surface. It is that we talk about things of heaven as we see them from here, and although this way of speaking is not exact or scientific, we all understand what we are wanting to say.

Similarly, when in the first chapter of the book of Genesis the word “day” is used in the narrative of the creation of the world, we must not understand it as a 24 hour period, but as a time space<sup>359</sup>. Speaking of the six days of the creation has a liturgical foundation, to instill the rest of the Sabbath. It presents God anthropologically, working six days and resting on the seventh<sup>360</sup>.

<sup>353</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRÁZ, S. I.: *¿De veras que el cristianismo no convence?*, O 50, Ed. Sal Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. Santander. 1972. Santander

<sup>354</sup> LUIS ARNALDICH, O.F.M.: *La Biblia y la evolución, II*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>355</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia n° 2127* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>356</sup> BIRNGRUBER: *Teología dogmática para seglares, n° 7* Ed. Litúrgica. Barcelona

<sup>357</sup> Leviticus, 11:19

<sup>358</sup> Joshua, 10:13

<sup>359</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 2128* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>360</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Dios y su obra, 3º, 1ª, IV, n°439*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

7. In what the Bible teaches, **there can be no error**, as it is a book inspired by God<sup>361</sup>, the being free of error ties each one of its books with the literary genre to which it belongs. Each literary genre in the Bible has its type of truth. As in a newspaper, one is the truth of the editorial article, another is the truth of the news from a news agency and another is the truth of the hyperbolic language of an advertisement. “There are no better”, “Superior to the best”, etc. Thus, one is a truth proper of the parable, in which it pretends to teach a truth without affirming each of the ornamental elements which make it pedagogical, another is the truth of a lyric song, that, as far as its sense and reality is concerned, must be judged according to the law of lyrics, another is the truth of a tale. In these, its author can want to affirm the historic reality of what he is narrating, in the substantial as well as in the details. But he can also only affirm the substance of the fact, without depriving himself, because of pedagogical and artistic reasons, to add to the substantial other elements whose historic reality does not assure anything.

You have to take into account that in an oriental mentality, it is not considered to be untruthful if you expand the narration with non historic details, but which contribute to the embellishment of the central event which is attempted to be transmitted. To distinguish between the historic and the ornamental details is no easy task. It is not a task that can be done by just anyone, but only by people who are prepared for the task, with a double preparation, scientific and theological. The Bible is a book which exists because of the joint and indivisible action of God and Man, God’s instrument, to whom God communicated His inspiration. His divine reality demands, in order to interpret it, theological preparation, and His human reality, scientific preparation; there cannot be a conflict amongst them if they are exercised with loyalty and intellectual rigor<sup>362</sup>.

The interpretation of the Bible is not a task that has to be forged and based **only** on science and competence, but above all through the adherence to faith and a humble acceptance of the word of God. This is why its reading presupposes a certain religious preparation, quite different from the spirit of criticism or curiosity. Above the particular interpretations is the judgment of the Church, to which **Christ** entrusted the intelligence of the true meaning of the Holy Books, conserved by the holy Fathers and transmitted by tradition and the Magisterium of the Church.

**The proper interpretation** of the passages of the Bible belongs to the authority of the Church, which is who has received from **Christ** the mission of teaching. The lay individual can make mistakes when interpreting some of the obscure passages. This is the origin of the multitude of erroneous and sometimes opposite interpretations of the Protestants, who admit the free personal interpretation of the Bible<sup>363</sup>. And **Peter** has already said: “There are passages in the Bible that are difficult to understand”<sup>364</sup>.

The task of authentically interpreting the word of God, written or transmitted, has been solely entrusted to the living Magisterium of the Church, whose authority is exercised in the name of **Christ**<sup>365</sup>. In the Gospel, underlying the true narratives of **Jesus Christ**, in a

<sup>361</sup> Second Vatican Council *Dei Verbum*: Dogmatic constitution on the Divine Revelation, n° 9.

<sup>362</sup> To better understand the Bible it is convenient to be prepared for it. DANIEL ROPS, ¿Que es la Biblia? Ed. Casal I Vall. Andorra

<sup>363</sup> Cristo en Casa. Curso Fundamental XXII Fe Católica. Maldonado. 1. Madrid.

<sup>364</sup> II PETER, 3:16

<sup>365</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum* Dogmatic Constitution on the Divine Revelation, n°. 10

hidden sense, in the background, as in a secret code, there usually is a theological content hidden in the narratives<sup>366</sup>. For example, the multiplication of the bread represents the Eucharist, the wedding at Canaan, the mediation of Mary, etc.

That is why, “according to an ancient tradition two senses can be distinguished in the Holy Scriptures: the literal sense and the spiritual sense<sup>367</sup>.”

To exactly understand what the author proposes in his writings, one must take into account the way of thinking, of expressing, of narrating that was used in the writer’s time, also, the expressions that were being used in ordinary conversation<sup>368</sup>. Each language has its own way of saying things. A Spaniard will say: “my head hurts”, while a Frenchman will say: “he has a pain in his head”, a Spaniard will say “he drinks a glass of beer” while a German will say that “he drinks the beer “that comes out of a glass”

Even admitting the **literary genre we** cannot deny that the Gospels relate true facts. We cannot say that they have falsified history or that they have invented it<sup>369</sup>.

Each verse of the Scriptures forces us to know the cultural medium in which the author finds himself- The recent finding of the Auxiliary Sciences of the exegesis have given us a deeper knowledge of the biblical world. This group of auxiliary knowledge is not, however, what is essential in the reading or interpretation of the bible. Above all, it is necessary to always bear in mind that the best way to understand the Word of God is to explain the Bible for the Bible itself: a teaching that is perhaps covered in a passage in a partial manner, incomplete, will frequently find its complement and its balance in other texts that are clearer, more developed and coherent. And together with the recourse of the same sacred text, it is necessary to pay attention to the interpretations of the Church’s Holy Fathers. These saints lived in human, social and religious conditions very similar to the conditions of the world at the time of the Gospel and also had a Christianity sharper and deeper than ours.

**8. The Church recognizes as sacred** all of the books of the Bible because “having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they had God as Author, because the inspired authors wrote everything and only what God wanted. That is why one must confess that the books of the Scriptures firmly teach with fidelity and without error the truth that God wanted to assign in the Holy Scriptures for our salvation<sup>370</sup>. The Bible is the Book of God.

The Church, in the Bible, “receives not only the human word, but the Word of God<sup>371</sup>, as the truths that are contained in the Holy Scriptures were assigned by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit<sup>372</sup>,

Even though the different parts that make it up were written by different authors, God is the principal author of all of them<sup>373</sup>. The list of the books inspired are in the “canon” published by the Church<sup>374</sup>.

<sup>366</sup> SECUNDINO CASTRO. *El sorprendente Jesús de Marcos*. REVISTA DE ESPIRITUALIDAD 47(1988)10

<sup>367</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 115

<sup>368</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum* Dogmatic Constitution on the Divine Revelation, n°. 12

<sup>369</sup> SALVADOR MUÑOZ IGLESIAS: *Los evangelios de la infancia, tomo IV, Epilogo*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>370</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum* Dogmatic Constitution on the Divine Revelation, n°. 11

<sup>371</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 104

<sup>372</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 105

<sup>373</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1787, Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>374</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 784, Ed. Herder. Barcelona

**Divine inspiration** is a supernatural influence of God over the reason and will of the Sacred Writer in the writing of the biblical texts. The inspired author is the instrument of God, but endowed with reason: it has personal characteristics. The inspiration, that “divine wind” has, respects the liberty and way of expression of each sacred author, who while maintaining his personality, carries out a job of reflection and writing to communicate what God wants him to write.

God’s inspiration notwithstanding, each author leaves his personal mark in the writings<sup>375</sup>. The same way that the stroke of a painter will vary according to how it was made, with a pen, brush or pencil: but the idea is always the author’s. In this way, above the literary differences existing among the different sacred books, God continues to be its author. The Bible, is a divine book<sup>376</sup>.

**Paul** says: “All the Scripture is inspired<sup>377</sup>”.

Inspiration is “the action that the Holy Spirit has exercised on the Holy writers so that they may write that which the Holy Spirit wanted to manifest<sup>378</sup>”.

As **Pius XII** stated in his encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu*, “the sacred author is instrument of the Holy Spirit” but “divine instrument endowed with reason”, that is to say, leaving his personal trait, personality, character, etc.

The Holy Spirit dictated what he wanted to be written. It was a silent internal dictation. The author would write according to his style of expression, not even being aware that he is writing under the influence of divine inspiration. The Holy Spirit wanted none the less, that each stroke be his<sup>379</sup>.

**9. Jehovah’s Witnesses** take advantage of the ignorance of their listeners to twist the Source of Revelation. They have their own translation of the Bible. New World Translation. The text of this translation differs in a radical way from the different Christian versions, Catholic and protestant. They reach theological conclusions that are diametrically opposed to traditional Christianity. This translation has received the unanimous repulse of all the exegetes, even the Protestants. “This volume is a clear proof as to how a translation is not to be made” says **H. H. Rowley**. And **A. Hoekema** says: “It is not an objective version of the sacred text, but a work full of prejudice that they have smuggled into the Bible<sup>380</sup>. In the book *En el Proceso a la Biblia de los Testigos de Jehová* written by the protestant pastor **Danyans**, in the foreword it says: Jehovah’s Witnesses have twisted the scriptures and have placed in circulation a Bible that is false and adapted to their prejudice. This is a sectarian Bible, and as such, is the negation of the genuine biblical spirit<sup>381</sup>”.

Faced with this cumulus of arbitrary situations bordering on sacrilege, because it is the Word of God, there is only one disjunctive: the translators of the Witnesses have failed in their quest because of ignorance or malice. If they do not know Greek and translated that way, they sinned because of ignorance, they should have never become translators of the Bible. If, however, they knew Greek very well, and did not translate properly. Then they

<sup>375</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la Fe Cristiana, 2ª, II, 24*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1975

<sup>376</sup> CESLAO SPICQ, O. P.: *La Biblia. Palabra de Dios*. Conference at the Instituto Aquinas de Estudios de Teología para Seglares.

<sup>377</sup> II Timothy, 3:16

<sup>378</sup> Dictionary of Catholic Theology, Vol. 7, col 2068

<sup>379</sup> LEO J. TRESE: *La fe explicada, I, 3*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1981. 6th Edition.

<sup>380</sup> PRUDENCIO DAMBORIENA, S. I.: IGLESIA-MUNDO Magazine nº 8 (12-XI-71)

<sup>381</sup> E. DANYANS: *Proceso a la Biblia de los Testigos de Jehová, II, 8*. Ed. Clie. Barcelona. 1971

sinned against the light. It is not strange, therefore, that this translation has merited the most severe of criticisms<sup>382</sup>.

This is why the Church wants the translations of the Bible to be published with ecclesiastical censorship, in order to assure the reader of the fidelity of the translation.

---

<sup>382</sup> AGUSTIN PANERO, Redentorist, NO a los Testigos de Jehová'a. Ed. Clie. Barcelona. 1971

## **Origin of Life**

10. **God is the Author of life**, even in an evolutionist hypothesis we must accept some laws that direct this evolution

**Juan Oró**, a Spaniard working for NASA in the USA, is leading the team that analyzed the lunar rocks that the astronauts brought back and whose opinion was definitive to state that there is no life on Mars, is of the opinion that life appeared through a gradual chemical process of evolution which conduces to the progressive generation according to determined laws, even though we are far away from having a clear comprehension of the laws that govern the evolution of the elemental particles<sup>383</sup>

Soviet Biologist **Alexander Oparin** explains the origin of life in this manner: "In the primitive terrestrial atmosphere, with some relatively simple compounds, principally methane, ammonia, water vapor and sulfuric acid, and with the presence of electrical discharges and ultraviolet rays, numerous and varied organic substances with a complex molecule were formed. These products were part of the hydrosphere, when carried away by rain, and once there, they suffered additional modifications and further increment in their complexity<sup>384</sup>.

In April 1985, Newsweek echoed the presentation of a group of NASA biochemists, whose tests indicate that clay was a catalyst in the formation of the first organic compounds. It could be an explanation of that that the Bible says: "Life was born of clay"<sup>385</sup>.

One of the world's experts on the matter, **Leslie Orgel**, demonstrates in the scientific magazine *Nature* that the origin of life could have appeared in the clay<sup>386</sup>.

**Stanley Miller and Harold Urey** in 1953 prepared an experiment in which they sent an electrical current through a mixture of methane, ammonia, nitrogen and water vapor, they managed to synthesize amino acids which form part of proteins<sup>387</sup>.

**D. José Sánchez-Real**, doctor of Chemical Sciences. And professor in Valencia has the opinion that the reaction that **Oparin** situates on the surface of the earth, could have happened in the higher strata of the atmosphere<sup>388</sup>

In any case, as **Oparin** himself writes in his works, with a plethora of formulas and chemical reactions. All of this supposes some laws and to the laws intelligence. This intelligence we call GOD.

---

<sup>383</sup> YA Newspaper Sunday, 20-V-79, pg. 5

<sup>384</sup> ALEJANDRO OPRIN: *Origen de la vida sobre la Tierra*. V. Ed. Tecnos. Madrid. 1970

<sup>385</sup> ALGO Magazine (VII, 1985)23

<sup>386</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 2-V-96. pg. 63

<sup>387</sup> FRED HOYLE: *Universo inteligente*, pg. 20. Ed. Grijalbo. Barcelona. 1984

<sup>388</sup> IBERICA de actualidad Científica Magazine 150(XI, 1974)452

That is why we say God is the Author of LIFE

He, **Oparin**, at the IV International Conference on the Origin of Life, held in Barcelona in 1973, stated: “The origin of life is not happenchance. It completely conforms to the laws of Nature”.

And **Stuart Mill**: “The laws of Nature cannot by themselves, offer an explanation of their own origin<sup>389</sup> .

**John B. Haldane**, an eminent British physiologist-geneticist, professor at the University of Cambridge, affirms that the origin of life is impossible without a pre-existing intelligent being<sup>390</sup> .

Serendipity did not form life; it is based on very precise laws<sup>391</sup> .

**Salvador de Madariaga**: “The world cannot even be conceived but as the execution of a project that preceded it”<sup>392</sup> . The change from micro molecules to macromolecules is carried out according to rules and laws<sup>393</sup> .

**Mardo Bersanelli**, director of the program for the European Space Agency that studies the Big Bang, has manifested that “Each time it is more evident that the structure of the Universe and the eras of its History are arranged, made on purpose, so that life would emerge from within<sup>394</sup> .

**Fred Hoyle**, a distinguished British scientist, who in 1972 was knighted for his scientific work, affirms: Life could have been provided by chance<sup>395</sup> .

11. **The basis of life**, is in the nucleic acids and in the amino acids. Amino acids are the components of the proteins<sup>396</sup> . Proteins are the bricks of the cells<sup>397</sup> . These macro molecules are essential in all living beings<sup>398</sup> .

There is a law that from the first amino acids and nuclides formed in the primitive waters, these have conduced through millions of years of evolution up to the formation of the human DNA<sup>399</sup> .

The molecule of the deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) fundamental component of the chromosomes, is the bearer of the genetic information. Each cell can possess dozens of

<sup>389</sup> JOSÉ M. CIURANA.: *Pruebas racionales de la existencia de Dios, V. D.* Difusora del Libro. Madrid. 1977

<sup>390</sup> MARIANO VIGANO, S. I.: LA CIVILTÁ CATÓLICA, 3 051(6-26.VIII.1977)

<sup>391</sup> IVAN EFREMOV: *Naves de estrellas, II.* Ed. Bruguera. Barcelona. 1971

<sup>392</sup> SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA: *Dios y los Españoles, pg. 37 E.* Planeta. Barcelona

<sup>393</sup> VINTILA HORIA: *Viaje a los centros de la Tierra, 2º, III, 6.* Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona. 1971

<sup>394</sup> ABC Cultural, nº 280 (14-III-97) 60

<sup>395</sup> FRED HOYLE: *El Universo inteligente, I. 1.* Ed. Grijalbo. Barcelona. 1984

<sup>396</sup> JUAN RAMÓN LACADENA: *Manipulación genética, 2, 21.* Universidad de Comillas, Madrid.

<sup>397</sup> J. ALCAZAR GODOY: *El origen del hombre, II, 1. a.* Ed. M.C. Madrid.1986

<sup>398</sup> DR. JIMENEZ VARGAS.: *El origen de la vida, I, 4.* Madrid

<sup>399</sup> PIERO PASOLINI.: *Las grandes ideas que han revolucionado la ciencia en el ultimo siglo, I, 4.* Ed. Ciudad Nueva. Madrid. 1981.

chromosomes. Each chromosome possesses hundreds of genes. Genes are chains of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA)<sup>400</sup>.

**Harada** synthesized amino acids, which are the structural components of the proteins<sup>401</sup>, by subjecting them to temperatures of one thousand degrees Centigrade, ammonia, water vapor and methane gas, three volcanic byproducts which were probably very abundant in the primitive atmosphere.

Nevertheless, the complexity of the protein far from being a disorder is a supreme order. That is to say, we always have to admit laws which direct evolution<sup>402</sup>.

**Dr. George Wald**, a biologist at Harvard, Nobel Prize Winner, told the International Congress on the Origin of Life in Barcelona in June 1973: "There is no opposition between the acceptance of a scientific explanation on the origin of life and a belief in God, since He is the author of the laws which govern the biological process"<sup>403</sup>.

Nowadays, quite a few scientists, at least among the occidental, consequently admit an ending tendency in the development of forms. Truly, the last discoveries lately, in a particular way, those realized in the sector of the living structures, are demonstrating the existence of laws in the vital phenomena, where simple chance is excluded, even just by the calculation of probabilities<sup>404</sup>.

Life and evolution have a sense, it is not absolute luck<sup>405</sup>

**Oparin** himself recognizes that the laws of Nature cannot be a product of casualty, but he does not question the origin of these laws.

To recognize the existence of the laws of nature and not ask oneself about the origin of them is going halfway. If we were to ask ourselves about the last origin of these laws, we would get to God.<sup>406</sup>

12. Life could have begun in the world at a determined moment, according to the laws placed by God in Nature. It seems as though this took place some 3,000 million years ago<sup>407</sup>. It began in a very simple fashion, and little by little it evolved towards man who is the supreme manifestation of life on Earth.

The evolution of life on Earth supposes laws that have directed it.

The natural selection of evolution is produced through mutation of the hereditary characters in the genes of the chromosomes. But this process has followed some laws that

<sup>400</sup> PASCUAL JORDAN: *Creación y misterio*. VI, 3. Ed. EUNSA. Pamplona. 1978

<sup>401</sup> IBERICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine, n 187 (III, 1978) 91

<sup>402</sup> G. Elliot, S. I.; *Evolución, marxismo y cristianismo*, I. Ed., Palaza y Janés. Barcelona

<sup>403</sup> Interview on Televisión Española, 21-VI-73, "24 Horas" program

<sup>404</sup> SEBASTIAN BARTINA, S. I.: *Hacia los orígenes del hombre*, I, 1. Ed. Garriga. Barcelona

<sup>405</sup> JOSÉ BASABÉ: *El origen de la vida en la historia del Mundo*. K Ed. Salvat. Barcelona. 1970

<sup>406</sup> JOSÉ A. SAYÉS: *Dios existe*, II, 1. b Ed. EDAPOR. Madrid. 1982.

<sup>407</sup> C. LEURRIEEE: *El origen de la vida*, III. Ed. Istmo. Madrid. 1971



have directed the line of evolution. The whole process has been programmed so that at the end man would appear. There has been a privileged direction, an end. Without doubt, this end is in a superior plane to the simple evolution of the matter<sup>408</sup>.

Whether life began on Earth or whether it came from another heavenly body is not essential as it only postpones the matter of time to another time and place, as **Dr. Robert Jastrow**, the celebrated American Astronomer explains<sup>409</sup>.

Besides, the cosmic rays would have ended with the possibility of life in interplanetary travel.

---

<sup>408</sup> DR. BERMUDO MELÉNDEZ: *Las bases científicas del evolucionismo*, pg. 89. Ed. ADUE. Madrid.

<sup>409</sup> ROBERT JASTROW: *El telar mágico*. Ed. Salvat. Barcelona. 1985

## Origin of Man

13. An international group of scientists, led by investigator **Russell Clochon**, of the University of Iowa, USA, discovered in China, human remains that date back two million years.<sup>410</sup>

American scientist, **D. Richard Leakey**, in 1972 in Tanzania, near Lake Rudolph, on the frontier with Kenya, discovered some human remains considered to be the most ancient of those discovered up to this date. They date back some 2,500,000 years<sup>411</sup>.

In November 1974, anthropologist **Donald Johanson** discovered in Ethiopia, a skeleton of a female, probably a hominid. It is the oldest, most complete and best preserved of the skeletons belonging to a past member of the human race. It is a biped hominid, three and a half million years old. It was baptized *Lucy*<sup>412</sup>

In 1994, a team from Berkeley University, in collaboration with experts from the University of Tel Aviv, in Israel, found in the dry river bed of the Awash River in Ethiopia, a collection of human fossils contemporary to *Lucy*<sup>413</sup>.

Recently, **Maeve Leakey**, wife of **Richard Leakey**, discovered a hominid in Kenya, the *Australopithecus anamnesis*, whose antiquity is four million years. It is considered as the "father" of *Lucy*<sup>414</sup>

The oldest human remains are in Spain<sup>415</sup>, At Atapuerca in the province of Burgos. **Jose Manuel Bermudez**, has found human remains of 800,000 years of age<sup>416</sup>, And **Jose Gilbert is** of the opinion that the *Hombre de Orce* (Granada), lived there a million years ago.<sup>417</sup>

If we were to put the history of the cosmos into a year, the Big Bang, would be at the beginning of January, and all of mankind's history could occupy only the last minute of the 31<sup>st</sup> of December in that hypothetical year, in which each day is the equivalent of fifty million years And **Christ** would appear on December 31<sup>st</sup> at 11 hours, 59 minutes and 50 seconds.

14. The Bible tells of the Creation of the **first man**: of his material body and his spiritual and immortal soul<sup>418</sup>.

Because of this we cannot simply say that man comes from the ape. It is necessary to admit the special intervention of God. The body can come through the evolution of matter, but not the soul, which is spiritual. The human soul is incorporated by God at the time of conception<sup>419</sup>. Never can the spirit come from the evolution of matter.<sup>420</sup> The jump from the

<sup>410</sup> ABC Newspaper, 6-XI-95, pg. 78

<sup>411</sup> DR. EMILIANO AGUIRRE: Hominidos Fósiles. Revista IBERICA, nº 160 (X-1975)331

<sup>412</sup> IBERICA de Actualidad Científica, Magazine nº 248 (X-83)360

<sup>413</sup> ABC Newspaper, 1-IV-94, pg. 62.

<sup>414</sup> ABC Newspaper, 17-VIII-95. pg.60.

<sup>415</sup> ABC Newspaper, 5-IX-95, pg. 49

<sup>416</sup> ABC Newspaper, 14-VIII-95. pg.47.

<sup>417</sup> ABC Newspaper, 5-IX-95, pg 49

<sup>418</sup> Genesis, 2:7

<sup>419</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARINO, O. P.: *Dios y su Obra*, 3º, 1, V. A, nº 445. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>420</sup> IAN G. BARBOUR: *Problemas sobre Religión y Ciencia*. 3ª, XII, 2, 1. Ed. Sal. Terrae. Santander

material to the spiritual can only come through the intervention of God. Between ape and man there is an abyss. This abyss is intelligence. And intelligence is of a spiritual order<sup>421</sup>.

Nobel Prize Winner in Medicine, **John C. Eccles**, said in the prologue to "The Frontiers of Evolutionism" the following: "Each soul is a new divine creation. I permit myself to say that no other explanation can be sustained<sup>422</sup>."

The Church has always insisted on the fact that the human soul, being spiritual, can only exist by having been created, and it is not possible for it to come from an inferior animal through evolution.<sup>423</sup>

**Pius XII** in the Encyclical "*Humani Generis*" says: "The Catholic faith obliges us to uphold that the human soul has been created immediately by God<sup>424</sup>."

However, **there is no difficulty** in admitting, within the Catholic doctrine, that God infused the spiritual soul in an anthropomorphic monkey<sup>425</sup>. The body of an animal is not less worthy than a piece of clay to receive the spiritual breath of God.

In the Biblical history of the formation of the first man that which we want to emphasize is that man comes from God<sup>426</sup>.

The intervention of God in the infusion of the spiritual soul in man is explained in the Bible with the words: "*Let us make man in our image and likeness...*" And "*God created man in his image*<sup>427</sup>." Man is the image of God in the spiritual soul, since God-Creator, does not have a material body. God is pure spirit.

"**Soul**" signifies the spiritual beginning of man.<sup>428</sup>

The reason man carries within him the image and likeness of God is not because of his body, but because of his spiritual soul, which carries understanding and will. Without a doubt, the Hebrew word *bará* (*created*) explains a special divine action.<sup>429</sup>

"Man is the masterpiece of creation"<sup>430</sup> As he was made in the image of God, the human being has the dignity of a person, he is not something, he is someone.<sup>431</sup>

"In the evolution of the Universe and of life, there comes a moment, when, overcoming the material and inferior inner energies, an energy of an eminently superior quality appeared, human psychic energy appeared on Earth.<sup>432</sup>"

**Darwin** had the insight of how the origin of man could have been, but in his time the hominid fossils were hardly known<sup>433</sup>. This is stated by **Dr. Bermudo Melendez**, professor of Paleontology at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

<sup>421</sup> PARENTE: *De Dios al Hombre*, VI, 4. Ed. Atenas. Madrid

<sup>422</sup> MARIANO ARTIGAS: *Las Fronteras del Evolucionismo*. Ed. Epalsa. Madrid. 1985

<sup>423</sup> E. C. MESSENGER: *El Génesis y el Origen del Hombre*. I. 6. Ed. Guadarrama. Madrid

<sup>424</sup> Acta Apostolicae Sedis. 42(1.950)575

<sup>425</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Dios y su Obra*, 3º, 1ª, V, B, nº 447. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>426</sup> ANGEL SANTOS RUIZ: *Vida y Espíritu ante la Ciencia, hoy*, XVIII, Ed. Rialp. Madrid, 1970

<sup>427</sup> Genesis 1:26s

<sup>428</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 363

<sup>429</sup> SEBASTIAN BARTINA, S. I. *Hacia los Orígenes del Hombre*, IIOI. I. Ed. Garriga. Barcelona

<sup>430</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 343

<sup>431</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 357

<sup>432</sup> MARTIN BRUGAROLA, S. I. *Sociología y Teología de la Técnica* 3ª, XIX, 4. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>433</sup> DR. BERMUDO MELENDEZ. Professor of Paleontology at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. *Las Bases Científicas del Evolucionismo*. pg. 88 Ed. A.D.U.E. Madrid. 1983

In other words, in the times of **Darwin's** theory of evolution, it was a hypothesis without due proof. That is why the church, which is very prudent, does not accept a scientific hypothesis immediately. but rather it waits that said working hypothesis be consolidated and its harmony with God's Revelation be studied.

15. This theory that God used the body of an ape in order to create the first man is called **evolutionism**. There are many theologians who defend this theory, and it is not condemned by the Church. From the point of view of Faith and Philosophy there is no inconvenience in admitting the theory of evolution. Science has the last word. But the theory of evolution does not eliminate the need of an ordering intelligence. To admit order in this world and not to ask about its cause is like finding a television set on top of a mountain and attributing it to chance<sup>434</sup>. The texts of the Bible<sup>435</sup> do not attempt to give us a scientific explanation of the way in which **Adam and Eve** were made, but rather something much more profound: man is the work of God and woman is of the same nature as man<sup>436</sup>.

Genesis is the symbolic narration of the origin of Humanity.

The Bible is full of **anthropomorphisms** which one must know how to interpret. By the image of the Divine breath we mean to say that man received something from God that turned him into man. This something we call the spiritual soul. And when it says that **Eve** came from the rib of **Adam** it means that woman is of the same nature as man<sup>437</sup>. The making of woman from the rib of man wants to express that the dignity of woman is the same as that of man.<sup>438</sup>

In the Encyclical *Humani Generis* (1950) Pius XII affirms regarding evolution: "The Church leaves the doctrine of evolution as an open question, as long as the speculations are limited to the development of the human body beginning with other existing living matter."

It is possible that man and ape actually come from a common trunk, but although the body of man may come through evolution from an anthropomorphic ape, we are not going to say that man is a naked ape. The chicken also comes from an egg and we do not say that the chicken is an egg with feathers. Man is much more than an animal and to put aside man's spiritual side is a mistaken vision of what man really is.

**Man is something more than a simple animal.** In man there is a spiritual soul that cannot come through evolution of matter but rather as God's creation. Man is more than the result of biological evolution<sup>439</sup>

The effect can never be greater than the cause which produces it. You cannot get a flower from a stone, you need a seed. The seed has life unlike the stone. No one can give what he does not have. If I only have 50 cents in my pocket I cannot give you 100 cents.

That the spiritual is produced by matter, from the viewpoint of logic, is inadmissible<sup>440</sup>. If the soul cannot come from matter, its existence can only be explained by the creative intervention of God.<sup>441</sup>

<sup>434</sup> JOSE SAYES: *Dios Existe, II, 1, e*. Ed. EDAPOR. Madrid. 1983

<sup>435</sup> Génesis 2:7, 21ss

<sup>436</sup> FLICK, S. I. and ALSZEGHY, S. I.: *Los Comienzos de la Salvación, II, B. 9*. Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca

<sup>437</sup> LUIS ARNALDICH, O. F. M.: *La Evolución, pg. 807*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>438</sup> ANGEL SANTOS RUIZ: *Vida y Espíritu ante la Ciencia Hoy, XVIII*. Ed. Rail. Madrid 1970.

<sup>439</sup> German Episcopal Conference: *Catecismo Católico para Adultos I<sup>o</sup>, III, A. c*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>440</sup> LUIS ARNALDICH, O. F. M.: *La Biblia y la Evolución, III*. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>441</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup>. CIURANA: *Fundamentos Racionales de la Existencia del Alma, III, A. c*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1978

That souls are immediately created by God is a point of view which Faith imposes on us<sup>442</sup>.

**Pius XII** adds in his Encyclical *Humani Generis*: "Faith orders us to defend that souls are immediately created by God."<sup>443</sup> But he also admits that "in order to form the body of the first man, he could have used the body of an anthropomorphous ape"<sup>444</sup>

Some time ago the Church received the theory of evolution with **mistrust**. Less than for the fault of **Darwin**, Father of the theory (he himself was a believer<sup>445</sup> who accepted God as the Author of the laws which control evolution<sup>446</sup>, as we say today) but more because of the fault of **Huxley** who was materialistic and who excluded God from the evolutionary process, making evolution "a new religion"<sup>447</sup>.

**Charles Robert Darwin** not only was a believer, but began to study as a clergyman, although later on he left this to dedicate himself to his real calling: Natural History. Because of this he always treated the reasoning not only from the scientific point of view but without ever putting it in conflict with his religious convictions. **Darwin** believed that evolution was due to "the general laws imposed by the Creator"<sup>448</sup>. At the end of his book "The Origin of the Species" published in 1859, **Darwin** says: "It is grandiose, the spectacle of the varied forces of life which God infused in the created being making him develop in forms each time more beautiful and admirable." "Life with its diverse faculties was infused in its origins by the Creator."<sup>449</sup>

**Darwin** wrote to **Marx** in 1880, rejecting the dedication in the English edition of "Das Kapital" because of its materialism.<sup>450</sup>

16. It is important to warn of the fact that evolution is a **hypothesis** and not something which is scientifically irrefutable. It is affirmed but it cannot be proven<sup>451</sup>.

There are more adversaries of evolution each day. Some scientists (**Louis Bounoure, Von-Hexkuell, Hermann Nielsen, Herbert Nilsson, etc.**) believe that evolution is not possible, because evolution only takes place within one species, but it is not possible to pass from one species to another.<sup>452</sup>

There are many scientists that reject Darwin's theory/ **Prof. Wilder Smith**, investigator in Biochemistry, has published a book, a well documented book, against biological evolution.<sup>453</sup>

**G. Sermonti**, professor of Genetics at the Universidad de Perugia, and **R. Fondi**, professor of Paleontology at the Universidad de Siena. have jointly written a book in which they deny all

<sup>442</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *Razones para Creer*, I, 3. E. Paulinas. Madrid. 1992

<sup>443</sup> IAN G. BARBOUR: *Problemas de Religión y Ciencia*, 3ª, XII, 2, 1. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1971

<sup>444</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P. *La Fe de la Iglesia*, 2ª, IV, 123. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1979

<sup>445</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y Problema Religioso. Introducción*. Unión Editorial. Madrid. 1984

<sup>446</sup> IAN G. BARBOUR: *Problemas de Religión y Ciencia*, 1ª, IV, 2, 1. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1971

<sup>447</sup> IAN G. BARBOUR: *Problemas de Religión y Ciencia*, 3ª, XII, 5, 1. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1971

<sup>448</sup> J. HUXLEY: *Religion without Revelation*. Harper and Brothers. New York.

<sup>449</sup> PIERO PASOLINI: *Las Grandes Ideas que han Revolucionado la Ciencia en el Ultimo Siglo*, 1 Ed. Ciudad Nueva. Madrid.

<sup>450</sup> CHARLES DARWIN: *Orígenes de las Especies. Recapitulación* Imprenta José de Rojas. Madrid

<sup>451</sup> E. M. UREÑA: *Marx and Darwin. History of Political Economy*. IX(1977)555

<sup>452</sup> MARIANO ARTIGAS: *Las Fronteras del Evolucionismo*, IV, 2s. Ed. Epalsa. Madrid. 1985

<sup>453</sup> JOSE M. CIURANA: *El fin del Materialismo Ateo*, III, C, d. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

determining value relating to the Darwinist natural selection<sup>454</sup>

The famous contemporary scientist **Sir Fred Hoyle** in his book, "*The Intelligent Universe*" has written: "Darwin's theory is erroneous"<sup>455</sup>.

The Italian newspaper "*Corriere de la Sera*" on August 25<sup>th</sup>, 1992 tells of the intervention of **Richard Milton**, a British specialist, in the Congress of the British Progress of Science Association. He said, "The Darwinist myth has been totally destroyed."

**Michael Canton**, Director of the Center for Investigation in Human Genetics of Sidney (Australia), is of the opinion that **Darwin** was wrong

**Pierre Paul Grasse**, Member of the French Academy and considered to be the first zoologist in the world, says that Darwinism contains important fallacies and warns: "One has to make the biologists think about the superficiality of the interpretations and extrapolations which the doctrinaire presents as truths."<sup>456</sup>

Recently, famous biologist and mathematician **Jorge Salet** in his book "*Azar y Certeza*"<sup>457</sup> mathematically demonstrates the impossibility of a progressive evolution. Affirming that from the origin of life some 3,000 million years ago there has not been enough time for the first live cell to evolve up until man, since the number of probabilities is in the order of ten elevated to the power of minus one hundred ( $10^{-100}$ ). That is to say, a probability so minute that for scientists it is practically impossible.

17. The problem presents itself regarding if it was just one couple or whether there were many which God transformed into men. The first theory is called "**monogenism**". The second is called "**polygenism**".

The theology of original sin has always been expressed under the "monogenism" concept regarding the origin of man. Currently, theologians have carried out serious intents seeking an explanation for the original sin on the hypothesis of "polygenism"<sup>458</sup>, but as yet they have not reached a fully satisfactory solution. "Monogenism" cannot be considered a revealed doctrine or one which is taught infallibly by the Church<sup>459</sup>; but it is a doctrine which is considered by good theologians as a doctrine which is close to the doctrine of faith. The Supreme **Pontiff Pius XII** said the following in his Encyclical *Humani Generis* regarding this intention: "When dealing with another hypothesis, that of the so-called polygenism, the children of the Church cannot enjoy the same liberty. Because the faithful cannot embrace the opinion of those who affirm: that after **Adam**, there were true men on Earth who did not come from that man who as the first father of all through natural generation, but that **Adam** signifies a kind of multitude of our first parents. It cannot be seen in any way how this sentence can be reconciled with the sources of revealed truth and those documents of the Magisterium of the Church which deal with original sin, which comes from the sin truly committed by a single **Adam** and transmitted to all through generations, belongs to each one of us"<sup>460</sup>. "**Pope Pius XII** does not say that polygenism cannot be reconciled with the

<sup>454</sup> SERMONTI-FONDI: *Dopo Darwin. Critica del Evolucionismo*. Rusconi. Milano. 1980

<sup>455</sup> FRED HOYLE: *El Universo Inteligente*, pg. 48 Ed. Grijalbo. Barcelona. 1984

<sup>456</sup> P. GRASSE: *Evolución de lo Viviente*, pg. 27. Madrid. 1984

<sup>457</sup> SALET: *Azar y Certeza*. Ed. Alambra. Madrid. 1975

<sup>458</sup> FLICK, S. I. and ALSZEGHY, S. I. *Anthropologic Theological*. Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca. 1970

<sup>459</sup> RUDOLPH LIEBIG: *La Otra Revelación, III, 6, b*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander.

<sup>460</sup> PIUS XII: *Humani Generis* Encyclical, n° 30

faith, but that “he does not see how it can be done”. That leaves the door open for a possibility of reconciliation.

The hypothesis of monogenism has a scientific confirmation, according to professor **Francisco Grande Covian**, the genetic DNA information of the mitochondria confirms that all humanity comes from the same mother.<sup>461</sup>

Mitochondria are cellular structures in the cytoplasm which surround the nucleus of the cell.

A group of geneticists from Berkeley University headed by **A. C. Wilson**, when studying the mitochondria DNA, suggested that it was the monogenic origin of humanity.<sup>462</sup>

## 7. MAN IS A DISTINGUISHED ANIMAL IN THAT HE HAS AN INTELLIGENT SOUL.

1. First Vatican Council states: “From the beginning of time, God created man in body and spirit, the angelic and the mundane, and then the mundane consisted of body and soul<sup>463</sup>.”

The human soul was created by God directly from nothing<sup>464</sup>

Man lives because of his soul.<sup>465</sup> The soul vivifies the body. The soul is the fountain of life of man.<sup>466</sup> The soul is the vital sign of man.<sup>467</sup> This refers to the existence of faith. The church has expressly defined this.<sup>468</sup>

The existence of the soul is something so clear that one cannot doubt it in a healthy philosophy. A growing number of scientists who in dealing with the real existence of the human soul, leave the materialist dogma which flatly forbids speaking of it under the pretext that it has been “scientifically” demonstrated that it does not exist.<sup>469</sup>

The soul is the spiritual principle of man.<sup>470</sup> **The soul is the spiritual part of man** which survives the body, and is the seat of the spiritual operations such, as for example, the act of reasoning.

That the duality of body-soul is of a platonic origin does not exclude that it also be revealed doctrine. **Paul**<sup>471</sup> analyzes the human being in the elements that conform it. The *psije* (soul) appears as different to the body (*soma*)<sup>472</sup>

The soul is part of a whole whose dual composition is evident from the diversity of functions with mutual influences, but with clear results peculiar to each part. It is a non-material reality, responsible for man’s free and conscious activity.<sup>473</sup>

Karl Popper, one of the first class personalities of modern philosophy of Science who was enrolled in the Marxist movements until he was convinced that Marxism is a pseudoscientific and anti-human doctrine, affirms that the human language implies a capability for reasoning which must be considered to be superior to the knowledge of the animals.

<sup>461</sup> ABC Newspaper, 16-III-88, pg. 3

<sup>462</sup> ABC CULTURAL Newspaper dated 25-VI-1993, pg. 54

<sup>463</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia* n° 1.783. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>464</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La Fe de la Iglesia*, 2ª, IV, n° 122. Ed. BAC. Madrid, 1979

<sup>465</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y Problema Religioso*, pg. 157. Unión Editorial. Madrid. 1979

<sup>466</sup> German Episcopal Conference: *Catechism for Adults*, 3ª, III, 3. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1984

<sup>467</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 3ª, I, 164. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>468</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 481. Ed. Herder. Barcelona.

<sup>469</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y Problema Religioso*, V. Unión Editorial. Madrid. 1984

<sup>470</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n°. 363

<sup>471</sup> Thessalonians, 5:23

<sup>472</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *Más allá de la Muerte*. IV, 2. E. San Pablo, Madrid. 1996

<sup>473</sup> MANUEL Mª, CARREIRA, S. I.: *Metafísica de la Materia IX*. Universidad de Comillas. Madrid. 1993

**John Eccles**, Nobel Prize Winner in Neuro-Physiology for his research on the brain, shares with **Popper** the rejection of materialism and admits the existence in man of a spiritual soul.<sup>474</sup>

Personally, I feel forced to believe that something exists, which we could call the supernatural origin of my unrepeatably self-consciousness, or my unrepeatably individuality or soul.<sup>475</sup> We must recognize that the Id is the effect of a supernatural creation, that which in a religious sense is called soul<sup>476</sup>

The soul is the “form”, an ontic structure that is unique in man. That which makes him a being, precisely, a man. It is something real that is to say, as is indicated by the definition of real, effective and true existence.<sup>477</sup>

The vital principle, we call soul. For such a reason, in the absolute, we could talk about the vegetative soul in the plants, of a sensitive soul in animals and of a rational soul in man. But folklore has reduced the name of “soul” to the vital principle of man, which is intellectual, spiritual and immortal.

The concept of the soul is something which can never be given up by all humanist anthropologists from the moment in which it is agreed in designating with this concept the qualitative and entity difference which makes man stand out from any other mundane reality.<sup>478</sup>

I feel as the same person as when I was a child. However, the majority of the material elements of my body have changed and have transformed. But there is something in me that gives continuity to my being. The soul which gives conscience of my Id, reason for which I think and love with freeness.<sup>479</sup>

It seems as though some don't dare to speak any more about the soul. Some priests avoid the respectable formula of the catechism as though we find ourselves before an element of Greek philosophy, strange to revelation; before a breakdown of the human reality, in fact indivisible.... Evidently a segment of the teachings of the Church are thus obligated in this way, and several essential aspects of the Church fade due to the lack of the idea of the soul which gave them consistency of expression... The existence of the soul, a spiritual principle that is inaccessible to all corruption, forms part of the doctrine of the faith.<sup>480</sup>

The German theologian **Ratzinger** Prefect of the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith says: “It seems to me that the time has come for a rehabilitation in the theology of the tabooed concepts of: “immortality” and “soul”. Certainly they are not free of problems... but to throw them out is naïve<sup>481</sup>.”

As **Malebranche** says, “man has a body, but it is not a body”. The one who has is different to the one had.<sup>482</sup> Man is something more than his body. “It is the spirit which makes us people. Without it, we would only be matter. We would only be animals.<sup>483</sup>”

One of the most eminent men in contemporary British science is **Sir Francis Walshe** who says: “I believe that we must return to the old concept of the spiritual soul: this integral part of the nature of man which is something immaterial, incorporeal, without which one is not a human person.” and **C. S. Lewis**, former Professor of Oxford University, said: “Nature is absolutely incapable of producing thought.... This supernatural element in man, demonstrates that something exists above and beyond Nature.”<sup>484</sup>

<sup>474</sup> MARIANO ARTIGAS: *Las Fronteras del Evolucionismo, III, 10s. Ed. Epalsa. Madrid. 1985*

<sup>475</sup> JOHN ECCLES: *El Cerebro y la Mente, III, 4, d. Ed. Herder. Barcelona. 1985*

<sup>476</sup> F. WALSHE: *Mind and Brain, pg. 132s/ Talafous. New York*

<sup>477</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y Problema Religioso, V. Unión Editorial. Madrid. 1984*

<sup>478</sup> JUAN LUIS RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *Las Nuevas Antropologías, IV, 2. E. Sal. Tèrrea. Santander.*

<sup>479</sup> JOSDE M<sup>o</sup>. CIURANA *En Busca de las Verdades Fundamentales, II, B, c, b. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1988*

<sup>480</sup> CARDENAL GARRONE: *Lo que Hemos de Creer, III, 5. Ed. Paulinas. Madrid.*

<sup>481</sup> JOSE RATZINGER: SELECCIONES DE TEOLOGIA Magazine, n° 51(1974)210

<sup>482</sup> CLAUDE TRESMONTANT: *El Problema del Alma, I, 17. Ed. Herder. Barcelona. 1974.*

<sup>483</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *Moral de la Sexualidad, II, A. 1. Ed. Tau. Avila. 1988*

<sup>484</sup> C. S. LEWIS: *Miracles, pgs. 25-29. McMillan. New York. 1977*



Australian neurologist **John C. Eccles**, Nobel Prize Winner, states that: "Material phenomena clearly transcends physiology and biochemistry phenomena."<sup>485</sup>

On May 17, 1979, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith published a letter in which the essential data of the Catholic faith on life after death was reaffirmed. Pope John Paul II previously had approved the text of the letter which thus has the value of a true papal Magisterium. It says ad verbatim: "The Church affirms that a spiritual element survives after death. An element endowed with a conscience and will, in such a way that the very "human being" endures. In order to designate this element the Church uses the word "soul", a term used in the language of the Bible and Tradition. And although this word has various meanings in the Bible, the Church believes that there are no valid reasons to prescind of this word. On the other hand, the Church considers that it is absolutely indispensable to use some word to transmit the information of a faith in the survival between death and resurrection."<sup>486</sup> **G. Deutzenberg** has shown that the Greek word *psije* has to be translated as "soul" and not as "life".<sup>487</sup>

Finally, Paul says that man is made up of body and soul <sup>488</sup>.

**2. The soul cannot be seen.** But there are things which exist although they cannot be seen or felt, such as atmospheric pressure.

The soul is not seen because it is spirit, and not everything is seen with one's eyes. Neither can we see space or time, but rather the things which occupy space and the things which change with time. We can know the existence of a soul by its acts.

In order to know if an electric current passes through a cable we connect a light bulb. If it lights up then we know by the luminous effect that there is a current; but you have not seen the current.

If behind a wall you see a column of smoke you know that there is a fire; you cannot see the fire but you know it by its effect: smoke.

When gazing at a river we think of the existence of its origin, not seeing it. **Rutherford and Bohr**, knew of the atom without seeing it, just by the facts known.

We do the same thing in order to know the existence of the soul. We know it **by its effects**.

The human soul is the foundation of life and intelligence. If we did not have an intelligent soul there would be no culture, nor science, nor arts, nor techniques, nor airplanes, nor railroads, nor radio nor television, etc. The human soul is the priceless part of a human. The value of the human body does not reach a dollar.<sup>489</sup>

**3. The soul in order to think** uses the brain as an instrument<sup>490</sup> but the brain without the soul which gives it life, cannot do anything; it is dead. It is like a light bulb without electric current. If the brain thinks it is because of the soul. The difference between that brain of a dead person and of a live person is that one has a soul and the other does not<sup>491</sup>. The cells and the atoms do not vary. The difference is in the soul.

A brain is needed for rationale. This condition is necessary, even though it is not the cause. A window is a necessary condition for the sunlight to enter into the room. But the cause of the light is not the window, but the sun. The cause of rationale is the soul. The brain is only the condition, the instrument.

<sup>485</sup> ALFONSO AGUILO: *Interrogantes en Torno a la Fe, III, 3*. Ed. Palabra. Madrid.

<sup>486</sup> CANDIDO POZO, S. I. *Teología del Mas Allá, 2ª, III* Ed. BAC. Madrid, 1980 Second Edition

<sup>487</sup> CANDIDO POZO, S. I. *Teología del Mas Allá, 2ª, III* 8.Ed. BAC. Madrid, 1980

<sup>488</sup> Thessalonians, 5: 23

<sup>489</sup> TIHAMER TOTH.: *Creo en Dios, III, 1, B*. Ed. Atenas. Madrid

<sup>490</sup> JOSE RATZINGER: COMMUNIO Magazine, pg. 283. VI, 1980

<sup>491</sup> KURT SANSGRUBERG: *El Atomo y el Alma, VI, 5*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona.

The painting of "The Lances" by **Velazquez** is not due to the brush. It is due to the artist, the painter, Velazquez. It is true that **Velazquez** with a broom would not have painted it. Velazquez needed the brush as an instrument. But the author of the painting is not the brush, but rather the artist. The brain is the instrument of the soul. Because of this the brain in order to think needs the artist, the soul. And if the brain is damaged, the soul malfunctions. The soul and the brain exert mutual influence.<sup>492</sup>

The neurologist **Wilder Penfield** of the University of Montreal who as a neurologist and neurosurgeon dedicated his life to the study of the person and the human brain<sup>493</sup> says: "The brain is very much like a computer. However, the mind, the spirit, is something independent from the brain. The mind is a product of the brain. It depends on the brain but it is not the brain, it is not something physiological. No scientist has been able to demonstrate that the mind has a material explanation.<sup>494</sup>" The mind, spirit and intelligence are not a material production.<sup>495</sup>

Yes, it is true that the brain can be compared to a high tech machine with all the bells and whistles, spearhead electronic and optimum switchboards. We do need, however, something or someone to run it: the soul.<sup>496</sup>

In the cerebral cortex there are 30,000 million nerve cells<sup>497</sup>. To want to understand the human mind by only studying the brain is like attempting to understand a television program only studying the transistors and the integrated circuits inside the television set. The television program presupposes many hours of thought on the part of technicians, producers, etc.

A **computer** can diagnose an illness and even program its treatment, but it cannot grasp the psychological factors of the patient, such as the fear, anxiety, worry, frustration, etc. which the doctor can grasp and bear in mind. The computer cannot feel, love, nor happiness, nor remorse. The computer only stores information, but it has neither conscience nor initiative. A tape recorder will record what is spoken or said to it, but it is indifferent to what is said. You can tell it a joke or insult it, and it will not react. A human will.

Psychic processes do not possess any of the properties of matter... On the other hand, matter does not show psychic characteristics. Man holds both kinds of processes: His body is matter and his consciousness is material and psychic<sup>498</sup>.

**Dr. Rodriguez Delgado**, an investigator of the brain at the "Ramón y Cajal" Hospital in Madrid, and Director of the Center for Neurobiological Academic Studies of the Royal Academy of Doctors, said through Radio Nacional de España on March 12, 1984 while being interviewed by **Silvia Ariet**, that the brain and the soul are two different things. One can touch the brain, measure it, weigh it, but not the soul, you can't. One must distinguish between cerebral functions and the brain. Memory, said **Dr. Rodriguez Delgado**, is in the brain, but it is not the brain. "The brain and soul are different things".

The mind holds proprietary functions which surpass the purely biological and physiological, and with greater degree the physical<sup>499</sup>. To reduce the thought of the brain is akin to looking at a painting of **Goya** and looking at the canvas and the overlaid colors, but disregarding the art, which is of a spiritual order. A book is more than paper and ink. The important part is the ideas that it conveys.

Recently antimatter has been discovered, but this must not be confused with the spirit. Antimatter is matter of a contrary sign: the positive electron and the negative proton. The spiritual acts are on another plane.

<sup>492</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup>. CIURANA: *En Busca de las Verdades Fundamentales*, II, 8, c. d. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

<sup>493</sup> JOHN ECCLES: *El Cerebro y la mente*, III, 3. Ed. Herder. Barcelona. 1985

<sup>494</sup> VINTILA HORIA: *Viaje a los Centros de la Tierra*. 2<sup>o</sup>, III, 3. Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona. 1971

<sup>495</sup> PAUL CHAUCHARD: *El Cerebro y la Conciencia*. IV. 9. Ed. Martínez Roca. Barcelona

<sup>496</sup> MIGUEL CRUSAFONT: *La Evolución en las Ciencias Positivas*, IX. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>497</sup> PEDRO LAIN ENTRALGO: *Alma, Cuerpo, Persona*. 2<sup>a</sup> IV, 4, 2. Ed. Galaxia. Barcelona. 1995

<sup>498</sup> H. ROHRACHEZ: *IBERICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine*. 237 (X-1982)363

<sup>499</sup> JUAN LUIS RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *Alma y Cerebro*. COMMUNIO Magazine, III. 87. pg. 223

The spirit, the intelligence or the mind are not a material product.

## 8. WITHOUT AN INTELLIGENT SOUL WE COULD NOT PROGRESS.

1. **Man progresses** because he has intelligence. The animal does not progress because he does not have intelligence. The life of the bees as described by **Virgil** some 2,000 years ago is exactly the same today<sup>500</sup>. The swallows build their nests today as they did 2,500 years ago, according to a description which **Herodotus** then made.<sup>501</sup>

On the other hand, man who began living in caves then built huts and cabins, and then houses, palaces and skyscrapers. What would a wise man of an ancient civilization do if he should resurrect and find himself with inventions such as the airplane, the submarine, radio and television, electric current and X-Rays?

Man - since he sees, observes, thinks and deduces. The animal - since he does not have an intelligent soul sees but he does not deduce anything. He does not know how to think. The animal works blindly. He follows his instincts which God has given him without knowing why.

Instinct is like an automatic machine. It always functions the same way.

That which we improperly call animal intelligence is its capacity to react to stimuli. The animal responds in the same fashion to the same stimulus which excites its instincts. Man however, can modify his responses to the stimulus<sup>502</sup>.

Animals learn things through the association of images and feelings, but they are incapable of reasoning or arguing. They are trained through punishment and reward.

Animal instincts have a sensitive memory that does not allow them to make the same mistake twice. But this sensitive memory has nothing to do with the spiritual memory, unique to human reasoning, which allows man to pass from the known to the unknown, and be able to progress, which animals cannot.

2. Human intelligence **permits us to pass** from the known to the unknown.

An iceberg only shows one ninth of its mass, which is above water. Underneath the water there are 8/9 parts which cannot be seen but which I can surmise, because of my intelligence.

In 1846 **Leverrier** discovered and pinpointed with exactness without ever having seen it, the planet Neptune, while he was calculating the deviation of the orbit of Uranus<sup>503</sup>. German astronomer **Galle** directed his telescope towards the place which **Leverrier** had indicated and there he found Neptune.

In the same fashion the astronomer **Lowelin** in 1915 discovered Pluto although it was not seen until March 12, 1930<sup>504</sup> by **Clyde Tombaugh**, who died in Mesilla Park, New Mexico in 1997.<sup>505</sup>

Currently, there is a search for Planet X, which is believed to be some ten thousand million kilometers from the sun.<sup>506</sup>

The structure of the atom, formed by neutrons and protons in its nucleus, and electrons in its orbit, was discovered by **Bohr & Rutherford** much before it could be seen. At

<sup>500</sup> VIGILIO: Libro IV de las *Geórgicas*.

<sup>501</sup> OLIVER SANDBOW, O. S. B.: Dios es un Espejo, IX, 17. Ed. Matéu. Barcelona

<sup>502</sup> XAVIER ZUBIRI: REVISTA DE OCCIDENTE Magazine, nº 16(VII, 1964)146-173

<sup>503</sup> JOSE M. RIAZA, S. I.: *El Comienzo del Mundo nº 60*, Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>504</sup> J. HERRMANN: *La Astronomía, IV, 8*. Circulo de Lectores.

<sup>505</sup> DIARIO DE CADIZ Newspaper 20-I-97, pg.38

<sup>506</sup> ROBIN KERROD: *Las Estrellas y Planetas, pg. 101*. Ed. Fontalba. Barcelona. 1984

the Seville Expo, in 1993, we could see a hydrogen atom magnified one thousand million times.

**Paul Dirac**, Nobel Prize Winner in Physics, predicted the existence of positive electrons before their experimental discovery which was carried out by the North American **Anderson** in 1932.<sup>507</sup>

In January 1972, in the Sierra del Güejar (Granada) a deposit of marine fossils of more than 30 million years and at a height of 1,000 meters above sea level. This indicates that these heights were covered one day by the sea. Our eyes only tell us about the existence of the fossils, but our intelligence tells us that these fossils could only have been left there by the sea.

In 1769, **James Watt**, observing the lid of a pot on the fire rising intermittently as steam escaped, deduced the expansive force of steam and invented the steam engine. Later on, in 1814 **George Stephenson** builds the first locomotive in the world.

A cat cannot wind up a ball of twine. Animals are not inventors. They cannot even manufacture tools. Man is different from the animal in that because of his intelligence he dominates Nature: he dominates the cold and the heat by air conditioning, he shortens distances through locomotion, he augments the power of the vision of our eye with the microscope, and the power of the ear through the radio, etc.

## 9.- WITHOUT AN INTELLIGENT SOUL WE COULD NOT UNDERSTAND ABSTRACT IDEAS, NOR FEEL DUTY OR VIRTUE.

1. In man there is something which is not material: an illusion, happiness, hope. We have a capacity for the non-material.<sup>508</sup>

Animals, not being able to grasp abstract ideas cannot concern themselves with **philosophic or religious problems**, which belong exclusively to man.

Animals have a way of communicating with each other. But this is not a proof of intelligence. This communication enters into the field of instincts.

Man, because he has an intelligent soul can understand the abstract, what cannot be seen, touched, what is not square nor round, what has no flavor or color: honesty, gratitude, duty. Do you think a donkey will be concerned if you talk to him about duty?

The donkey only obeys the whip. The animal knows nothing of duty, since duty cannot be seen or touched; it is understood. And the animal does not have an intelligent soul: he sees and feels, but he does not understand anything. The animal only has a sensitive life. You can educate him and train him, but only with the carrot and the sticks. He does not understand reasoning. He does not understand the relationships of ideas. He only grasps sensations. If you make friends with your brother-in-law's dog, the dog will end up knowing you by sight, smell or voice, through sensations. But he'll never think of identifying you as his master's relative. The animal has no knowledge, he cannot grasp ideas.

If we did not have a spiritual soul, **able to grasp ideas**, we would remain in the same state as the one who does not understand the Morse code, dumbfounded while looking at a line of dots and dashes, you do not know if the news is good or bad.

<sup>507</sup> JUAN MANUEL IGARTUA, S. I.: *La Resurrección del Cristo y su Cuerpo, Apéndice, II, 4*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>508</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 2ª, I 123*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1965

Outside of the human species, we know of no animal able to have abstract reasoning. Human mental activity is based on abstract concepts and is qualitatively different to bioelectrical processes that occur in the brain. There is a non-material entity within us capable of abstract reasoning<sup>509</sup>.

Animals are only moved by instincts of self-preservation and that of a species: reproduction and survival, feeding and self preservation.

Man likes to celebrate great events of his life: births, weddings, deaths, anniversaries, etc. Animals do not understand celebrations.

The Nobel Prize Winner in Medicine, **Alexis Carrel**, said, "The soul is an aspect of ourselves which is specific to our nature and which distinguishes man from the rest of the animals<sup>510</sup>."

Animals have a means of communicating. But this is not a proof of intelligence. This communication enters into the field of the instincts. A canary can emit a group of instinctive sounds, but it is unable to interpret the score of **Beethoven's** symphony.

Between the human language and the communication between animals there exists an insurmountable abyss. Animals are capable of expressing different states: friendship, fear, surprise, etc., but they are incapable of expressing judgments. Some chimpanzees can repeat simple words, but they're incapable of constructing sentences<sup>511</sup>. In spite of the fact that a chimpanzee has a vocal apparatus capable of pronouncing all kinds of words, after six years of instruction, he is only able to pronounce six words, while a child in the same years is capable of knowing and pronouncing more than two thousand. It's not that we are dealing with voice, but rather intelligence. The possession of an articulate language is sufficient proof of the supremacy of man. The language of animals, whichever its modality, is no more than a grouping of responses.<sup>512</sup>

2. Our intelligent soul is the great abyss which separates us from animals. Thanks be to God, we men are something more than animals. We have an intellectual soul which is spiritual and immortal, destined to know God and to enjoy glory for all eternity.

## 10. OUR INTELLIGENT SOUL IS FURTHERMORE SPIRITUAL AND IMMORTAL.

1. It is proven that the soul is spiritual because it has intellectual functions with which it **grasps that which does not impress the senses**<sup>513</sup>, those which cannot be seen nor touched, which have no color, nor shape, nor weight; that which is not material: duty, justice, nobility, honor, virtue, heroism.. Sentiments such as: envy, hatred, vengeance, greed, ambition, pride, are of a spiritual character. The same is true with kindness, generosity, etc. etc.

<sup>509</sup> IBERICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine, 196(I-1979)24

<sup>510</sup> ALEXIS CARREL: *La Incógnita del Hombre*, pg.132. Ed. Ibérica. Barcelona.

<sup>511</sup> JOSE LUIS PINILLOS: *La Frontera entre la Comunicación Animal y el Lenguaje Humano*. IBERICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine. 151(XII-1974)515

<sup>512</sup> T. CARBO: *El Origen del Lenguaje*. IBERICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine, 129(III-1973)118

<sup>513</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup>. CIURANA: *En Busca de las Verdades Fundamentales, II, A. c.* Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

Abstract concepts are not subject to time or space. They are of yesterday and today, from here and there. Not like the flower which I see here and now. Yesterday it was a blossom and tomorrow it will wither. On the other hand, abstract concepts are invariable in space and time. The concept of triangularity is applied to all possible triangles, of all times and all forms, whether equilateral, isosceles or scalene.

When I say “mother”, “son”, “brother”, besides the physical and physiological process of sound waves and nervous tones which reach from my vocal chords to your eardrum, from your hearing to your brain, there is something very different in the matter which leaves your heart and is moved to where your mother, your son or your brother are. To say “Te amo” and “I love you” sound totally different. Nevertheless, the Spaniard and the Englishman understand the same idea. The physical-biological process of the sound and sensitive waves is different. But the idea which they express is the same. That which belongs to the material orders is different, but the idea which is grasped with the spiritual soul is the same.

The soul compares two ideas and can see its conformity or lack of conformity

If I were to write on a blackboard ‘sugar is red and a carnation is sweet’, you immediately capture the disconnection of the ideas; because what is red is not the sugar but the carnation, and what is sweet is not the carnation, but the sugar. This you can recognize because you have a spiritual power that grasps ideas.. If someone were to insult your mother, it hurts you, but if the phrase were spoken into a recorder, it would be recorded, and the recorder would not be offended.

A computer can do mathematical operations. But only those for which it has been previously programmed, but the machine cannot feel love, gratitude, pain, shame, remorse, repentance, etc.<sup>514</sup> etc. These are sentiments of a spiritual order which are superior to that which is merely material.<sup>515</sup>

Spirit exists in me, because science cannot explain reasoning, nor free will. The human being knows, besides concrete objects, abstract and universal notions, and that can only be gotten with an imponderable spiritual principle<sup>516</sup>.

An animal can distinguish with its sense concrete things; for example, an equilateral triangle from another isosceles or scalene one. But it will never be able to grasp the idea of “triangularity” which is in the spiritual order.

**The effect cannot be of a superior nature to the cause which produces it;** a chicken egg cannot come from a pine tree. No one gives what he does not have. If you do not have ten dollars you cannot lend them to me. If the soul is capable of spiritual acts (reasoning) it is because it is spiritual<sup>517</sup>. The spiritual cannot come from the material. The spiritual soul is greater than the material, it cannot come from the material. The spiritual soul is superior to matter, it cannot come from matter. Matter can only engender matter. The spirit is not subject to the laws of matter. A judgment, a reasoning or a willing act cannot be seen, heard or weighed.

---

<sup>514</sup> RUDOLF LIEBIG. *La Otra Revelación: la Fe Cristiana en Dialogo con la Ciencia Moderna. IV, 2. d.* Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1977

<sup>515</sup> MUNDO CIENTIFICO Magazine, 53)XII-1985)1.195

<sup>516</sup> Dr. ANGEL SANTOS RUIZ: *Vida y Espiritu ante la Ciencia Hoy, XIV* Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1970.

<sup>517</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 2ª, I, n° 129, 2.* Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1965

2. The soul produces spiritual operations, therefore it is spiritual<sup>518</sup>.

What's more, man can know his own psychic potential; he can be aware that he thinks and that he knows. Conscience and judgment are not a simple change of quality in reference to the animal instinct, but an absolute change in nature and state.<sup>519</sup>

Animals know, but they do not know what they know. Man is the only one who can reflect and is aware that he knows.<sup>520</sup>

Instead of calling man a "rational animal" as **Aristotle** did, it would be better to say that he is "a reflexive animal". A man is not a being that knows, but also a being that knows it knows. A characteristic of man is the **reflexive conscience**.

Man is a being who asks himself in the ultimate sense about what he is doing and what he is. This is a question which an animal does not ask. This is a question an animal does not ask itself.<sup>521</sup>

Man is a being who poses problems for himself. Because of this he is distinguished from other beings who populate the Universe.

The typical thing about man is that he makes transcendental questions: "Something which can never be given up is that man should ask about the origins of the Universe.....The opposite of reasoning over this problem is irrational: it contradicts the very essence of reason."<sup>522</sup>

Inert matter does not pose any problems about itself. The table is what it is without worrying about what it is, or what it should be. Neither does the animal think. It lives, exercises its appetites and its instincts, but without thinking, without asking questions about them: their objects and their value.

Man, on the other hand, is capable of reflecting, to see inside himself and to think about his acts. In the questioning and in the thinking, our actions are born and mature which is truly human.<sup>523</sup>

During a Parapsychology Congress in Toledo, Spain, in 1988, I heard **Father Pilón, S. I.** state that the human conscience is totally different from the sensations of the animal world. These sensations can be measured materially, but not the perception of the conscience.

Talking about the difference between body and soul, I heard **Julian Marias** state at a conference given at the Colegio Oficial de Mexico in Madrid these ideas:

The body tells me that I am, but not who I am. The who is proper of the soul. The body tells me that I am made of carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, calcium, iron, etc., but the personality, charm, cordiality, friendliness, sincerity, pride, lies, hate, vengeance, are spiritual virtues and defects. A medical checkup can discover that my body is sick, I am a diabetic, that my cholesterol level is higher, or that I am myopic, but at the same time, my spirit, my drive, my happiness, my optimism, can be very healthy. Even though there may be a certain influx between the body and soul, it is evident that man does not reduce himself to the body alone, but what is more important is who he is, and this transcends matter.

We live an agitated life. We want to do many things and do not have the time for everything. We seem to spin our wheels and get nowhere fast. This is because there is no horizon. Many ignore the sense of life. They ignore the why, what and wherefores of life.

<sup>518</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *En Busca de Verdades Fundamentales. II, d, c, c'*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

<sup>519</sup> VENANCIO GARCIA RODRÍGUEZ: *Hombre, Materia, Evolución y Vida* XXIII, 4, Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona

<sup>520</sup> SANTIAGO LOREN: *Del electrón a Dios. VI*. Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona:

<sup>521</sup> JOSE SAYES: *Dios Existe I, 1*. Ed. EDPAOR. Madrid, 1982

<sup>522</sup> JUAN HUARTE: *Evolución y Problema Religioso*, pg. 314. Unión Editorial, Madrid. 1984

<sup>523</sup> ALBERT DOSIDEYNE: *Dios, el Hombre y el Cosmos, I. 5*.Ed. Guadarrama. Madrid.

However, every rational being should ask himself: What am I doing in life? Where am I going? Only those who have a clear picture can live with optimism. That clear idea, positive, optimistic, is given by faith

3. The spirituality of the soul can be proven, besides, **man is free**. That man is free is a dogma of faith<sup>524</sup>.

Our liberty can be influenced by diverse circumstances which are external or internal to we ourselves.

Endocrinology studies for example, the influx of thyroid on psychism<sup>525</sup>

It will always stand that, in normal conditions, we have freedom. And we prove it with our own experience. I am conscious that I have the freedom to scratch my nose, or either one of my two ears. Nevertheless, I know that I cannot freely stop the palpitations of my heart. I am not free of being hungry if I stop eating. That is to say, no one can discuss with me that I am free for something, although not for everything. And the proof that all men believe in human liberty is that we become indignant when faced with certain monstrous actions which presuppose liberty and responsibility: a son who stabs his mother in order to steal. On the other hand, if the action is done without liberty or freedom (he who stabbed his mother was crazy), this does not provoke indignation, but rather pity.

If man is not free, he is impotent to change his conduct, as it is to change the orbit of the sun. In this case, neither sanctions nor decorations make any sense. If they exist, it is because all the world is in agreement that man is free and responsible for his acts.

If man has freedom or liberty it is because he is something more than matter. Matter does not have any liberty: it unfailingly obeys the laws of physics. It is matter, says **Weiszacker**, which conforms to physical laws.<sup>526</sup> A machine will always respond in the same fashion to the same stimuli in the same circumstances. If a motor on the motorcycle will not start, it is not because it does not want to. It will be that it does not have gasoline, or that the spark plugs are not in condition. But if it does not start, do not punish it because it does not have liberty. You seek the cause and you fix it because you know that if it is in condition the motor will start necessarily. Man, on the other hand, can work freely, because of this a murderer is put into prison; but one does not incarcerate a machine which has chopped up a man because it does not have any responsibility.

4. **Animals also don't have any freedom**<sup>527</sup>. Their spontaneous movements are due to the impulses of different instincts for self-preservation: to seek food, to defend their lives and reproduce.

Man, as a free being, can choose what he wants between two things. The animal, as he is not free, cannot choose. It necessarily follows that which attracts its sensibility: the strongest stimuli of its instincts. Man can renounce to his hunger. The animal cannot<sup>528</sup>. An

<sup>524</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 815. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>525</sup> ALEJANDRO ROLDAN, S. I.: *El Carácter*, VIII, 1.b. Ed. Fe. Católica. Madrid.

<sup>526</sup> JUAN LUIS RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *Teología de la Creación*. 2º, IX, 1,1. Ed. Sal Térrea, Santander.

<sup>527</sup> DR. BERMUDO MELENDEZ: *Las Bases Científicas del Evolucionismo*. pg. 90 Ed. A.D.U.E... Madrid 1983

<sup>528</sup> JOSE MIGUEL PERO-SANZ *Ateísmo, hoy 1, 2*, Colección RTV. nº 9. 1075



animal cannot subordinate the pleasant to the honest. Man, can. Man can oppose the inclinations of his instincts in order to serve an ideal<sup>529</sup>.

A famous text by **Scheler** states that man is “the only animal capable of saying NO to his instinctive appetite.”<sup>530</sup>

Liberty is not the same as licentiousness. Liberty is a good. Licentiousness is an evil. Liberty becomes licentiousness when one bypasses the rights of others. Personal liberty should always be subordinate to the common good. Liberty, the same as fire and water, are good when under control. But when out of control, they ravish everything.

5. But furthermore, the existence of the spiritual soul **is something which is perceived.**

**Paul** says: “*I cannot explain what is happening to me, because I do not do what I want, but on the contrary, the very things I hate. Well then, if I do the evil I do not want to do, I agree that the Law is good; but in this case, I am not the one striving toward evil, but it is sin, living in me. I know that what is right does not abide in me, I mean in my flesh. I can want to do what is right, but I am unable to do it. In fact I do not do the good I want, but the evil I hate. Therefore, if I do what I do not want to do, I am not the one striving towards evil, but Sin which is in me I discover, then, this reality: though I wish to do what is right, the evil within me asserts itself first. My inmost self agrees and rejoices with the Law of God, but I notice in my body another law challenging the law of the spirit, and delivering me as a slave to the law of sin written in my members*”<sup>531</sup>.

**Ovidio** says: “*Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor*”: I see the best and I approve but I do the worst.<sup>532</sup>

Man must follow the moral rule that obliges him to do good and avoid evil. This law sounds in his conscience. But hurt in his nature by original sin, he is subject to error and inclined to evil while exercising his freedom<sup>533</sup>

We all note in our being that there are two parts; a low one and another which is high, one which prefers that which is comfortable and another which prefers the heroic, one which is inclined towards pleasure and another which stops before that which is prohibited, one which flees from pain and another which faces up to death itself when demanded by duty.

Now then, the **instinct of self-preservation** is essential to all nature. The plant clings to the earth with its roots; animals defend themselves like savages. On the other hand, man whatever his ideas and religion might be, believes that there are occasions when it is worthwhile to give one’s life for other values which are not material. And those who act thusly are called heroes. This signifies that man is something more than matter. If man were exclusively matter, the supreme goal of man would be terrestrial life<sup>534</sup>. And we see that it is not.

On the other hand, in man that which belongs to the spirit is of more importance than that which belongs to the body. A slap in the face hurts more for the humiliation it causes than for the physical pain exerted.

<sup>529</sup> VICTOR MARCOZZI, S. I.: *Los Orígenes del Hombre Según la Ciencia, la Filosofía y la Religión. V. 7.* Ed. Studium. Madrid.

<sup>530</sup> PEDRO LAIN ENTRALGO: *Alma, Cuerpo, Persona, 2ª, II. Ed. Galaxia Gutenberg. Barcelona. 1995.*

<sup>531</sup> Paul: Letter to the Romans 7: 15-23

<sup>532</sup> OVIDIO: *Metamorphosis, VII, 20s*

<sup>533</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 1713ss

<sup>534</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 2, I. 129, 2., b.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

The guilt of a bad action is felt in the soul. The body may be satisfied, and the soul, not. If God is just, there can be no equality between the terrorist who has just placed a bomb and his possible victims.

And we know that God is just. We see that in today's world there is no justice: many bad people succeed and many good people do not receive the proper rewards for their actions. Therefore there must be another life afterwards, where God gives each a reward or punishment deserved<sup>535</sup>. That is to say, that the soul must outlive the body. If the soul outlives the body, it is because it needs of the body to exist<sup>536</sup>, in other words, because it is spiritual.

Spiritual is all that does not intrinsically depend on matter to exist. All that can exist separate from matter, such as occurs with the soul, is spiritual.

In 1972, the Spanish Jesuit, **Father Oscar Gonzalez de Quevedo**, Professor of Parapsychology at the Schools of Anchetá de Sao Paulo (Brazil) and the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, was in Spain giving courses in Parapsychology. He lectured and he carried out experiments which clearly showed the existence of the spiritual soul. Because of this, in one of his books he affirms: "Today there is no place in the world for a materialist parapsychologist"<sup>537</sup>. They all know that we have a spiritual soul.

Swiss psychiatrist. Doctor **Elizabeth Kübler-Ross**, thanatologist, that is to say, a specialist on the matters of death and dying, has interviewed more than twenty thousand patients on the threshold of death, many of which have been revived after a clinical death, states that the reality of another life, after death, is something totally true<sup>538</sup>.

There is a book written by American Psychiatrist **Raymond A. Moody**, with the unique title "*Life After Life*" where he recounts the stories of over one hundred persons, who, were clinically dead, and then returned to life. They talk about a series of interesting experiences in which they saw themselves outside of their physical bodies, talking with already deceased persons, and above all, in contact with a luminous being who lovingly questions them about their past life. After this, I have no doubts. I know that there is life after death. These phrases are repeated throughout these stories.<sup>539</sup>

6. The soul also is immortal **because it is spiritual**. The spiritual does not have parts as does matter. Therefore that which is spiritual cannot die, nor decompose nor by corruption of its parts - which it does not have because it is a spiritual being, nor by corruption of the body - which it does not need in order to exist<sup>540</sup>.

The church affirms the subsistence and survival of the soul after death<sup>541</sup>, of a spiritual element<sup>542</sup> which has a conscience and will, and that it survives the human id.<sup>543</sup>

Furthermore, God has given to all men a yearning for happiness which immortality demands<sup>544</sup>. A happiness that wanes is not true happiness. If a blind man were given his

<sup>535</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup>, CIURANA *En Busca de las Verdades Fundamentales, II, C, c.* Ed. Bosch. Barcelona.

<sup>536</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la Salvación. 2, I, 128,3, b.* Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>537</sup> OSCAR GONZÁLEZ DE QUEVEDO, S. I.: *¿Que es la Parapsicología?* XIX Ed. Columbia. Buenos Aires. 1971

<sup>538</sup> P. LINDE, S. I.: *Fundamentos de la Religión, XX, 2.* Ed. Fomento de Cultura. Valencia.

<sup>539</sup> RAYMOND A. MOODY: *Life After Life*, 2, XVI. Ed. EDAF. Madrid. 1977

<sup>540</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la Salvación. 2<sup>a</sup>, I, n<sup>o</sup> 127.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>541</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n<sup>o</sup> 366 and 997

<sup>542</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n<sup>o</sup> 738.* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>543</sup> Communiqué of the Conference of the Doctrine of Faith on matters referring to Scatology, 17-IV-79

sight back for only a day, if a prisoner were set free for only one hour, neither the blind man nor the prisoner would be happy. They would be tormented by the thought that this happiness would soon end. Happiness, to be complete, must be forever.

As **Aristotle says** “All we men want to be happy to the greatest degree possible. Nevertheless, in this world no one is totally happy. We all have our sorrows. With some it will be material difficulties. With others, sicknesses. With others moral problems. But we all have in life clouds which darken the sun of the happiness which we yearn for. It is that our soul has been made for heaven and only there will it find this infinite and eternal happiness which will sate it completely.”<sup>545</sup>

**Enrique Rojas** of ABC states: “Man is a discontent being. His existence is a permanent acknowledgement of his limitations. **Ortega** said that the only essence of man was loneliness. For **Zubiri**, restlessness. For **Unamuno**, the Tragic Sentiments. For **Heidegger** and **Kierkegaard**, anguish. For Sartre, the nausea. All that is human is lacking, is indigent.”<sup>546</sup>

If God has placed in the human soul this **irresistible tendency to happiness**, it is because he is disposed to give us the means in order to satisfy it<sup>547</sup>. The contrary would be against His Wisdom and Goodness. This is why the happiness which we desire demands immortality, and our body is mortal, therefore our soul has to be immortal.

Vatican Council II says: “To affirm the spirituality and the immortality of the soul is not an illusory mirage, but rather a profound reality.”<sup>548</sup> The Sacred Congregation of the Faith, on May 17, 1979 published a document on scatology, which in nº 3 says: “The church affirms that after death there is a continuation of a spiritual element of the Id which lacks, during that time, of the corporal supplement.”<sup>549</sup> The immortality of the soul is **dogma of faith**.<sup>550</sup>

7. **Jehovah’s Witnesses** deny the immortality of the soul because the word in Genesis “nephesh” signifies a vital principle which is common to animals and men<sup>551</sup>. It is that the Biblical message of revelation is progressive. God accommodated himself to the mentality of the people to whom he was speaking. For example, the distinction between soul and body does not appear until **Daniel**, in the Second Century before **Christ**<sup>552</sup>. Afterwards, in the Book of Wisdom there already appears a clear idea of immortality: “*God created man*

<sup>544</sup> STAUDINGER: *La Vida Eterna*, IV, 6. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>545</sup> STAUDINGER: *La Vida Eterna*, I, 2. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>546</sup> ABC Newspaper. Madrid (11-V-96) Pg. 52

<sup>547</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup>. CIURANA: *En Busca de las Verdades Fundamentales*, II, C. b. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

<sup>548</sup> Vatican Council II *Gaudium et Spes*.

<sup>549</sup> Apostolicae Sedis Act. 73. (1979) 941

<sup>550</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 530s, 738. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>551</sup> JORGE AUZOU: *En un Principio Creo Dios el Mundo*. IV. Ed. Verbo Divino. Estella. 1978

<sup>552</sup> ALEJANDRO DIEZ MACHO: *La Resurrección de Jesucristo y la del Hombre en la Biblia*, 2<sup>a</sup>. 1.3. Ediciones Fe Católica. Madrid. 1977.

for immortality<sup>553</sup>". The body dies and disappears. That which remains is the soul<sup>554</sup>. Because of this **Saul** spoke with the spirit of **Samuel** who had already died.<sup>555</sup>

Because of this **Jesus Christ** said: "Do not fear those who deprive the body of life but cannot destroy the soul. Rather, fear him who can destroy both body and soul in Gehenna<sup>556</sup>. "Whoever believes in me, though he should die, will come to life; and who believes in me will never die<sup>557</sup>". With these words Jesus confirms the thought that the Jews had that the soul would continue to live after death.<sup>558</sup>

8. Recently a theory has circulated that the separation of the soul body was a dualism of platonic origins and that therefore man resurrected at the moment of death. But it must not be forgotten that such human categories are both Semitic and Hellenistic, and as such they are equally apt to be an instrument for the revelation of God<sup>559</sup>. The idea that resurrection is **immediate** after death is a doctrine rejected by the majority of the Catholic theologians, and even by Protestants of such standing as **Oscar Cullman**, Professor of the University of Paris, and one of the outstanding figures of Protestant theology<sup>560</sup>. In his turn, **Cardinal Ratzinger**, Prefect of the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the faith, affirms: "The hypothesis of resurrection at the time of death cannot be proven either logically nor Biblically.<sup>561</sup>"

9. **Christ** speaks that a man lives past death: the parable of **Lazarus** and the rich man **Epulon** speaks of a reality of hell after death<sup>562</sup>. To the good thief, He promises paradise after death<sup>563</sup>.

Before he had said: "*If you wish to enter into eternal life keep the commandments*<sup>564</sup>," "These will go off to eternal punishment and the just to eternal life.<sup>565</sup>" "Be glad and rejoice, for great is your reward in heaven<sup>566</sup>."

The Gospel says that the God of **Abraham, of Isaac** and of **Jacob**, is not the God of the dead but of the living.<sup>567</sup>. Therefore, if **Abraham, Isaac** and **Jacob** are alive, it is because their souls are immortal.

Paul says: that in this life we know God imperfectly, but that in Glory we shall see him face to face and he adds: "For, to me, "life" means Christ: hence dying is so much gain.<sup>568</sup>"

<sup>553</sup> WISDOM, 2 :23

<sup>554</sup> G. HERBERT, S. I. Los Testigos de Jehová, su Historia y su Doctrina, V. 4. Ed. PPC. Madrid

<sup>555</sup> I SAMUEL: 28: 3-25

<sup>556</sup> Matthew 10:28

<sup>557</sup> JOHN, 11:25s

<sup>558</sup> ALEJANDRO DIEZ MACHO: *La Resurrección de Jesucristo y la del Hombre en la Biblia*, 2ª. II.D... Ediciones Fe Católica. Madrid. 1977.

<sup>559</sup> CANDIDO POZO, S. I.: *Teología del Mas Allá*. 2. III. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1980.

<sup>560</sup> OSCAR CULLMAN: *La Inmortalidad del Alma*, Ed. Studium. Madrid. 1970

<sup>561</sup> JOSE RATZINGER: *Escatología*, II. 5. 5. Ed. Herder. Barcelona, 1980

<sup>562</sup> LUKE, 16:19-31

<sup>563</sup> LUKE, 23:42s

<sup>564</sup> Matthew, 19: 17

<sup>565</sup> Matthew, 25:46

<sup>566</sup> Matthew, 5:12

<sup>567</sup> Matthew, 22:32

“Eye has not seen, ear has not heard, nor has it so much as dawned on man what God has prepared for those who love him.” and he adds “as for me, I wish to die and be with **Christ**, which is so much better.<sup>569</sup>” The joy of heaven is indescribable<sup>570</sup>

That is to say, it is clear that we shall continue to live beyond death.

Pope **John Paul II** told the youngsters gathering in Vancouver, Canada, on September 18, 1984 “Do not let anyone fool you about the true sense of life. Life comes from God. God is the source and the goal of your lives.” In the Gospel, **Jesus** warns us that in the world there are thieves who come to steal<sup>571</sup> you will find the ones who want to trick you. They will say that the essence of life is in the greatest number of earthly pleasures. They will try to convince you that this is the only world that exists, and that you must try all that you can.. There will be someone who will tell you that happiness is in accumulating as much wealth as possible and enjoying life. The authentic happiness is not found in material things. The authentic life is found in God. And you will discover God in the body of **Christ** Love and serve him now, so that you can have a plentiful life.<sup>572</sup>

**10. We have an immortal soul.** Whether we like it or not, this is an undoubted truth. And furthermore, a dogma of faith. And he who does not believe it, is going to find out because he is going to die. To deny that we have a soul is like denying that we have a liver because we do not see it or feel it. We are what we are, aside from what we would like to be. Within a thousand million years we still will be alive: happy in Heaven, or suffering in hell; but alive. And living forever. And happy forever, or suffering forever. And this happiness or this torment will depend on our years of life in this world.

On the other hand, faced with the affirmation of **Christ-God** that man lives on beyond death, it is logical and prudent to take this into account. If I am driving on the highway and I see a sign which says: “The road is cut off after this curve. Bridge is out”, the logical thing to do is to brake. To take the curve at full speed is suicidal

He who lives in this life without worrying about the next is a madman. The logical, the intelligent and the rational is to live here thinking about that which certainly has to come after death.

We worry about keeping our health, a good physical presence, our investments, etc. To maintain or improve all of this we exercise, we sacrifice and we spend money. Do we forget the salvation of our soul? If we lose it, we will have lost everything and forever. If we save it, it will be saved forever.

To be concerned of our salvation will keep us from living in mortal sin., as a sudden death will take us to an eternal condemnation. Sudden deaths are very common, accidents, illnesses, unexpected and fatal, etc. Who would sleep peacefully with a snake in his bed? Many a in hell who left their conversion for later, and then it did not arrive , as death found them first. **Jesus Christ** warns us repeatedly in the Gospel. *You will not know the day nor the hour*<sup>573</sup> And we wager it all on one card, as we die only once. There is no second

<sup>569</sup> PHILLIPIANS, 1:2ss

<sup>570</sup> II CORINTHIANS, 2 :9

<sup>571</sup> John, 10:10

<sup>572</sup> MARIA MENSAJERA Magazine, 183 (IV-96)6

<sup>573</sup> Matthew 25: 10-13, MARK: 13:35ss; LUKE, 12:20

chance. There is no middle of the road between saving and condemning oneself. It is heaven or hell. And this is, for all eternity. He who is wrong at the time of death, will never have the opportunity to rectify.

A person or man of integrity makes good use of this life in order to do all the good possible. At the hour of our death we shall repent not only for the evil which we may have committed, but also for the good which we might have done and which we foolishly did not do. We should not do things because we like them, but because they are proper for the body and soul, and good for everyone else. We must do a good deed every day. And also, do one thing that we do not like to do, especially if it is in the benefit of the neighbor.. If someone were sure that he would be transferred to another place for the rest of his days, would it not be wise to move all possessions there, before going? A good Christian treasures his life for heaven<sup>574</sup>

## Other Perfections of GOD

### 11. GOD IS OMNIPERFECT

1. God is the Necessary Being (see No. 2.) The Necessary Being has the fullness of existence, because its essence is to exist. Because of this, God has all the possible perfections in an infinite degree and he cannot have any defect. If not, He would not be God. Contingent beings which exist for other ones, demand a being which does not exist for another one; that exists for itself, that has to be eternal, that cannot begin to exist, that it necessarily exists. That it cannot exist, that its essence is to exist, who has a fullness of existence, who has existence without limitations, who has all of its existing perfection in the maximum degree: that is to say, who is omni perfect.

**The omni-perfect being is immutable.** Any being which changes or moves is lacking in something (of that new modality). Therefore, the omni perfect being is immutable.

God is the plenitude of the BEING<sup>575</sup>

The only being in plenitude is God, since he possesses by nature the fullness of existence, cannot grow, and therefore is infinite. And the infinite being is unique, since there cannot be two different infinite beings, as neither one of the two have what belongs to the other and consequently both could grow, and in this case they would not be infinite as we had supposed.

All of this is amply demonstrated in Philosophy.

### 12. GOD CAN DO IT ALL.

1. Man can do great things:

---

<sup>574</sup> .TOMAS MORO: *Dialogo de la Fortaleza*, 3ª, XV. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1988.

<sup>575</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 213

In ancient times, he built beautiful cathedrals, with the collaboration of the whole town<sup>576</sup>, gigantic pyramids, like the ones at Keops, in Giza, where, according to **Breasted**, over one hundred thousand men labored for over thirty years and used 2,300,000 blocks of stone, each weighing two tons. With that huge amount of stone, you could build a two meter high wall from Lisbon to Warsaw<sup>577</sup>. Today man builds super-tankers, supersonic airplanes, atomic submarines, artificial satellites, etc., but man cannot make the Sun nor the Universe. God can indeed make the Sun and the Universe, because in fact he can do it all. *Nothing is impossible for God*<sup>578</sup>

All which can be made, God can do.

God can do all that is not contradictory<sup>579</sup>

. But that which cannot be made, the absurd, the contradictory, is impossible for anyone to make, not even God: for example, a square circle. A circle cannot be a square because it then stops being a circle. Because of this a square circle is an absurdity; and God does not make absurdities.

### 13. GOD KNOWS ALL.

1. God knows the secrets of Nature, and all the happenings of History, both the past as well as that which is to come., *God knows about everything before it happens*<sup>580</sup>.. For God everything is present. For God there is no time.

God also knows all your sins, not only those of works, but also those of desire and thought<sup>581</sup>. But God also knows your sins, not only those of things done, but also those of thought and desire perfectly - and he will recount them all on judgment day – all your good deeds and even your good wishes<sup>582</sup>

Bear this in mind because it will help you to do good.

### 14. GOD SEES EVERYTHING

A boy who escaped safely before an opportunity to sin, said that what had saved him was the thought as follows: “What would my mother say if she found out? Well, God not only knows but he is watching you. Doesn’t that put you to shame? Think about this when you are tempted. It will help you not to sin

### 15. GOD IS OUR FATHER WHO IS IN HEAVEN: CREATOR AND LORD OF ALL THINGS, WHO WILL REWARD THE GOOD AND PUNISH THE EVIL.

1. **Paul** says: “each will receive the reward or punishment for his acts during his mortal life<sup>583</sup>

<sup>576</sup> .C. ENLART: *Manual d’archéologie*. Ed. Picard. Paris

<sup>577</sup> H. PINARD DE LA BOULLAYE, S. I.: *Jesús, Luz del Mundo. III, Note 29*.Ed. Razón y Fe. Madrid.

<sup>578</sup> LUKE, 1:37

<sup>579</sup> PEDRO LAIN ENTREALGO: *Alma, Cuerpo, Persona. Epilogue, II, 1. a*.Ed. Galaxia. Madrid. 1995

<sup>580</sup> DANIEL, 13:42

<sup>581</sup> Paralipómenos, 28:9

<sup>582</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 3ª, II, n° 209s* Ed. BAC. Madrid

God is the Father of all men whom He loves infinitely. In order to encourage us to be good, He rewards us by giving us Heaven and punishes the evil with hell. In the same way that a good father rewards a good son and has to punish a misbehaving son.

Notwithstanding, God, in His great mercy – prefers to pardon us if we ask for His forgiveness. If he sometimes judges it, it is when he has no recourse because of man's stubbornness in not wanting to seek pardon and whose liberty God has enjoined Himself to respect.

God, in His infinite mercy, forgives one and all. God is not vindictive. We must not be anguished. We must trust in His clemency. God always forgives those who seek forgiveness. It would be a monstrosity unworthy of the justice of God.

**Jesus** spoke of "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit" as an unforgivable sin. This sin is unpardonable because it is an obstinate rejection to convert to the merciful love of God the Father.<sup>584</sup> It is not wanting to repent. And God cannot pardon those who do not want to repent.<sup>585</sup>

2. The expression "**a punishment of God**" is Biblical<sup>586</sup>. But it must be rightly understood. It is not that God delivers a punishment. But rather that the punishment is something intrinsic to the fault. Therefore the punishment comes from man and not from God. God limits Himself to manifestation of the situation of the callous man. As a professor one only reports the inability of the student. The professor does not suspend, it is the pupil who suspends himself for not being well prepared. It is to be assumed that the professor acts with justice.

God permits punishment for it is necessary; but He does not want it. He also does not want sin.<sup>587</sup>

What is evident is the following:

- a) God wants all men to be saved<sup>588</sup>
- b) For this purpose He helps us in many ways
- c) He respects our freedom, and he who wants to reject God, can do so.
- d) He who does so elect hell, against what God had wanted: 'God does not want death (eternal) of the sinner, but rather that he convert and live (forever)'<sup>589</sup>
- e) Hell is a consequence of sin.

3 The fear of God must be filial, not servile. More than fear, it is a loving respect. The fear of the son, that is the fear of offending, nor of not loving sufficiently. He who fears not loving enough, has a superior form of love.<sup>590</sup>

## 16. GOD IS EVERYWHERE.

1. In the same way that perfume permeates through a room, God fills all; He is everywhere. But in a more perfect fashion.

<sup>583</sup> Corinthians, 5:10

<sup>584</sup> SPANISH EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE.: *Esta es Nuestra Fe*, 2ª, III, 2, 4, c. EDICE. Madrid

<sup>585</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 1ª, IV, nª 87-93. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>586</sup> II SAMUEL, 12. WISDOM. 5:20-23. Matthew 25:41ss, LEON-DUFOUR: *Vocabulario de la Teología Bíblica*, voz: *castigo* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>587</sup> JOSE RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *La Otra Dimensión: Escatología Cristiana*, VIII, 3. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>588</sup> I TIMOTHY, 2:4

<sup>589</sup> I John, 4:8

<sup>590</sup> Biblia de Jerusalén, Nota de la pag. 1631



When we say that God is in Heaven, we want to indicate that there He particularly manifests His glory.

Before creation God could not be in all things, because they still did not exist. From all eternity God was present within himself<sup>591</sup>

## 17.. WE DO NOT SEE GOD BECAUSE HE IS PURE SPIRIT.

1. Because of the limitation of the eyes in our body we cannot see that which is very small, nor that which is very far away. This is why we use a microscope or telescope,

Neither can one see the wind and the light, but we only see things which are illuminated by the light and the leaves which are moved by the wind.

Nor can our eyes visualize the image of God because he is spirit. Therefore, those who are in Heaven see God with the eyes” of the soul, since they are granted a special privilege.

---

<sup>591</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Dios y su Obra. 1ª, 2º, II, 6, nº 75, a.* Ed. BAC. Madrid.

## TRINITY

### 18. THERE IS ONLY ONE TRUE GOD.

1. **There can only be one true God.** If there were more, or if one would mandate over the others - this would be the only true God - or they would be independent from each other. But this is impossible because the true God must have absolute control over everything which exists outside of Him. If not, he could not rule everything. And God, - as demonstrated by philosophers, - can do all.<sup>592</sup>

The Bible says: "Thus says the Lord, Israel's King..... there is no God but Me<sup>593</sup>."

The Hebrews, out of respect for God, did not even pronounce His name. They wrote only the consonants, YHVH, so the vowels had to be added. Thus there are two forms of the name, Jehovah and Yahweh.

### 19.. IN GOD THERE ARE THREE DIFFERENT PERSONS.

1. "God is love", for that reason he is Trinitarian; because love requires more than one to love in his alter ego. That's why in God there are three.<sup>594</sup>

### 20. THE THREE PERSONS ARE: FATHER, SON AND HOLY SPIRIT.

1. The Father loves us and has made us his children. The Son has saved us by dying for us. The Holy Spirit helps us with his grace to be good Christians.

2. Only by reason can we get to know something about God: His eternity, His omni perfection. But not the intimate life of God. (The Trinity)<sup>595</sup>

The second person is like the idea that sprouts from understanding. That is why it is called Verb: Word. The third person is the Love that comes forth from the two First Persons. However, all three persons are simultaneous in time, because the Three are eternal.

---

<sup>592</sup> Go to number 11, there I make reference as to why there can only be one true God

<sup>593</sup> ISAIAH, 44:6, Deuteronomy, 6:4, Corinthians, 8:6, etc

<sup>594</sup> JUAN LUIS RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *Teología De la Creación, 1ª, IV, 2, 1.* Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>595</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Jesucristo y la Vida Cristiana. cap. preliminar.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

## 21. THE FATHER IS GOD.

### 22. THE SON IS GOD.

1. The Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity proceeds from the Father, but He is not after Him in time. It is a source of origin, not of time. We can illustrate this with an example. If I turn on a light in my room at night, I shall simultaneously see my hand and the shadow of my hand on the table. The shadow has its origin in my hand, but I see the two simultaneously. There is no priority in time. The shadow and the hand appear before my eyes simultaneously, although the shadow is originated by the hand.

2. **Jehovah's Witnesses** do not believe that the Son is God like the Father, and they fool the naive who listen to them saying that the Son was made flesh by the Father and therefore comes after the Father and is not eternal like Him. It is that they ignore the philosophical distinction between the priority of origins and time, For example: fire gives origin to light, light does not appear after the fire, but rather it appears simultaneously. The same occurs in God with the Father and the Son.

### 23. THE HOLY SPIRIT IS GOD.

1. **Christ** said: *"It is much better for you that I leave. If I fail to go, the Comforter will never come to you, whereas if I depart, I will send him to you"*<sup>596</sup>.

The Holy Spirit is also a Divine Person, therefore he should receive the same adoration and honor that the other two receive.

**Jehovah's Witnesses** deny that the Holy Spirit is a Divine Person; nevertheless, Holy Scripture gives to the Holy Spirit the same attributes of God: omniscience<sup>597</sup>, omnipresence<sup>598</sup>, omnipotence<sup>599</sup>. The Holy Spirit is the active power of God; it is God in action<sup>600</sup>. The Holy Spirit is a Divine Person, because of this **Jesus Christ** says that the Holy Spirit inspires us<sup>601</sup>, teaches us<sup>602</sup>, and guides us<sup>603</sup>, and **Luke** says that to lie to the Holy Spirit is to lie to God<sup>604</sup>.

The Holy Spirit helps us to understand better what **Jesus** told us, and gives us the strength to follow the Lord.

**John** says that he inspires us<sup>605</sup>. And he comforts us<sup>606</sup>. **Paul** says that he is the giver of life<sup>607</sup>. And he sanctifies us<sup>608</sup>.

<sup>596</sup> John, 16:7

<sup>597</sup> 1 Corinthians, 2:10),

<sup>598</sup> Psalm, 139:1

<sup>599</sup> Zachariah, 4:6; JOB 32:8; 33:4

<sup>600</sup> JUDGES, 14:6, John,14:17,26; 15:26; 16:8,13; ACTS, 1 :6; 8:29; 13

<sup>601</sup> Matthew, 10: 19s

<sup>602</sup> John, 14:26

<sup>603</sup> John, 16:13

<sup>604</sup> ACTS, 5:3s

<sup>605</sup> John, 3:8

<sup>606</sup> John, 14:16

<sup>607</sup> ROMAS, 8:11

The Holy Spirit helps us to better understand what **Jesus Christ** told us, and gives us strength to follow the Lord.

In the Nicene creed it is said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the father: *Ex-Patre*. This formula means that he has the same nature as the father, in other words, that he is God as the Father is.

When we live in sanctifying grace we are **living temples** of the Holy Spirit<sup>609</sup>. He dwells in us and fills us with his gifts. Without his inspiration and help, we can do no good.

**Jesus Christ** says that the sin against the Holy Spirit is not to be forgiven. Theologians interpret this as a willingness of not wanting to repent. And God cannot pardon those who do not want to repent.<sup>610</sup>

Such hardness can lead to the final condemnation and to eternal perdition<sup>611</sup>.

2. The Catechism speaks of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, which are permanent rules that make a man docile to follow the impulses of the Holy Spirit, and they are seven:

**Gift of Wisdom:** A special liking of the spiritual

**Gift of Understanding**> It is a grace of the Holy Spirit to understanding the word of God and to immerse oneself in the revealed truths

**Gift of Advise:** A light to know at each moment what is the will of God.

**Gift of Science:** Makes us able to distinguish between the true and the false in the order of eternal life.

**Gift of Strength:** It is a special strength to courageously do what God wants us to do, and to overcome the challenges in our life.

**Gift of Piety** : Is a true brotherly affection towards God as Father

**Gift of the Fear of God:** It is an act of humility in fear of offending God, recognizing our own weaknesses.

## 24. THEY ARE NOT THREE GODS WHO ARE EQUAL, BUT RATHER ONLY ONE TRUE GOD IN THREE DISTINCT PERSONS<sup>612</sup>.

1. The three Persons are distinct because the Father is not the Son nor the Holy Spirit, and the Son and the Holy Spirit are distinct from the Father and amongst themselves.

But all three Persons **have the same and single divine nature**. The same grandeur, power, wisdom, goodness, saintliness, the same lovingness and the way of doing things, etc. That which one Person does, all three do, nevertheless, certain activities appear to be more appropriate for one Person than the other: the Creation to the Father, the Redemption to the Son, and the Sanctification to the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>608</sup> ROMANS,, 15:16

<sup>609</sup> CORINTHIANS, 6: 19

<sup>610</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, nn. 87-93. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>611</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1864

<sup>612</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n°. 253

It is not that the Three Persons share the power, the wisdom, the divinity etc., between themselves but rather that each of the Three Persons have all the divinity, all the power, all the wisdom, etc.

This is a profound mystery, but we are certain that it is this way, because God Himself has said it, and God cannot deceive Himself nor deceive us.

The Trinity is a mystery of love. Love is the mutual giving of oneself in order to form a third person which is "us". In the Trinity, the Three Persons meld together because of love forming a single nature.

2. **Jehovah's Witnesses** also deny the Trinity, saying that it is a word which does not appear in the Bible. It is true that the word Trinity is not there, but the doctrine is, which is deduced from the whole Gospel, and which **Christ** condensed when he said that one must baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit<sup>613</sup>. Precisely because this formula expresses the Trinity, **Jehovah's Witnesses** eliminate it in their baptism with which they disobey that which **Christ** taught<sup>614</sup>.

**Jehovah's Witnesses** say that the Mystery of the Most Holy Trinity is something which we have copied from Hinduism, in that three divinities of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva who form one trinity. However, **Father Ceferino Santos, S.J.**, explains in his Chair of Oriental Philosophy at the Universidad de Comillas in Madrid, that although these three divinities are mentioned in the Mahabarata and in some Puranas before **Jesus Christ**, these were independent divinities among themselves and even opposed to each other<sup>615</sup>. The Hindu Trimurti (triple form of divinity) is something totally different from the Trinity of the Christian faith<sup>616</sup>. The Trimurti never becomes a trinity in the Christian sense<sup>617</sup>.

These Hindu divinities are considered as a Trimurti after the V Century A.D., probably through the influence of the preaching of the Apostle **Thomas** in India. There are testimonies that go back to the III Century, from different sources that **Thomas** evangelized throughout India. There he was killed and his body is buried in the Cathedral of Madras (India).

All in all, the Hindu Trimurti never became a trinity in the Christian sense.

That is to say, the historical truth is totally opposite to what **Jehovah's Witnesses** go about saying, deceiving the unwary who put their trust in them.

One should not speak about religion with **Jehovah's Witnesses** because with their lies and half-truths they can harm you. He who takes poison will be poisoned. . **John** has already warned us not to receive in our home he who comes with a doctrine which is not that of **Jesus Christ**.<sup>618</sup>

<sup>613</sup> Matthew, 28:19

<sup>614</sup> BENJAMÍN MARTÍN SÁNCHEZ: *Quiénes son los Testigos de Jehová?*, X. Ed. Montecasino. Zamora. 1971

<sup>615</sup> H. ZIMMER: *Mythes et Symboles dans l'Indie*, pg. 124 P.U.F. Payot. Paris. 1951

<sup>616</sup> P. FALLON: *Religious Hinduism*, Vii, E. St. Paul Publications, Allahabad (India) 1968

<sup>617</sup> FRANZ KATSTBERGER: *Léxico de Filosofía Hindú*, pg. 291s. Buenos Aires. 1954

<sup>618</sup> II John, Ver. 10

## THE MYSTERIES

3. In our Holy Religion there are some incomprehensible mysteries for our limited human understanding, but we must believe them because they have been revealed by God. And God does not teach falsehoods.

Furthermore, philosophers and theologians demonstrate that the mysteries of faith are superior to human understanding, but **not contrary to reason**<sup>619</sup>, that is to say, that they are not impossible and absurd. This was confirmed by the Vatican Council<sup>620</sup>. What happens with them as with many other things in life, that we continually use and that we do not know about, magnetism offers us a few mysteries<sup>621</sup>. **Maxwell's** equations, ever so strong, do not tell us what magnetism and electricity are, but only how matter behaves, magnetically and electrically.<sup>622</sup>

No one knows what light is. It is defined as a "physical agent who makes objects visible" but its nature is unknown. Its activity is explained by the double theory: corpuscular by **Newton**, undulating by **Huygens** and associated wave by **Schrödinger**<sup>623</sup>. But the nature of light is somewhat mysterious. The same thing happens with gravity, through the mutual attraction of material masses. We don't know its matter<sup>624</sup>, **Newton** himself, who expressed this attraction in a simple mathematical formula confessed that he knew what the laws of attraction were<sup>625</sup>, but did not know what the essence of such attraction was<sup>626</sup>. It is that Physics only tells us about the facts. No one tells us about the essence of things and their ultimate causes. There are truths which are known by demonstration: the angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles. But others can only be known through the testimony of authority: the mystery of the Holy Trinity.

**Life is full of mysteries.** Are we going to be astonished that they will also be in an infinite God, which surpasses our understanding?

Neither does the immensity of the sea fit in our eye, nor that of God in our understanding. If God should fit in our understanding. He would be limited. He would cease being God, as God has to be infinite. We cannot know God completely with adequate and perfect science<sup>627</sup>. It would be absurd to believe that only what is true is that which fits within our limited understanding. When we believe in the mysteries, we are in an act of humility recognizing that God knows more than we.

**Niels Bohr**, one of the first scientists who discovered the structure of the atom, discussing with **Einstein**, also a believer, said to him: "It is not, nor can it be, our task to tell God how to rule the world<sup>628</sup>". Some are carried away by an excessive nationalism which rejects all that is superior to reason.

Mysteries are not exclusive of Religion, nor are they an obstacle in order to believe. And the same occurs with other sciences, when we do not understand something, we trust in those who tell us that they understand this science. Thus, in things of Religion we must trust in what God tells us in

<sup>619</sup> LUIS CREUS VIDAL: *Introducción a la Apologética*, 2ª, 16 Ed. La Hormiga de Oro. Barcelona.

<sup>620</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº. 480

<sup>621</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº. 481

<sup>622</sup> PEDRO LAIN ENTRALGO: *Alma, Cuerpo, Persona.*, 2º, IV, 5, 1. Ed. Galaxia. Barcelona.

<sup>623</sup> JOSÉ M. MÉNDEZ: *Finito e Infinito*, II, 7. Ed. Estudios de Axiología. Madrid. 1987

<sup>624</sup> JOSÉ LUIS COMELLAS *Astronomía*, XXIV, C. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1987

<sup>625</sup> JESÚS SIMÓN, S. I.: *A Dios por Ciencia*, II, 11. Ed. Codesal. Sevilla

<sup>626</sup> IAN G. BARBOUR: *Problemas de Religión y Ciencia*, 1º, III, 1. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander.

<sup>627</sup> JOSÉ SÁNCHEZ COVALEDA, S. I. *Breviario Teológico de la Salvación*, 1º, III, 1. Salamanca

<sup>628</sup> WERNER HEISENBERG: *Diálogos sobre Física Atómica*, VI. Ed. BAC. Madrid

Revelation, which is a work of God even though our limited understanding does not comprehend it perfectly. Neither does an ant understand chess, and nevertheless a game of chess is a reality.

**There are unexplained things In physics which**, and it is not because of this that a physicist denies Physics; in Medicine there are cases which have no solution, and because of this a doctor does not detest Medicine. In Religion there are things which surpass our understanding, but we must trust in God who tells us so.

It is like that little native African boy who had never seen ice and because of this he did not believe the missionary when he told him that if it got very cold sometimes water hardened in such a fashion that a man could walk on it without sinking. The little boy did not understand how this could happen, but he was aware of the integrity of the missionary and that he knew what he was talking about, and therefore he should trust him even though his understanding did not comprehend it. We should believe in the mysteries of Religion which God teaches us through the Church with His divine assistance.. "I firmly believe in that which I do not see, because I believe in He who sees all." (Bossuet). Although it is well that we seek the reason which makes our faith reasonable, nevertheless we do not believe because it appears to us to be reasonable, but rather because we trust in the scientific truthfulness of God, and we accept with confidence all that He tells us.

However, in Heaven we shall clearly understand all of the mysteries which we do not understand now.

What happens to us is the same as happened to the person who only knew of flat surfaces, and ignored what a sphere was> He cannot begin to understand that if you travel through the diameter of the sphere, without backtracking yourself, you will arrive at the point of departure.

4. The mystery that there is only one God in three distinct Persons is called the Mystery of the Most Holy Trinity. Although we cannot understand this perfectly, we can nevertheless clear it up with some comparisons.

Water can be in three states (solid, liquid and gaseous) without losing its same nature: H<sub>2</sub>O.

Three matches joined at the head have a single flame: each match has a flame, but they are not three flames, just one. In a triangle, each angle encompasses the complete triangle, however, the three angles are different, etc. etc. etc.

A rosebush can have three roses which are the same, but they are not three rosebushes.

A mountain with three peaks is not considered three distinct mountains.

With the same soul we think, we love, we remember: they are three different operations which we do with the same nature.

If you look at yourself at the same time in three different mirrors, you will see three images of yourself.

## **INCARNATION**

### **25. OF THREE PERSONS OF THE MOST HOLY TRINITY, THE SECOND ONE WHO IS THE SON BECAME MAN.**

1. "The only Son of the Father, who without losing Divine Nature, assumed Human nature"<sup>629</sup>

### **26. JESUS CHRIST IS GOD MADE MAN WHO WAS BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY.**

1. **Jesus Christ** who is true God and true man in the unity of his Holy person. **Jesus Christ** has two natures, the Divine<sup>630</sup> and the human, united in the only Person of the Son of God<sup>631</sup>.

In the year 431, the Council of Ephesus condemned **Nestorius** for saying that in **Christ** there were two Persons, and in the year 451, the Council of Chalcedon condemned **Eutyches** for saying the in **Christ** there was only one nature: his followers are known as monophysitic heretics.

### **27. HE IS GOD BECAUSE HE IS THE SON OF GOD.**

1. **Jesus Christ** allowed himself to be called "Son of God". When **Peter** says such to Him, **Christ** answers that such has been revealed to Him by the Father who is in heaven<sup>632</sup>

**28. HE IS MAN BECAUSE HE IS ALSO THE SON OF THE VIRGIN MARY, in whose womb God formed his human body.**

1. Even if the comparison is inexact, we also carry the first surname of our father and the second one of our mother's. **Jesus Christ** is God and Man. God because he is the Son of God; and Man because he is also the Son of the Virgin Mary. **Christ** is only one Person but in Him there are two natures, the divine and the human, composed of body and soul. As he had a human nature, he sometimes was thirsty and hungry.

---

<sup>629</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 479

<sup>630</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 480

<sup>631</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 481

<sup>632</sup> Matthew, **16:17ss**



As his person was divine, he was his father's equal<sup>633</sup>

2. We have to distinguish between nature and person. Nature answers to the: what is it? The Person to: Who is it?

**Nature** is the entirety of common characteristics of those of the same species, which makes them different from other species: stone, flower, man.

**Person** is the whole of the characteristics which belong to the "Id" which differentiate him from other individuals of the same species: Peter, John, Anthony, The Person is unique and is non-transferable<sup>634</sup>.

A person is always an intellectual nature.<sup>635</sup> Person is the being of an intellectual nature<sup>636</sup>. Person "is the autonomous individual who acts in the conscious possession and the free disposition of himself."<sup>637</sup>

3. The Council of Nicaea in the year 325 A.D. defined the divinity of Jesus as a dogma of faith; and in the year 451 A.D. the Council of Chalcedon defined His absolute humanity.<sup>638</sup>

---

<sup>633</sup> H. PINAR DE LA BOULLAYE, S. I.: *La Persona de Jesús, II*. Ed. Razón y Fe. Madrid

<sup>634</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *La Virgen Maria, 2º, V, I*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1968

<sup>635</sup> RENE LAURENTIN: *Creo en Dios, X, XI*, Ed. San Pablo, Madrid. 1995

<sup>636</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Jesucristo y la Vida Cristiana, nº 38*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1961

<sup>637</sup> EMERICH CORETH: *¿Qué es el Hombre?* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>638</sup> DENZINGER: *El Magisterio de la Iglesia. nº 148*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

ever being together, was found to be laden with child by the Holy Spirit<sup>639</sup>

Protestant theologian of international fame, **Max Thurian**, says that those who deny the virginal conception of **Christ** are not faithful to the Bible. "The virginity of **Mary** constitutes an indubitable part of the text of the New Testament."<sup>640</sup>

**Max Thurian** died in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1996, AGED 75. He converted to Catholicism in 1987. His biblical studies led him to discover the role of **Mary** in the church.<sup>641</sup>

God formed within the purest womb of Mary Most Holy, a body like ours and created a soul like ours. To this Human Being, at the very instant of His conception, was united the Son of God, that is to say, the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity, and thus that which was the Son of God became Man without ceasing to be God. This is the mystery of the Incarnation.

In the genealogy of the Gospel of Matthew it says: so-and-so begat so-and-so, and upon coming to **Joseph** it does not say he begat Jesus, as in all the previous cases, but says: *Jacob begat Joseph, husband of Mary, of whom Jesus was born<sup>642</sup>, letting it be known that Joseph did not begat Jesus, but that the conception was virginal. And Luke* says of **Jesus**: "that it was thought that Jesus was the son of **Joseph**,<sup>643</sup>" meaning that **Joseph** did not beget **Jesus**, but rather that **Mary** was a virgin when **Jesus** was conceived.

But it says: "Jacob was the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary. It was of her that Jesus who is called the Messiah was born.<sup>644</sup>").

**Joseph's doubts confirm the virginal conception of Mary**, because when he saw the external signs of his wife's pregnancy, and knowing that it was not his, as he had done nothing to make her pregnant, he began to have great doubts with what his eyes witnessed and the virtue which he knew of Mary. Unable to reconcile the two things, he suffered anguishing doubts until the angel calmed him, telling him that his wife's condition was the work of the Holy Spirit<sup>645</sup>. Not being able to harmonize the two factors, he had anguishing doubts until an angel calmed him telling him that what was happening to his wife was the work of the Holy Spirit<sup>646</sup>

Virginity did not have amongst the Jews any aureole. Quite the contrary, honors went to the fertile women.<sup>647</sup>

2. The **Virgin Mary** had a single son, who was **Jesus Christ**. When the Gospel speaks of the brothers of **Jesus**<sup>648</sup> it is referring to first cousins and relatives, who among the Jews also were called brothers<sup>649</sup>. In Hebrew there is no word that signifies

<sup>639</sup> Matthew, 1: 18

<sup>640</sup> MAX THURIAN: *Maria, Madre del Señor y Figura de la Iglesia*, pgs. 43s. Ed. Hechos y Dichos. Zaragoza

<sup>641</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2805 (7-IX-96) 17

<sup>642</sup> Matthew, 1: 16

<sup>643</sup> LUKE, 3: 23

<sup>644</sup> Matthew, 1: 25

<sup>645</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la fe cristiana*, 3ª, I, 36. Ed. BAC. Madrid . 1975

<sup>646</sup> Matthew, 1:20

<sup>647</sup> HANS URS von BALTHASAR: *Puntos Centrales de la Fe*, 2ª, VI, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1985

<sup>648</sup> Matthew, 13: 55; MARK, 6: 3

<sup>649</sup> M. DAIBER: *Manuyal de los estudios bíblicos católicos*, XXX. 8. Librería Salesiana. Zamora

cousin<sup>650</sup>.(Lv, 10:14). The word “brother” encompasses several stages of relationship<sup>651</sup>. They would call “brother” all who were close or a relative<sup>652</sup>.

**Jehovah’s Witnesses** try to make people believe that the Most Holy Mary was not a virgin, but that she had many children, point to the text of the Gospel where it says that James and Joseph were brothers of Jesus<sup>653</sup>. But here, as in many of their other deceits, they present a text which can complicate and hide the text which can clear things up. In fact, the same Holy Gospel says that at the foot of the cross was Mary the Mother of **Jesus**<sup>654</sup> and next to her the mother of **James** and **Joseph**<sup>655</sup> who was the wife of Cleophas, Joseph’s<sup>656</sup> brother. **Cleophas**<sup>657</sup> is the same name in Greek, as Alpheus is in Aramaic. (Mt, 27:56) Both are the same name given to Joseph’s elder brother, **Mary’s** husband. He was the father of James the young<sup>658</sup> and **Joseph**, and was married to the other MARY who was at the foot of the cross next to the virgin. He married her after widowing in his first marriage where Simon and Judas Thaddeus were born. Therefore the mother of James and Joseph is different from the mother of Jesus. Then why does the Gospel say that James and Joseph were brothers of Jesus? Because they were relatives, and these among the Hebrews were called brothers. In fact, we know from the Bible that Abraham was an uncle of Lot<sup>659</sup>. However, Lot and Abraham call each other “brothers” five times<sup>660</sup> (Gn, 13:8; 14:16, etc.) In another passage, it says that Laban was **Jacob’s** uncle<sup>661</sup>. Later it says that **Laban** calls **Jacob** ‘brother’<sup>662</sup>

If the **Virgin Mary** had other children, **Jesus** on the cross would not have entrusted her to **John**, but rather to them<sup>663</sup>. It is evident that **Mary** did not have other children to care for her.<sup>664</sup>

That is to say, that the **Most Holy Mary** had only one son: Jesus. When the Gospel calls him ‘primogenital’, it is affirming that he is the first child, but that does not signify, according to the way of talking in those days, that there were other children later on. Primogenital means first in line of birth, not preceded by others. It precludes the existence of others after him.

Not long ago, a tombstone inscription has been discovered that states of a young Jewish mother that “she died while giving birth to her primogenital son” Which means that there were no other children after this one.<sup>665</sup>

<sup>650</sup> SANTOS SABUGAL, O.S.A.: *Credo. 1ª, II, 2, 3, a.* Ed. Monte Casino. Zamora

<sup>651</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine. 2806 (14-IX-96) 24

<sup>652</sup> MAX MEINERTZ: *Teología del Nuevo Testamento, 1ª, IV, 5.* Ed. FAX. Madrid0

<sup>653</sup> Matthew, 13 :55

<sup>654</sup> John, 19:25

<sup>655</sup> Matthew, 27:56; MARK, 6:3, 15:40

<sup>656</sup> MAX MEINERTZ: *Teología del Nuevo Testamento, 1ª, IV, 5.* Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>657</sup> John. 19:25

<sup>658</sup> Matthew, 10:3

<sup>659</sup> Genesis, 11:27; 12:5

<sup>660</sup> Genesis, 13:8; 14:14, 16, ETC.

<sup>661</sup> Genesis, 29:10

<sup>662</sup> Genesis, 29:15

<sup>663</sup> SANTOS SABUGAL, O.S.A.: *Credo, 1ª, II, 2, 3, a.* Ed. Monte Casino, Zamora

<sup>664</sup> MAX MEINERTZ: *Teología del Nuevo Testamento, 1ª, V, 5.* Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>665</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO DE SOBRINO, S.I.: *Así fue Jesús, II, 12, b.* Ed. BAC. Madrid, 1984

**Saint Geronimo** says that “all single children are primogenital, but not all primogenital are only children”<sup>666</sup>

When **Jehovah’s Witnesses** go about deceiving the unwary who listen to them saying that **Mary** had many children, know that that is not true because they presume to know the Bible. They teach the obscure text which I have mentioned and they are quiet about the clear text. This is not honorable, but it is their way of doing things.

Some are of the opinion that the Gospels calling “brothers of **Jesus**” is in reference to the children of Joseph from a prior marriage, as he was a widower, as per the Apocrypha writing of the II Century *Protoevanlio of James*..

The Virginity of Mary is a dogma of faith. It was defined in the year 649<sup>667</sup> A.D., in the first Council of Lateran.

The Church teaches since the V Century that **Mary** was a virgin before the birth, during the birth and after the birth<sup>668</sup>. The virginity during childbirth is faith in the whole church since the IV Century<sup>669</sup>. It was confirmed by the Second Vatican Council.<sup>670</sup> Because of this it calls her “always **Virgin Mary**”<sup>671</sup>.

It is a matter of faith that the **Most Holy Virgin Mary** always remained virginal.<sup>672</sup>

The literal translation of “since” can be construed in English to accept “yes afterwards”. But in the Bible, it does not accept a post change of situation<sup>673</sup>

### 3. The **Most Holy Virgin** is our Mother in Heaven.

**Mary** is our mother, since she is the mother of **Jesus Christ** who is the head of the Mystical Body of Christ<sup>674</sup>. The mother of the head is also the mother of all members of the body. And we are the members of the Mystical Body of **Christ**. That is why **Mary** is the mother of the church. **Paul VI** so proclaimed it in the year 1964 during the closing of the third session of the Second Vatican Council.

That **Jesus** enjoined **John** to care for his mother is perfectly normal, but what is not normal is the parallel request that **Mary** take loving care of **John**. This seems unnecessary. If **John** is to take care of **Mary**, her correspondence seems obvious, to insist on this seems superfluous and not too delicate. Any normal woman needs not to be told. She will know it spontaneously. **Jesus’** enjoining supposes a transcendental theological content,. We are all represented in **John**. Besides, at that time John’s mother was present. To enjoin **John to Mary** would be offensive to his mother **Mary Salome**. There is no doubt that in the words of **Jesus** there is a deeper sense than what the seen to intend **Jesus** gives a MOTHER to HUMANITY. These words have a

<sup>666</sup> FELIX CALLE, O.S.A.: *Razona tú fe*, XXI, 4. Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid

<sup>667</sup> CÁNDIDO POZO, S. I.: *Maria en la Obra de Salvación*, 3ª VI, 2, 3, f. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1974

<sup>668</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la fe cristiana*, 3ª, I, 36. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1975

<sup>669</sup> SANTOS SABUGAL, O.S.A.: *Credo*, 1ª, II, 2, 3, a. Ed. Monte Casino. Zamora

<sup>670</sup> Vatican Council II: *Lumen Gentium. dogmatic constitution of the Church*, nº 57

<sup>671</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 510. DENZINGER, nº 57

<sup>672</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2ª, 2º, VII, nº461, a,2. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>673</sup> CÁNDIDO POZO, S.I.: *Maria en la Obra de la Salvación*, 3ª, VI, 2, 3, f. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1974

<sup>674</sup> EPHESIANS, 1:22

transcendental meaning, they say, relative to all men, that they have universal meaning<sup>675</sup>

Mary is the physical mother of Jesus and the spiritual mother of all men<sup>676</sup>. We must love **Mary** and honor her with our hearts. Thus we shall please the Lord, who like all well-born sons, will be pleased to see his Most Holy Mother honored and loved<sup>677</sup>.

In order to value the qualities of **Mary**, it is enough to have an idea of how **Christ** could make his mother to His will. How would you have endowed your mother if this had been up to you? **Christ** could have done it and he was omnipotent.

The Most Holy Virgin is the greatest woman who has ever existed in the world.<sup>678</sup>

**The Holiest Mary** is the most exquisite creature that has come from the hands of God.

We must seek the Most Holy Virgin with all our sorrows and temptations. She can do it all, because God concedes all to her<sup>679</sup> because she is the Mother of **Christ** and because she never had any sin, not even the original sin.

**Mary** remained pure, without original sin, throughout her life<sup>680</sup>.

Because of this St. Luke calls her full of grace<sup>681</sup>.

The fact that Most Holy Mary was preserved from original sin from the first moment of her conception in the womb of her mother **Saint Ann** is what we want to express when we say "The Immaculate Conception".

The church has celebrated the feast of the Immaculate Conception since the VII Century<sup>682</sup>

The Spanish people celebrated the Immaculate Conception many years before it was defined, **Murillo** himself had done thirty paintings of the Immaculate Virgin, three hundred years before the dogmatic definition.<sup>683</sup>

The Spanish people used to sing in those days:

If he wanted and could not, He is not God,  
If he did , and did not want, he is not Son  
Let's say then, that he could and wanted.

And **Escoto**, with his concise style, said, "*Potuit, deuit, ergo, fecit*": He could do it, he should do it, and then he did it.<sup>684</sup>

The Dogma on the Immaculate Conception of **Mary** was defined on December 8, 1854, by **Pope Pius IX**<sup>685</sup>

The redemption of Mary was preventive, as she was to become the mother of God.<sup>686</sup>

The dogma of the Conception of **Mary** was defined by Pope **Pius IX** on December 8, 1854.

God could have arranged that **Jesus Christ** should appear in the world as an adult, but He did not want Him to. He gave Him over to **Mary**. He placed Him in Her hands. God had

<sup>675</sup> IGNACIO LARRAÑAGA: *El Silencio de Maria IV. 3.* Ed. Paulinas. Madrid

<sup>676</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *La Virgen Maria, 2ª, VI.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>677</sup> Vatican Council II: *Lumen Gentium. dogmatic constitution of the Church, n° 66*

<sup>678</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la salvación, n° 111.*Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>679</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la salvación, n° 111.*Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>680</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 494

<sup>681</sup> LUKE, 1:28

<sup>682</sup> FELIPE CALLE, O.S.A.: *Razona tú Fe ,XVI, 4.* Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid

<sup>683</sup> TIHAMER TOTH; *La Virgen Maria, III, 3. a.* Ed. Rialp. Madrid

<sup>684</sup> JESÚS Mª GRANERO, S. IO.: *Credo -\* Jesucristo, XV.* Ed. Cerón. Cádiz. 1943

<sup>685</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 1641* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>686</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Jesucristo y la vida cristiana, n. 199.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

wanted to use Her in the redemption and salvation of all men.<sup>687</sup> (Vatican Council II, *Lumen Gentium*.)

Christ is the mediator with the Father. *No one gets to the father but through me.*<sup>688</sup> (1 Tm, 2:5).

He is the mediator with the father<sup>689</sup>.. Because of His own merits. Without depending on any other person, **Mary** is the path to **Christ**. She is the secondary mediator, subordinated to **Christ**<sup>690</sup>. She is mediator as she intercedes for us. Vatican Council II says of **Mary** that “Her multiple intercessions grant eternal salvation”<sup>691</sup>. (Vatican Council II, *Lumen Gentium*)

4. In churches there seem to be many images of the virgin, the Virgin of Fatima, the virgin of Lourdes, the virgin of Guadalupe, etc. It is that the Most Holy Virgin has many titles and prerogatives. Each town has its own virgin or representation. But they are all images or pictures of the one and only **Virgin Mary**, who is in heaven in body and soul<sup>692</sup>

The elevation of **Mary** to Heaven in body and soul is called the Assumption. The Assumption was declared dogma of faith on November 1, 1950 by Pope **Pius XII**. But the feast of the Assumption had already been celebrated on August 15 for 500 years after **Christ**.

5. One of the best devotions to the Most Holy Virgin is the prayer of the **Holy Rosary**. If you can pray it in church, so much the better. If not, pray at any moment you are free, or while you are waiting to go to sleep. I advise you to make an effort to pray it because it is a very pleasant gift to the Virgin, as she herself has said in Lourdes and Fatima. And better yet if you pray it with the family. This is a very Christian practice. Try to introduce this practice at home, if you do not already have it, because it unites the family.

Prayed in a church or at a reunion, it has a plenary indulgence.

If you cannot pray the whole rosary because it is too long, pray a mystery every day.

Praying to the Virgin is a very beautiful devotion. **Mary** is the only woman who has ever existed who is most worthy of love. It is a love that dignifies and elevates. Her sweet memory can protect you against the temptations which are at the extreme opposite to purity.

Another recommendable devotion to the Virgin is the **Holy Scapulary**. This was a devotion revealed to **Saint Simon Stock**, Prior to the order of the Carmelites, in the XIII Century. The virgin promised him that whoever was wearing the Carmelite Scapulary at the moment of his death would not be condemned. The scapulary must be imposed by a priest, and one must daily pray three Hail Mary's. The cloth scapulary can be substituted by a medallion which carries on one side the image of the virgin<sup>693</sup>, and on the other side the Scared Heart of Jesus. Such was granted by the Pope.

<sup>687</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, n° 62  
<sup>688</sup> John, 14:6

<sup>689</sup> Timothy, 2:5

<sup>690</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La Virgen Maria, 2ª, VIII. 146*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>691</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, n°

<sup>692</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n°974

<sup>693</sup> JESÚS MARTINEZ GARCIA: *Hablemos de la Fe, X, 10*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

6. To be devoted to **Mary** is the way to salvation. He who daily prays **three Hail Mary's** in her honor, will attain a special help in obtaining a good death, as God revealed to **Saint Matilda**<sup>694</sup>, and as is shown from many experiences.

“Remember, then, you the faithful, that the true devotion to Mary does not consist either of a sterile and fleeting affection, nor in vain credulity; but rather it comes from the true faith through which we are led to know the excellence of the Mother of God and we are nourished with a filial love towards our Mother and in imitation of her virtues<sup>695</sup>. But above all in her love of **Christ**, her strong faith in the Annunciation, and her faithfulness until the Cross.

Protestants accuse us Catholics of adoring the **Virgin Mary**, but this is a calumny. All of us Catholics know full well that the Virgin is not God. And adoration is exclusive to God. We do not adore the Most Holy Virgin, but we honor and venerate her because she is mother of God. That is why in the Hail Mary, we say “pray for us”. In the litany of the Rosary, when addressing God, we say “have pity on us”. On the other hand, when we pray to the Virgin, we say: “. pray for us” We go to **Mary** so that she may take us to God.

---

<sup>694</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *La Virgen Maria*, n° 437. Ed. BAC. Madrid .

<sup>695</sup> Vatican Council II; *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, n° 67

## Saint Joseph

**28.** ST. JOSEPH IS THE TRUE HUSBAND OF THE VIRGIN MARY; AND THEREFORE, THE LEGAL FATHER OF JESUS CHRIST, ENTRUSTED WITH HIS EDUCATION AND SUSTENANCE.

St. Joseph lived with the Most Holy Virgin in perfect chastity, without making use of the marriage rights, as though they were brother and sister. But as he was the true husband of Mary he is also the father of **Jesus Christ**; although not by the flesh, because **Jesus Christ** did not have a human father.

According to an investigation of **Fr. Sebastian Bartina, S. I.**, professor of Biblical Sciences which he published in the magazine "*Revista de Estudios Josefinos*", Joseph was a legal heir of King David. As a direct descendant he was entitled to royal rights. Joseph's royal family went into hiding in Nazareth, running away from Herod, the usurper of the throne, who was not of the Jewish race, but an Idumean. Jesus being the legal son of Joseph, was the king of Israel, not only spiritually, but also legally. Paradoxically, the sign that Pilate put on the cross was expressing a reality: "Jesus of Nazareth King of the Jews."<sup>696</sup>

The gospel calls him "*a just man*", which in the way of speaking in Hebrew means "holy man".

St. Joseph was a carpenter in Nazareth. He was a model worker. Because of this the Church has named him Patron of all workers. He died accompanied by Jesus and Mary. Because of this he is also is the patron of the good death.

When you establish a home, pick St. Joseph as your patron; he also knew what it meant to have the worries of maintaining a household.. St. Theresa said that she never asked anything of St. Joseph that the saint did not grant her. And to those who do not believe it, she tells them to try it for themselves.<sup>697</sup>

### *THE HOLIEST VIRGIN*

**29.-** THE VIRGIN MARY IS THE LADY FULL OF GRACE AND VIRTUES CONCEIVED WITHOUT ORIGINAL SIN, WHO IS THE MOTHER OF GOD AND OUR MOTHER, AND WHO IS IN HEAVEN IN BODY AND SOUL.

**30.** WE SAY THAT THE VIRGIN MARY IS THE MOTHER OF GOD BECAUSE JESUS CHRIST, TRUE GOD AND TRUE MAN WAS BORN OF HER.

---

<sup>696</sup> Matthew, 1:19

<sup>697</sup> SANTA TERESA DE JESUS: Vida, VI, 6-8



1. **Mary** is the Mother of **Jesus Christ** because she gave him a human body. But as **Jesus Christ** besides being Man, is God, **the Most Holy Mary** is also Mother of God<sup>698</sup>. **Mary** is the mother of a man who has Divinity.

The same thing occurs if one becomes a mayor. One's mother would be the mayor's mother. She has not given him the mayor's office, but because she gave him his body, she is his mother, the mayor's mother..

But the **Most Holy Mary** is the Mother of God with still more reason; because **Jesus Christ** is God from the time of his conception, therefore He who is born of **Mary** is God, and thus **Mary** is the Mother of God. **Paul** says: "*But when the fullness of time came, God sent forth his Son born of a woman*"<sup>699</sup> .

That **Mary** is the Mother of God is a dogma of Faith, defined by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431 A.D.<sup>700</sup>. **Jesus** was conceived, not by virtue of man, but rather miraculously by virtue of the Holy Spirit. **St. Matthew** says: "This is how the birth of **Jesus Christ** came about. When his mother **Mary** was wed to **Joseph**, but before they consummated the marriage, she was found with child through the power of the Holy Spirit"<sup>701</sup> .

Among the Jews the betrothals were the same as our weddings, although they were not definite nuptials. If after the betrothal, she was unfaithful to the husband, she was considered an adulteress and if he should die, she was considered a widow<sup>702</sup> .

The Jewish betrothals supposed such a commitment so real that the fiancé was called "husband"<sup>703</sup>

Even though **Mary** did not yet live with **Joseph**, she was his legitimate wife<sup>704</sup>  
Because of this the angel called **Mary** wife: "**Joseph**, have no fear about taking **Mary** as your wife"<sup>705</sup> .

**Luke** says: "The angel answered her: The Holy Spirit will come upon you and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; hence the holy offspring to be born will be called the Son of God"<sup>706</sup> .

**Jesus** was conceived , not by man, but miraculously by virtue of the Holy Spirit. **MATTHEW** says: The birth of **Jesus Christ** was this way: **Mary, being married to Joseph**, without ever being together, was found to be laden with child by the Holy Spirit<sup>707</sup>

Protestant theologian of international fame, **Max Thurian**, says that those who deny the virginal conception of **Christ** are not faithful to the Bible. "The virginity of **Mary** constitutes an indubitable part of the text of the New Testament."<sup>708</sup>

**Max Thurian** died in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1996, AGED 75. He converted to Catholicism in 1987. His biblical studies led him to discover the role of **Mary** in the church.<sup>709</sup>

God formed within the purest womb of Mary Most Holy, a body like ours and created a soul like ours. To this Human Being, at the very instant of His conception, was united the Son of God, that is

<sup>698</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*, Dogmatic Constitution of the Church. n° 53

<sup>699</sup> GALATIANS, 4:4

<sup>700</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 111ss Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>701</sup> Matthew, 1:18

<sup>702</sup> IGNACIO LARRAÑAGA: *El Silencio de Maria*, II, 2, 3. Ed. Paulinas. Madrid

<sup>703</sup> JOSÉ SAYÉS: *Jesucristo Nuestro Señor: II, 1, n° 985* Ed. EDAPOR. Madrid. 1985

<sup>704</sup> B. MANZANO, S. I.: *Vida de Jesucristo*, n° 17

<sup>705</sup> Matthew, 1: 20

<sup>706</sup> LUKE, 1:35

<sup>707</sup> Matthew, 1: 18

<sup>708</sup> MAX THURIAN: *Maria, Madre del Señor y Figura de la Iglesia*, pgs. 43s. Ed. Hechos y Dichos. Zaragoza

<sup>709</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2805 (7-IX-96) 17

to say, the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity, and thus that which was the Son of God became Man without ceasing to be God. This is the mystery of the Incarnation.

In the genealogy of the Gospel of **Matthew** it says: so-and-so begat so-and-so, and upon coming to **Joseph** it does not say he begat Jesus, as in all the previous cases, but says: **Jacob begat Joseph, husband of Mary, of whom Jesus was born<sup>710</sup>, letting it be known that Joseph did not beget Jesus, but that the conception was virginal. And Luke** says of **Jesus** :“that it was thought that Jesus was the son of **Joseph**,<sup>711</sup>.. meaning that **Joseph** did not beget **Jesus**, but rather that **Mary** was a virgin when **Jesus** was conceived.

But it says: “**Jacob** was the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary. It was of her that Jesus who is called the Messiah was born.<sup>712</sup>”.

**Joseph’s doubts confirm the virginal conception of Mary**, because when he saw the external signs of his wife’s pregnancy , and knowing that it was not his, as he had done nothing to make her pregnant, he began to have great doubts with what his eyes witnessed and the virtue which he knew of Mary. Unable to reconcile the two things, he suffered anguishing doubts until the angel calmed him, telling him that his wife’s condition was the work of the Holy Spirit<sup>713</sup>. Not being able to harmonize the two factors, he had anguishing doubts until an angel calmed him telling him that what was happening to his wife was the work of the Holy Spirit<sup>714</sup>

Virginity did not have any areola amongst the Jews. Quite the contrary, honors went to the fertile women.<sup>715</sup>

2. The **Virgin Mary** had a single son, who was **Jesus Christ**. When the Gospel speaks of the brothers of **Jesus**<sup>716</sup> it is referring to first cousins and relatives, who among the Jews also were called brothers<sup>717</sup>. In Hebrew there is no word that signifies cousin<sup>718</sup>.. The word “brother” encompasses several stages of relationship<sup>719</sup>. They would call “brother” all who were close or a relative<sup>720</sup>.

**Jehovah’s Witnesses** try to make people believe that the **Most Holy Mary** was not a virgin, but that she had many children, point to the text of the Gospel where it says that **James** and **Joseph** were brothers of **Jesus**<sup>721</sup>. But here, as in many of their other deceits, they present a text which can complicate and hide the text which can clear things up. In fact, the same Holy Gospel says that at the foot of the cross was Mary the Mother of **Jesus**<sup>722</sup> and next to her the mother of **James** and **Joseph**<sup>723</sup> who was the wife of **Cleophas, Joseph’s**<sup>724</sup> brother. **Cleophas**<sup>725</sup> is the same name in Greek, as Alpheus is in Aramaic. Both are the same name given to Joseph’s elder brother, **Mary’s** husband. He was the father of **James** the young<sup>726</sup> and **Joseph**, and was married to the other **MARY** who was at the foot of the cross next to the virgin. He married her after widowing in his first marriage where **Simon** and **Judas Thaddeus** were born.

<sup>710</sup> Matthew, 1: 16

<sup>711</sup> LUKE, 3: 23

<sup>712</sup> Matthew, 1: 25

<sup>713</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la fe cristiana*, 3ª, I, 36. Ed. BAC. Madrid . 1975

<sup>714</sup> Matthew, 1:20

<sup>715</sup> HANS URS von BALTHASAR: *Puntos Centrales de la Fe*, 2ª, VI, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1985

<sup>716</sup> Matthew, 13: 55; MARK, 6: 3

<sup>717</sup> M. DAIBER: *Manuyal de los estudios bíblicos católicos*, XXX. 8. Librería Salesiana. Zamora

<sup>718</sup> SANTOS SABUGAL, O.S.A.: *Credo*. 1ª, II,2, 3,, a. Ed. Monte Casino. Zamora

<sup>719</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine. 2806 (14-IX-96) 24

<sup>720</sup> MAX MEINERTZ: *Teología del Nuevo Testamento*, 1ª, IV, 5. Ed. FAX. Madrid0

<sup>721</sup> Matthew, 13 :55

<sup>722</sup> John, 19:25

<sup>723</sup> Matthew, 27:56; MARK, 6:3, 15:40

<sup>724</sup> MAX MEINERTZ: *Teología del Nuevo Testamento*, 1ª. IV, 5. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>725</sup> John. 19:25

<sup>726</sup> Matthew, 10:3

Therefore the mother of **James** and **Joseph** is different from the mother of Jesus. Then why does the Gospel say that **James** and **Joseph** were brothers of **Jesus**? Because they were relatives, and these among the Hebrews were called brothers. In fact, we know from the Bible that **Abraham** was an uncle of **Lot**<sup>727</sup>. However, **Lot** and **Abraham** call each other “brothers” five times<sup>728</sup> In another passage, it says that Laban was **Jacob’s** uncle<sup>729</sup>. Later it says that **Laban** calls **Jacob** ‘brother’<sup>730</sup>

If the **Virgin Mary** had other children, **Jesus** on the cross would not have entrusted her to **John**, but rather to them<sup>731</sup>. It is evident that **Mary** did not have other children to care for her.<sup>732</sup>

That is to say, that the **Most Holy Mary** had only one son: **Jesus**. When the Gospel calls him ‘primogenital’, it is affirming that he is the first child, but that does not signify, according to the way of talking in those days, that there were other children later on. Primogenital means first in line of birth, not preceded by others. It precludes the existence of others after him.

Not long ago, a tombstone inscription has been discovered that states of a young Jewish mother that “she died while giving birth to her primogenital son” Which means that there were no other children after this one.<sup>733</sup>

**Saint Geronimo** says that “all single children are primogenital, but not all primogenital are only children”<sup>734</sup>

When **Jehovah’s Witnesses** go about deceiving the unwary who listen to them saying that **Mary** had many children, know that that is not true because they presume to know the Bible. They teach the obscure text which I have mentioned and they are quiet about the clear text. This is not honorable, but it is their way of doing things.

Some are of the opinion that the Gospels calling “brothers of **Jesus**” is in reference to the children of **Joseph** from a prior marriage, as he was a widower, as per the Apocrypha writing of the II Century *Protoevangelio of James*..

The Virginity of **Mary** is a dogma of faith. It was defined in the year 649<sup>735</sup> A.D., in the first Council of Lateran.

The Church teaches since the V Century that **Mary** was a virgin before the birth, during the birth and after the birth<sup>736</sup>. The virginity during childbirth is faith in the whole church since the IV Century<sup>737</sup>. It was confirmed by the Second Vatican Council.<sup>738</sup> Because of this it calls her “always **Virgin Mary**”<sup>739</sup>.

It is a matter of faith that the **Most Holy Virgin Mary** always remained virginal.<sup>740</sup>

<sup>727</sup> Genesis, 11:27; 12:5

<sup>728</sup> Genesis, 13:8; 14:14, 16, ETC.

<sup>729</sup> Genesis, 29:10

<sup>730</sup> Genesis, 29:15

<sup>731</sup> SANTOS SABUGAL, O.S.A.: *Credo, 1ª, II, 2, 3, a*. Ed. Monte Casino, Zamora

<sup>732</sup> MAX MEINERTZ: *Teología del Nuevo Testamento, 1ª, V, 5*. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>733</sup> JOSE ANTONIO DE SOBRINO, S.I.: *Así fue Jesús, II, 12, b*. Ed. BAC. Madrid, 1984

<sup>734</sup> FELIX CALLE, O.S.A.: *Razona tu fe, XXI, 4*. Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid

<sup>735</sup> CÁNDIDO POZO, S. I.: *Maria en la Obra de Salvación, 3ª VI, 2, 3, f*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1974

<sup>736</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la fe cristiana, 3ª, I, 36*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1975

<sup>737</sup> SANTOS SABUGAL, O.S.A.: *Credo, 1ª, II, 2, 3, a*. Ed. Monte Casino. Zamora

<sup>738</sup> Vatican Council II: *Lumen Gentium. dogmatic constitution of the Church, n° 57*

<sup>739</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 510. DENZINGER, n° 57

<sup>740</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 2ª, 2º, VII, n°461, a,2*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

The literal translation of “since” can be construed in English to accept “yes afterwards”. But in the Bible, it does not accept a post change of situation<sup>741</sup>

3. The **Most Holy Virgin** is our Mother in Heaven.

**Mary** is our mother, since she is the mother of **Jesus Christ** who is the head of the Mystical Body of Christ<sup>742</sup>. The mother of the head is also the mother of all members of the body. And we are the members of the Mystical Body of **Christ**. That is why **Mary** is the mother of the church. **Paul VI** so proclaimed it in the year 1964 during the closing of the third session of the Second Vatican Council.

That **Jesus** enjoined **John** to care for his mother is perfectly normal, but what is not normal is the parallel request that **Mary** take loving care of **John**. This seems unnecessary. If **John** is to take care of **Mary**, her correspondence seems obvious, to insist on this seems superfluous and not too delicate. Any normal woman needs not to be told. She will know it spontaneously. **Jesus'** enjoining supposes a transcendental theological content. We are all represented in **John**. Besides, at that time John's mother was present. To enjoin **John to Mary** would be offensive to his mother **Mary Salome**. There is no doubt that in the words of **Jesus** there is a deeper sense than what the seen to intend **Jesus** gives a MOTHER to HUMANITY. These words have a transcendental meaning, they say, relative to all men, that they have universal meaning<sup>743</sup>

**Mary** is the physical mother of **Jesus** and the spiritual mother of all men<sup>744</sup>. We must love **Mary** and honor her with our hearts. Thus we shall please the Lord, who like all well-born sons, will be pleased to see His Most Holy Mother honored and loved<sup>745</sup>.

In order to value the qualities of **Mary**, it is enough to have an idea of how **Christ** could make his mother to His will. How would you have endowed your mother if this had been up to you? **Christ** could have done it and he was omnipotent.

The Most Holy Virgin is the greatest woman who has ever existed in the world.<sup>746</sup>

**The Holiest Mary** is the most exquisite creature that has come from the hands of God.

We must seek the Most Holy Virgin with all our sorrows and temptations. She can do it all, because God concedes all to her<sup>747</sup> because she is the Mother of **Christ** and because she never had any sin, not even the original sin.

**Mary** remained pure, without original sin, throughout her life<sup>748</sup>.

Because of this **Luke** calls her full of grace<sup>749</sup>.

The fact that **Most Holy Mary** was preserved from original sin from the first moment of her conception in the womb of her mother **Saint Ann** is what we want to express when we say “The Immaculate Conception”.

The church has celebrated the feast of the Immaculate Conception since the VII Century<sup>750</sup>

The Spanish people celebrated the Immaculate Conception many years before it was defined, **Murillo** himself had done thirty paintings of the Immaculate Virgin, three hundred years before the dogmatic definition.<sup>751</sup>

<sup>741</sup> CÁNDIDO POZO, S.I.: *Maria en la Obra de la Salvación*, 3ª, VI, 2, 3, f. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1974

<sup>742</sup> EPHESIANS, 1:22

<sup>743</sup> IGNACIO LARRAÑAGA: *El Silencio de Maria IV. 3*. Ed. Paulinas. Madrid

<sup>744</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *La Virgen Maria, 2ª, VI*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>745</sup> Vatican Council II: *Lumen Gentium. dogmatic constitution of the Church, n° 66*

<sup>746</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la salvación, n° 111*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>747</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la salvación, n° 111*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>748</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 494

<sup>749</sup> LUKE, 1:28

<sup>750</sup> FELIPE CALLE, O.S.A.: *Razona tú Fe ,XVI, 4*. Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid

<sup>751</sup> THAMER TOTH; *La Virgen Maria, III, 3. a*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid

The Spanish people used to sing in those days:  
 If he wanted and could not, He is not God,  
 If he did , and did not want, he is not Son  
 Let's say then, that he could and wanted.

And **Escoto**, with his concise style, said, "*Potuit, deuit, ergo, fecit*": He could do it, he should do it, then he did it.<sup>752</sup>

The Dogma on the Immaculate Conception of **Mary** was defined on December 8, 1854, by **Pope Pius IX**<sup>753</sup>

The redemption of **Mary** was preventive, as she was to become the mother of God.<sup>754</sup>

The dogma of the Conception of **Mary** was defined by Pope **Pius IX** on December 8, 1854.

God could have arranged that **Jesus Christ** should appear in the world as an adult, but He did not want Him to. He gave Him over to **Mary**. He placed Him in Her hands. God had wanted to use Her in the redemption and salvation of all men.<sup>755</sup> (Vatican Council II, *Lumen Gentium*.)

**Christ** is the mediator with the Father. *No one gets to the father but through me.*<sup>756</sup> (1 Tm, 2:5).

He is the mediator with the father<sup>757</sup>.. Because of His own merits. Without depending on any other person, **Mary** is the path to **Christ**. She is the secondary mediator, subordinated to **Christ**<sup>758</sup>. She is mediator as she intercedes for us. Vatican Council II says of **Mary** that "Her multiple intercessions grant eternal salvation"<sup>759</sup>.

4. In churches there seem to be many **images** of the virgin, the Virgin of Fatima, the virgin of Lourdes, the virgin of Guadalupe, etc. It is that the **Most Holy Virgin** has many titles and prerogatives. Each town has its own virgin or representation. But they are all images or pictures of the one and only **Virgin Mary**, who is in heaven in body and soul<sup>760</sup>

The elevation of **Mary** to Heaven in body and soul is called the Assumption. The Assumption was declared dogma of faith on November 1, 1950 by Pope **Pius XII**. But the feast of the Assumption had already been celebrated on August 15 for 500 years after **Christ**.

5. One of the best devotions to the Most Holy Virgin is the prayer of the **Holy Rosary**. If you can pray it in church, so much the better. If not, pray at any moment you are free, or while you are waiting to go to sleep. I advise you to make an effort to pray it because it is a very pleasant gift to the Virgin, as she herself has said in Lourdes and Fatima. And better yet if you pray it with the family. This is a very Christian practice. Try to introduce this practice at home, if you do not already have it, because it unites the family.

Prayed in a church or at a reunion, it has a plenary indulgence.

If you cannot pray the whole rosary because it is too long, pray a mystery every day.

Praying to the Virgin is a very beautiful devotion. **Mary** is the only woman who has ever existed who is most worthy of love. It is a love that dignifies and elevates. Her sweet memory can protect you against the temptations which are at the extreme opposite to purity.

<sup>752</sup> JESÚS M<sup>a</sup> GRANERO, S. I.: *Credo -\* Jesucristo, XV*. Ed. Cerón. Cádiz. 1943

<sup>753</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 1641* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>754</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Jesucristo y la vida cristiana, n. 199*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>755</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, n° 62

<sup>756</sup> John, 14:6

<sup>757</sup> Timothy, 2:5

<sup>758</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La Virgen Maria, 2ª, VIII. 146*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>759</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, n°

<sup>760</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n°974

Another recommendable devotion to the Virgin is the **Holy Scapulary**. This was a devotion revealed to **Saint Simon Stock**, Prior to the order of the Carmelites, in the XIII Century. The virgin promised him that whoever was wearing the Carmelite Scapulary at the moment of his death would not be condemned. The scapulary must be imposed by a priest, and one must daily pray three Hail Mary's. The cloth scapulary can be substituted by a medallion which carries on one side the image of the virgin<sup>761</sup>, and on the other side the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Such was granted by the Pope.

6. To be devoted to **Mary** is the way to salvation. He who daily prays **three Hail Mary's** in her honor, will attain special help in obtaining a good death, as God revealed to **Saint Matilda**<sup>762</sup>, and as is shown from many experiences.

“Remember, then, you the faithful, that the true devotion to **Mary** does not consist either of a sterile and fleeting affection, nor in vain credulity; but rather it comes from the true faith through which we are led to know the excellence of the Mother of God and we are nourished with a filial love towards our Mother and in imitation of her virtues<sup>763</sup>. But above all in her love of **Christ**, her strong faith in the Annunciation, and her faithfulness until the Cross.

Protestants accuse us Catholics of adoring the **Virgin Mary**, but this is a calumny. All Catholics know full well that the Virgin is not God. And adoration is exclusive to God. We do not adore the Most Holy Virgin, but we honor and venerate her because she is mother of God. That is why in the Hail Mary, we say “pray for us”. In the litany of the Rosary, when addressing God, we say “have pity on us”. On the other hand, when we pray to the Virgin, we say: “. pray for us” We go to **Mary** so that she may take us to God.

---

<sup>761</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA: *Hablemos de la Fe, X, 10*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>762</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *La Virgen María, n° 437*. Ed. BAC. Madrid .

<sup>763</sup> Vatican Council II; *Lumen Gentium: Dogmatic Constitution of the Church*, n° 67

## Saint Joseph

**31.- ST. JOSEPH IS THE TRUE HUSBAND OF THE VIRGIN MARY; AND THEREFORE, THE LEGAL FATHER OF JESUS CHRIST, ENTRUSTED WITH HIS EDUCATION AND SUSTENANCE.**

1. **St. Joseph** lived with the Most Holy Virgin in perfect chastity, without making use of the marriage rights, as though they were brother and sister. But as he was the true husband of **Mary** he is also the father of **Jesus Christ**; although not by the flesh, because **Jesus Christ** did not have a human father.

According to an investigation of **Fr. Sebastian Bartina, S. I.**, professor of Biblical Sciences which he published in the magazine "*Revista de Estudios Josefinos*", Joseph was a legal heir of King David. As a direct descendant he was entitled to royal rights. Joseph's royal family went into hiding in Nazareth, running away from Herod, the usurper of the throne, who was not of the Jewish race, but an Idumean. Jesus being the legal son of Joseph, was the king of Israel, not only spiritually, but also legally. Paradoxically, the sign that Pilate put on the cross was expressing a reality: "Jesus of Nazareth King of the Jews."<sup>764</sup>

The gospel calls him "*a just man*", which in the way of speaking in Hebrew means "holy man".

**St. Joseph** was a carpenter in Nazareth. He was a model worker. Because of this the Church has named him Patron of all workers. He died accompanied by **Jesus** and **Mary**. Because of this he is also the patron of the good death.

When you establish a home, select **St. Joseph** as your patron; he also knew what it meant to have the worries of maintaining a household.. **St. Theresa** said that she never asked anything of **St. Joseph** that the saint did not grant her. And to those who do not believe it, she tells them to try it for themselves.<sup>765</sup>

2. –To know **Saint Joseph** well, the book by Bonifacio Llamera, O. P., called: *Teología de San José*<sup>766</sup>. This is one of the best books on Saint Joseph in the whole world<sup>767</sup>

---

<sup>764</sup> Matthew, 1:19

<sup>765</sup> SANTA TERESA DE JESUS: Vida, VI, 6-8

<sup>766</sup> BONIFACIO LLAMERA, O.P.: *Teología de San José*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>767</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La Virgen María, n° 406*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

## JESUS CHRIST

### 32. JESUS CHRIST LIVED MORE THAN 33 YEARS<sup>768</sup>

.1. The history of **Jesus** did not start with his birth. Many centuries before He was born, **He** was already being spoken by the prophets.

**Micheas**, some 730 years before His birth, spoke about His birthplace.(5:2)

**Isaiah**, 734 years before His birth, states that He will be born of a virgin (7:14), and describes His passion (53:3-8)

**Zachariah** about 520 years before His coming, says that He will be sold for 30 coins (11:12s) with which he will purchase a potters field.

Eight hundred years before this happened, **Isaiah** prophesized that He would be treated as a hoodlum (53:12). whipped (50:6) and condemned to death (53:8).

It is said in the **Psalms** that His tunic will be raffled (22(21:19)

**Jesus** was not born on the first year of the Christian era, as is commonly stated. The wise Benedictine Dionysius the Small who in the year 533 began for the first time to count the years starting with the birth of the Lord, substituted the old enumeration which began with the founding of Rome, and was off by 6 years<sup>769</sup>. He made the first of January of the year I coincide with the first of January of the year 754 B.C. of the foundation of Rome, instead of picking the year 748 which today is considered to be exact. Therefore, we should place the birth of **Christ** six years before the Christian era.<sup>770</sup>

According to historians, **Herod the Great** died in the year 4 B.C. As it was he who ordered the massacre of the children of Bethlehem who were less than 2 years of age, we can suppose that **Jesus** was born two years before, that is to say, the 6<sup>th</sup> year before our era.

This is confirmed because according to the mathematician and astronomer, **John Keppler**, in 7 B.C. there was a conjunction (one was placed behind the other) of Jupiter and Saturn which provoked an intense light in the starry heavens. Could this be the star of Bethlehem?

About the day of the year that **Jesus** was born, the Gospel does not tell us anything, but from the First Century, it has been celebrated on December 25<sup>th</sup>.<sup>771</sup>

**Jesus** was born in Bethlehem, as the census taken by **Quirino**, ordered that all register at their place of origin, and **Mary and Joseph**, hailed from Bethlehem, the city of David.

With the name of "Quirino Census", they included portions of a previous census, which culminated in the Quirino Census, as was explained by Professor **Joaquin Gonzalez Echegaray**, of the Instituto Bíblico y Arqueológico de Jerusalem, in a short course on the Gospel of **Luke** in the Seminario de Monte Corban of Santander, in July 1995.

It is believed that the day **Jesus** died on was perhaps the 14 of Nissan<sup>772</sup> of the year 785 B.C., of the foundation of Rome, which corresponds to April 3 of the year 33 A.D., which was the First Friday of the month.

<sup>768</sup> JUAN LEAL, S. I.: *Sinopsis de los cuatro Evangelios, 1ª, VII, 1*.Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>769</sup> VITTORIO MESSORI: *Hipótesis sobre Jesús, IV, 11*.Ed. Mensajero, Bilbao. 1978

<sup>770</sup> JUAN MANUEL IGARTUA, S. I.: *Los Evangelios ante la Historia, I, 12, b. Ed. Acervo. Barcelona*

<sup>771</sup> JOSE LUIS MARTÍN DESCALZO: *Vida y misterio de Jesús de Nazaret, VI, 7*. Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca

<sup>772</sup> 30 DIAS Magazine, 77 (1994) 61



Recent astronomical studies carried out by **Colin Humphries** and **W. G. Waddington**, of Oxford University, have revealed a partial eclipse which darkened the skies over Jerusalem on April 3, of the year 33, which corresponds to the 14 of Nissan of the Jewish calendar, which is the day that **Jesus Christ** died. This is an explanation of “Darkness came over the earth” that day, as per the Gospel.<sup>773</sup>

Without excluding the possibility that this was a miracle, it is also possible that it was a natural phenomenon foreseen by God for its symbolism. The sun could have been covered over by a cloud of dust raised by a powerful sirocco wind, as it happens there sometimes.<sup>774</sup> Notwithstanding, there are others that put the probable date of the death of **Christ** at Passover of the year 32.

Because of these obscurities, we see that the Gospel writers did not attempt to publish any “Diary of the Life of Jesus”. The exact determination of the dates and places did not interest them especially. Frequently they speak in general terms of “at that time”; and many times there follow a very indeterminate description of a place. The Gospels want to transmit the preaching of the faith of the Apostles, and to draw a sufficient image of Christ, so that each one may convince himself of the truth of the faith. None of them attempted to relate all; on the contrary, each one took the liberty of collecting what seemed the most important to him, and to arrange it according to their determined points of view.<sup>775</sup>

## 2. The pagan historians of the epoch speak to us about **Jesus Christ**.

**Plinius Secundus** who was governor of Bithynia (Asia Minor) in the year 112, in a letter to Governor **Trajan** speaking of Christians said that they “they refused to offer sacrifices to the emperor and met at daybreak to sing hymns to **Christ**, their God<sup>776</sup>”.

**Flavius Josephus** wrote in the year 93 of the I Century: “In those times Jesus appeared who was an exceptional man, if we can call Him a man because He carried out surprising wonders... Among the Jews as well as among the Greeks he had many disciples who followed him. Because He was denounced by the elders of the people, Pilate had Him condemned to the torture of the cross. But this did not stop His disciples from continuing to love Him as before. Three days after His death He appeared alive<sup>777</sup>”.

**Suetonius**, historian of the Cesar’s’ from **Augustus** to **Domitian**, in his work written between the years 110 and 120 A.D. twice alludes to the Christians. Once in the life of **Nero** and again in the life of **Claudius**.

**Cornelius Tacitus**, the great historian, also speaks of them, and he was a disciple of **Pliny the Elder**. In relating the burning of Rome on the orders of Nero in 64 A.D. he says: “...it was imputed to the Christians who take their name from **Christ**, who during the reign of Tiberius, had been condemned to death by the solicitor **Pontius Pilate**<sup>778</sup>”.

## 3. But above all the Holy Gospel speaks to us about **Jesus Christ**.

Gospel means “good news<sup>779</sup>” The “good news” is the coming of **Jesus**, Savior of men. The word “Gospel” does not mean primarily a text, a book, but because of its etymological and biblical usage it originally states a happy message or, an announcement that brings joy<sup>780</sup> The Gospel was therefore primarily the word of **Jesus**. None had spoken like Him<sup>781</sup>

<sup>773</sup> MARIA GRAZIA SILIATO: *El Hombre de la Sabana, XIV*. Ed. BAC. Madrid . 1987

<sup>774</sup> MANUEL GARCIA BLÁZQUEZ: *La búsqueda científica de Dios, VII*. Ed. Azahara. Granada. 1996

<sup>775</sup> BRUGGEBOS: *Jesucristo, introducción practica al Evangelio*. V. Ed. Verbo Divino. Estella

<sup>776</sup> C. PLINIO. Epist. X. 97.

<sup>777</sup> Antiquitates Judaeorum, 18, III, 3

<sup>778</sup> Anales, XV, 44

<sup>779</sup> JUAN LEAL, S. I.: *Valor histórico de los Evangelios, I, j*. Ed. Facultad Teológica, S. I. Granada

<sup>780</sup> ROMANS, 10:15

<sup>781</sup> John, 7:46

The gospel, was preached before being written, before it was read, it was heard; before it was a book, it was word. But as the circle of Christianity grew, it became necessary to set the deeds and words of **Christ** in writing.

The word "gospel" to mean a collection of writings of the life of **Christ** is already found in the second century<sup>782</sup>

The Gospels are books written between 40 and 100 A.D. by eyewitness<sup>783</sup>.who tell of what the heard and saw<sup>784</sup>, or by those who had personal contact with those who did. **John** says: "That which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes...we proclaim to you<sup>785</sup>".

**Luke** says: *Many have dedicated themselves to compose a narrative of the happenings, just like the ones which have been transmitted from the beginning by those who were eyewitnesses y bearers of the word.*<sup>786</sup>

4. The theories of Protestant theologian Professor **Rudolph Bultmann**, which for some time oriented the interpretations of the Biblical text of the New Testament, are today disparaged thanks to the investigations of Hebrew specialists. Above all the works of **David Flusser**<sup>787</sup> and **Geza Vermes**<sup>788</sup> who have reached the conclusion that behind these affirmations of **Bultmann** on the Biblical texts that there was much German philosophic ideology. **Geza Vermes** went so far as to say: "The myth of **Jesus** has only existed in some German minds". Historical studies of Judaism in the First Century allowed the rescue of new aspects of the historical **Jesus**. However, the opposition to the theories of **Bultmann** began among his own disciples, such as **Ernest Kasemann**<sup>789</sup> and **Gunther Bornkamm**<sup>790</sup>.

5. The Second Vatican Council affirms the historicity of the Gospel<sup>791</sup> "Holy Mother Church has maintained and maintains with firmness and maximum constancy that the four Gospels (according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John) whose historic fact it affirms without doubt, truthfully narrate that which **Jesus**, the Son of God, living among men truly did and taught. The historic fact of the Gospel besides being clear for the critics is for the Catholics a truth of divine faith."<sup>792</sup>

**St. Irenaeus** who became a Bishop of Lyon and had been a disciple of **St. Polycarp** in Smyrna and the latter of the Evangelist **John**, that is to say, one of the more representative figures of the Second Century, said: "**Matthew** published a written Gospel. for the Hebrews and in their tongue.; **Mark**, a disciple of **Peter** also transmitted to us in writing the things preached by. **Peter**: **Luke**, a follower of **Paul**, put in book form the Gospel preached by his teacher. Later on, John, a disciple of the Lord...also published a Gospel during his stay in Ephesus<sup>793</sup>".

We have two other documents from the second century:

**Papias** states that **Matthew** wrote his gospel in Hebrew, and that **Mark** was the interpreter of the evangelization of **Peter**.

<sup>782</sup> J. HUBY, S. I.: *El Evangelio y los Evangelios, I, 5*. Ed. PAX. San Sebastián.

<sup>783</sup> LUKE, 1:2

<sup>784</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Divine Revelation, n° 19

<sup>785</sup> I John, 1:13

<sup>786</sup> LUKE, 1:1s

<sup>787</sup> DAVID FLUSSER: *Jesús en sus palabras y en su tiempo*. Ed. Cristiandad. Madrid. 1975

<sup>788</sup> GEZA VERMES: *Jesús el judío* Ed. Muchnik. Barcelona. 1980.

<sup>789</sup> ERNST KÄSEMANN: *Essays on the New Testament*. London. 1954

<sup>790</sup> G. BORNKANMM: *Gesú di Nazareth*. Ed. Claudina. Torino. 1977

<sup>791</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Divine Revelation, n° 19

<sup>792</sup> F. VIZMANOS, S. I.: *Teologia Fundamental*, pg. 297. Ed. BAC. Madrid 1953

<sup>793</sup> SAINT IRANEAUS: *Adversus Haereses, III, 11, 8*

The other document, is the **Canon of Muratori** which manifests the official thoughts of the Church<sup>794</sup> of the second century<sup>795</sup>, which speaks of **Luke** being the author of the third gospel and **John** being the author of the fourth<sup>796</sup>.

**Fr. Vaccari, S. I.**, a bible specialist, of international fame, states that until the campaign by the rationalist Protestants in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, no one had doubted that the gospels belonged to **Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.**<sup>797</sup>

In 1977, **Dr. John A. T. Robinson**, Professor at Cambridge, published a book entitled: "*Redating the New Testament*"<sup>798</sup>, where he affirms that all of the books of the New Testament excepting **John**, were written before the year 70 and that the names of the authors **Matthew** and **John** correspond to the Apostles of **Jesus. Mark** and **Luke** were in direct and immediate contact with the witnesses<sup>799</sup> and they used contemporary documents<sup>800</sup>. **Luke** says that he writes his gospel "*after diligently investigating everything, from its origins.*"<sup>801</sup>

6. Furthermore, these books were written for contemporaries of **Jesus**<sup>802</sup>. The facts that they narrate were known to all; either by having seen them personally<sup>803</sup>, or by having heard them from persons who saw them<sup>804</sup>. They could not, therefore, distort anything of the reality. In this case they would have been refuted and there is no trace of any rectification<sup>805</sup>.

If the evangelists had said what is not true, their gospels would have been rejected by that generation which was witness to the facts. There is no document that shows said rejection.<sup>806</sup>

On the other hand, the **Apocrypha Gospels**, which lack historical rigor, were commonly rejected<sup>807</sup>. They are fantastic and unbelievable tales<sup>808</sup>. They contain errors in the geography of Palestine, and are not set in the historical time frame<sup>809</sup>.

The deceitful gospels called "Apocrypha Gospels" have never been accepted by the church, as they are not included in the **Canon of Muratori** which is a list of the inspired books which was drawn up by the church in the second century<sup>810</sup>

The information that is included in the Gospels on the geography of the land, its political and religious situation, and of its traditions and customs, are in agreement with all that we now know through other sources. The Evangelists died defending the truth of what they said, and no one gives his life for what he knows to be a lie.

Aside from the fact that they are inspired by God they cannot make mistakes or lie. Vatican Council II says that the whole Bible is inspired by God<sup>811</sup>. (Vatican Council II, Dei Verbum. Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, No. 11). And **Paul** says: "All Scripture is inspired of God"<sup>812</sup>.

<sup>794</sup> ALFREDO WINKENHAUSER: *Introducción al Nuevo Testamento*, 1ª, VI, 1. Ed. Herder. Barcelona.

<sup>795</sup> J. HUBY, S. I.: *El Evangelio y los Evangelios*, III, 1. Ed. PAX. San Sebastián.

<sup>796</sup> BEUMEN: *El camino de la Fe*, III, 1. Ed. Fax. Madrid.

<sup>797</sup> VACCARI, S. I.: *La Sacra Biblia. Introducción a los Evangelios*. Ed. Salan.,

<sup>798</sup> JOSE LUIS CARREÑO, S. D. B.: *El ultimo reportero*. VII, 6. Pamplona. 1977.

<sup>799</sup> JUAN LEAL, S. I.: *Nuestra confianza en los Evangelios*, nº 13. Ed. EAPSA. Madrid

<sup>800</sup> MANUEL GONZALEZ GIL, S. I.: *Cristo, el Misterio de Dios*, 1ª, 1º, III, 5. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1976

<sup>801</sup> LUKE, 1:13

<sup>802</sup> ALEJANDRO DIEZ MACHO: *La resurrección de Jesucristo y la del hombre en la Biblia*, pg. 26. Ed. Fe Católica. Madrid, 1977

<sup>803</sup> I John, 1:1-4

<sup>804</sup> LUKE, 1:2-4

<sup>805</sup> PARENTE: *De Dios al hombre*, VIII, 2. Ed. Atenas. Madrid

<sup>806</sup> JOSE Mª CIURANA: *La verdad del cristianismo*, III, a. a', c'', 2º. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

<sup>807</sup> JUAN MANUEL IGARTUA, S. I.: *Los Evangelios ante la Historia*, II, 3, a. Ed. Acervo. Barcelona

<sup>808</sup> JOSE Mª CIURANA: *En busca de las verdades fundamentales*, III. A. b. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

<sup>809</sup> JOHANNES BEUMER: *Camino de la Fe*, III, 2. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>810</sup> JOSE ANTONIO DE SOBRINO, S. I.: *Así fue Jesús*, IV, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1984

<sup>811</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Divine Revelation, nº 11

7. On the other hand, the four Gospels narrate the same facts, coinciding in the fundamental and differing in the accidental. If each one for its part had attempted to deceive, they would not have coincided so much: if they had agreed to deceive, they would have avoided the showy differences<sup>813</sup>. Each evangelist has sincerely narrated facts which have most impressed him. Each evangelist made his selection of materials and happenings and the succession of facts according to his catechetical objectives. Each evangelist presents from a personal point of view, the figure and person of **Jesus Christ**<sup>814</sup>. The gospel according to **Matthew**, addressed to a Christian community comes from Judaism, and the gospel according to **Luke**, addressed to a gentile community, shows a different focus.<sup>815</sup>

The evangelical narrations are diverse, the details of each one are different, and none stray from the truth. What is narrated by each, is in harmony with the rest of the writings..<sup>816</sup>

The gospels offer **differences** due to the fact that they do not always literally quote the words of **Jesus**, nor do they narrate with the exactness that we now demand. Each tells what he remembers and in his own style, some limit themselves to the essential, others give extensive details. without clearly defining the essential elements; others have a more abstract narrative; some are more concrete or popular, etc. The narration of an act depends heavily on the psychology of the narrator, of his way of observing, of his memory, of his imagination, of his character and of the auditory which he is addressing. Taking into account that we are not looking at observers or narrators with a modern and occidental psychology of today, but that of an older world, of a simple mind and culture, in which the imaginative element is more dominating. But as they are inspired books, everything they say has God's approval, who respects the peculiarities of the instrument/writer and does not dictate as if he were a typist of the things which he has to say, but respects his way of talking, and only stops him in the case of error<sup>817</sup>.

**Matthew's** gospel is written for Jews, that is why it insists that **Jesus** is the Messiah prophesized in the Old Testament, and frequently refers to the way of talking and living of the Jews.<sup>818</sup>

**Marks's** gospel reflects the catechism in Rome of **Peter**, whom he accompanied. He probably writes in Rome, and that is why he explains many of the Jewish traditions to those who are not Jewish<sup>819</sup>.

**Luke's** gospel, companion to **Paul**, reveals the doctrine of the Apostle of the People<sup>820</sup>. He writes about Christian communities of Greek mentality, who proceed from paganism. that is why he insists that **Jesus** is the Savior.

The gospel of **John** is the last one written. That is why he completes the other three<sup>821</sup>, which are similar amongst themselves, (that is why they are called "synoptic", they can be read simultaneously), and it tells things which the others left out. He centers himself in the figure of **Jesus**, and is the most theological of the four.

There are those that are of the opinion that the fourth gospel was not written by **John**, the apostle. They ascribe it to **John the Elder** a Greek that never knew **Jesus** directly<sup>822</sup>. That opinion

<sup>812</sup> TIMOTHY, 3:16

<sup>813</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *Cristología fundamental, Introducción, V, c. Ed. C.E.T.E. Madrid*

<sup>814</sup> JOSE CABA, S. I.: *De los Evangelios al Jesús histórico, 2ª, IX, Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1971*

<sup>815</sup> JOSE CABA, S. I.: *De los Evangelios al Jesús histórico, II, 4, c, 3, c. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1971*

<sup>816</sup> EUSTAQUI GUERRERO, S. I.: *Jesucristo, la mejor prueba de la fe católica, VIII, 2, C, c. Ed. FAX.*

<sup>817</sup> CARDENAL BEA: *La historicidad de los Evangelios, 2º, II. Ed. FAX. Madrid*

<sup>818</sup> J. HUBY, S. I.: *El Evangelio y los Evangelios, II, 2 Ed. PAX. San Sebastián*

<sup>819</sup> J. HUBY, S. I.: *El Evangelio y los Evangelios, III, 2 Ed. PAX. San Sebastián*

<sup>820</sup> J. HUBY, S. I.: *El Evangelio y los Evangelios, IV 2 Ed. PAX. San Sebastián*

<sup>821</sup> JOHANNES BEUMER: *Camino de la Fe, III, 2. Ed. FAX. Madrid*

<sup>822</sup> PEPE RODRÍGUEZ: *Mentiras de la Iglesia católica, III, 11. Ed. Zeta. Barcelona.*

is unacceptable, because the narrator of the fourth gospel declares himself as a witness to the acts he describes<sup>823</sup>, and recognizes that he was **Jesus'** favorite disciple<sup>824</sup>, who at the supper rested his head on **Jesus'** chest<sup>825</sup>, that he was with **Most Holy Mary** at the foot of the cross<sup>826</sup>, that together with **Peter** went to the Lord's tomb, and when seeing the sheet lying on the ground, and the shroud neatly folded which had been on his head, *he saw and believed*<sup>827</sup>

It is much more logical to apply all of this to the apostle **John**, than to try to introduce a new player, also called **John**, who reclined his head on **Jesus'** chest at the Last Supper, then having "fourteen people in attendance".<sup>828</sup>

But the gospels state that only twelve were seated to the dinner with Jesus<sup>829</sup>

On the other hand<sup>830</sup>, in the other three gospels, apostle **John** is named seventeen times, the fourth gospel, he is not named a single time. He is always referred to as the "Loved Disciple". This substitution is explained if the Apostle **John** and the "Loved Disciple" was the same person.

Besides, in the fourth gospel, the friendship between **Peter** and the "Loved Disciple" is mentioned multiple times, and **Luke** in the book of **Acts** says that the friend of **Peter** was the apostle **John**

To introduce another **John**, different from the apostle, makes no sense.

The author of the fourth gospel can be identified, without fault, with the "Loved Disciple" of **Jesus**, one of the twelve. (.....) From the second century, the fourth gospel is attributed to the apostle **John**. (.....) From its first spreading of the news, the church received the fourth gospel as that of **John**, the apostle<sup>831</sup>

**Saint Irenaeus**<sup>832</sup> says that **John** dictated his gospel in Ephesus, when an elder. This explains the different style between the Apocalypses and the Gospel, as the Ammonite could have been a well cultured person and improved **John's Greek**.

'Those who proclaim the fourth gospel to **John the Elder** say that the apostle **John** died a martyr together with his brother **James**. This is inadmissible as **Luke** tells of the martyrdom of **James** chapter XII of the book of Acts. not mentioning **John** at all. This silence could not be possible if both brothers died together. Besides, it shows us latter on, in Chapter XV, Apostle John being a participant at the assembly in Jerusalem on a date certainly after the death of **James**<sup>833</sup>

Would it not be he who is referred to as **John the Elder** the same apostle **John**, who was very old when he dictated his gospel in Ephesus?

8. Evangelists did not write their books like modern day historians would do so describing a historical fact investigated by him<sup>834</sup>, with concrete dates, and exact itineraries. "Gospels are not chronologically correct series of events, but a catechism for the faithful transmittal of the Christian truth<sup>835</sup>"

**Matthew** juxtaposes miracles and parables which took place at very different times. and **Luke** puts it all in order on a trip to Jerusalem.

<sup>823</sup> John, 3:11; 19:35; 21:24

<sup>824</sup> John, 21:7 & 20

<sup>825</sup> John, 13:25

<sup>826</sup> John, 19:26

<sup>827</sup> John, 20:2-8

<sup>828</sup> PEPE RODRÍGUEZ: *Mentiras de la Iglesia católica*, I, 2, C. Ed. Zeta. Barcelona.

<sup>829</sup> Matthew, 26:20; Mark, 14:17

<sup>830</sup> JUAN LEAL, S. I. *Valor histórico de los Evangelios*, VI, 4. Ed. Facultad Teológica. Granada.

<sup>831</sup> J. HUBY, S. I.: *El Evangelio y los Evangelios*, V, I. Ed. PAX. San Sebastián

<sup>832</sup> SAINT IRANEAUS: *Adversus Haereses*, 3<sup>a</sup>, I, 3

<sup>833</sup> J. HUBY, S. I.: *El Evangelio y los Evangelios*, Epilogo. Ed. PAX. San Sebastián

<sup>834</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Catecismo Escolar*, 7<sup>o</sup> EGB, I. Madrid., 1984

<sup>835</sup> JUSTO COLLANTES, S. I.: *La Iglesia de la Palabra*, 1<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup>, Esc. IX, 3. Ed. BAC. Madrid

Gospels do not have a historical form, but rather a message form.

Evangelists do not try to relate the events in exact chronological form, but try to present the person, the doctrine; the redeeming works of **Jesus** to men, so that they may believe.<sup>836</sup>

Gospels are narratives, schematic, fragmentary, selections and summaries.

On the other hand, they have always had the practical finality of preaching: they try to be a teaching, to transmit a message which one should take upon oneself and live in the faith, they do not try to give us a bit of information, and when contributing to the formation of a new world, born of the redeeming work of **Jesus**, they present the **Lord Jesus**, so one may find Him and be His disciple.<sup>837</sup>

Gospels are neither a diary nor a biography in the modern sense of the word. They are a catechesis of apostolic preaching.

The more one is imbued in the individual methods of the evangelists, in their goals and in their plan, the more one is convinced of the fragmentary and serialized character that is peculiar to each, and they showed no interest in the little things which may seem to us today as being of almost substantial character.

Evangelists try to strengthen the faith of their readers, and in order to accomplish this it is enough for them to select something of the most outstanding of the life and doctrine of the Lord. Topographic and chronological framework was not necessary, and for such reasons they overlooked it. Many facts and words are outside of their historical framework<sup>838</sup>.

Generally, the evangelist, has no chronological interest. He sometimes gathers parables, miracles or controversies with the Jews with a linking word ("then", "later", "after"). even though the facts may have happened at very distant times. The intention of the evangelists was to inculcate a way of life, religious upbringing. The base of the narration is historical, but not as we understand history now.<sup>839</sup>

The Gospels are historical books although history is not understood in the modern sense. But their style, describing places and introducing historical characters in their time, however, do clearly demonstrate that they are not trying to write a work of fiction. Although not always, they sometimes show with exactness the day and date, and give a multitude of details, which show their desire to describe the true facts.<sup>840</sup>

The gospels are "historical" in the common and vulgar sense. The church has always thought so: The clergy and the laity.<sup>841</sup> It is evident that they were not "invented".

Evangelists affirm that what they narrate is the truth<sup>842</sup>

**Luke** at the beginning of his gospel guarantees his readers of "the certainty of his narrative, as they are "true and authentic things"

**Luke**<sup>843</sup> says that to write about the recently occurred happenings after it was determined "after having investigated with exactness all of those facts from their origin"<sup>844</sup>

**John** affirms that what he narrates is "*what his eyes saw and his ears heard*"<sup>845</sup>. He who bears witness to it, and his testimony is true and he knows that he is telling the truth so that you may believe"<sup>846</sup>

<sup>836</sup> GUARDINI: *El Señor, 1º, XI*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid.

<sup>837</sup> JORGE AUZOU: *La tradición bíblica, XIII, 1*. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>838</sup> JUAN LEAL, S. I.: *Los Evangelios ante la Historia, II, 1, a*. Ed. Acervo. Barcelona.

<sup>839</sup> SALVADOR MUÑOZ IGLESIAS: *Los géneros literarios de la Biblia, 1º, XI*. Casa de la Biblia. Madrid.

<sup>840</sup> JUAN MANUEL IGARTUA, S. I.: *Los Evangelios ante la Historia, II, 1, a*. Ed. Acervo. Barcelona.

<sup>841</sup> BALDOMERO JIMÉNEZ DUQUE: *Volver a lo esencial, XVI*. Ed. TAU. Ávila. 1985

<sup>842</sup> Luke, 1:4

<sup>843</sup> Luke, 1:1-4

<sup>844</sup> Luke, 1:3

<sup>845</sup> John, 3:11

<sup>846</sup> John, 19:35

Gospels appear, then, to be written without any true apologetic preoccupation, in the modern sense of the word, but rather with the purpose of transmitting just as it is regarding the fact about which they give witness.

Gospels are not a doctrinal speculation, but rather the attestation of a fact

The authors not only do not make a eulogy to themselves, but rather present them as without intelligence, ambitious, quarrelsome, with cowards, and traitors. They present **Christ**, inferior to the Father as abandoned by the Father... The miracles are described with a sobriety which distinguishes them immediately from the accounts which are not evangelical.<sup>847</sup>

The Apostolic origin, direct or indirect, and the literary genesis of the Gospels justify their historical value.

Derived from an oral preaching which goes back to the origins of a primitive community, they have as their basis the guarantee of eyewitnesses.

Undoubtedly neither the Apostles nor the other preachers and evangelical narrators tried to make history in the technical sense of this word; their purpose was less secular and more theological; they spoke to convert and to edify, to inculcate and to illustrate the faith, to defend it against the adversaries.

But they did it relying on veridical and controllable testimony demanded both by the integrity of their consciences as by the desire not to give cause for hostile refutations.

If the Gospels are not "history books", nor is it less certain that they do not attempt to offer anything which is not historical.<sup>848</sup>

The historical value of the gospels, besides being true for the critic, are for the Catholic a truth of faith<sup>849</sup>.

**Comparative studies** have been made on all of the copies of the writings of the evangelists that we keep.<sup>850</sup>

**Hort**, one of the surest critics of the XIX century<sup>851</sup> summarizes his research of twenty-five years and those of his colleague **Westcott** in their original critique of the Greek text of the New Testament, with these words: "The variants which touch the substance of the text are scant and can be evaluated in less than a one-thousandth part of the text"<sup>852</sup>.

The majority of the variants only refer to the exterior grammatical form, the order of the words, and synonyms.<sup>853</sup>

Of the one hundred fifty thousand variations, only fifteen are of any importance, and not a single one touches the faith of the church<sup>854</sup>

This attests to the care with which they were copied<sup>855</sup>.

That Christian generation who had witnessed the facts that are narrated in the gospels, found them to be so correctly narrated, that they copied them by hand (no printers were available then) and were handed down generation to generation, so that today we have more copies of the gospels than of any other book of that time. No one dares doubt the authenticity of the works of the Latin classics, **Caesar, Cicero, Horatio** and **Virgil**. Even though they all lived some 50 years before **Christ**, do not have, by far, the amount of proof that we have of the gospels. The only contemporary of **Christ** of whom we have the best documents is **Virgil**. And of **Virgil**, we only have three uncial codes. On the

<sup>847</sup> ROBERT FEUILLET: *Introducción a la Biblia: Nuevo Testamento, vol. II, pg. 309s.* Ed. Herder. Barcelona.

<sup>848</sup> Jerusalem Bible: Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels. I. Ed. Desclée. Bilbao.

<sup>849</sup> FRANCISCO VIZMANOS, S. I.: *Teología fundamental para seglares. n.º 229.* Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>850</sup> JOSE MANUEL HERNÁNDEZ: *Jesucristo existió!* Publicaciones ACU. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>851</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCIA: *Hablemos DE la Fe, I, 5.* Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>852</sup> JESÚS M<sup>a</sup> GRANERO, S. I.: *Credo – Jesucristo, I.* Ed. Escelicer. Cádiz. 1943

<sup>853</sup> JOHANNES BEUMER: *Camino de la Fe, III, 3.* Ed. FAX. Madrid.

<sup>854</sup> JOSE MANUEL IGARTUA, S. I.: *Los Evangelios ante la Historia. Apéndice, 2.* Ed. Acervo. Madrid.

<sup>855</sup> JOSE ANTONIO LABURU, S. I.: *Incredulidad o fe, 1º, II.* Ed. EAPSA. Madrid

other hand, we have two hundred and ten copies of the gospels, a complete superiority!<sup>856</sup> Of **Plato**, we conserve manuscripts that are 1,500 years after him<sup>857</sup> **Aristotle** who lived 300 years before **Christ**, whose “Treaty on Logic” continues to this day to be the foundation of all philosophical reasoning, the earliest manuscript that is known is 1400 years after him. The great contemporary historian, **Menéndez Pidal**, who in his “*History of Spain*”<sup>858</sup>, a 30 volume set of books, refers to and backs some of his affirmations in the work *Germania* of the Roman Emperor **Tacitus**, who was after **Christ**, as he died in the year 120. Of the “*Germania*” of **Tacitus**, the oldest known code is 1340 years after him.<sup>859</sup>

Greek historian **Polibius**, who died 120 years before **Christ**, and of whom **Mommsen**, (Doctor of Ancient History at the University of Berlin, and Noble prize winner) says that: “it is to him that later generations, including our own, owe the best documents concerning the march of the Roman civilization”<sup>860</sup>, the oldest manuscript that we have from him is 1067 years after his death.<sup>861</sup>

On the other hand, we have manuscripts of the gospels very close to the evangelists. The Gospel according to **John** was written in the year 95<sup>862</sup>; well then, in 1935 the **Rylands** papyrus which refers to this gospel was discovered, and is kept in Manchester. It was purchased in 1920 by **B. P. Granfell** for the book merchant **John Rylands**<sup>863</sup>. **According to specialists, it was written in the year 130**<sup>864</sup>. Only 35 years later! This is wonderful! The **Bodmer II** papyrus, which is kept in the Cologne library in Geneva, and which almost completely contains the gospel according to **John**, is 100 years after him<sup>865</sup>. It was published in 1956 by **V. Martin**<sup>866</sup>. Of the three centuries after **Christ**, there are thirty papyruses<sup>867</sup>

This is a unique case in Greco-Roman history.

In 1972, **Fr. Joseph O’Callaghan**, a Spanish Jesuit papyrologist, Professor at the Gregorian University in Rome and Dean of the Biblical Faculty of the Pontificio Instituto Bíblico di Roma, and of the Theological Faculty of Barcelona, deciphered some fragments of scrolls found in cave 7 in Qunram (Dead Sea). They are identified as 7Q5, It is the text of **Mark, 6:52s**. In eleven other caves there were six hundred scrolls. In these manuscripts,, which were discovered in 1947 other texts have been identified, such as Exodus, Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc. Of almost all of the books of the Old Testament. The text deciphered by **Fr. O’Callaghan** is a fragment of the gospel of **Mark**, sent to Jerusalem by the Christina community in Rome, which was hidden by the Essene inside amphorae in those caves. one of which has the name “ROME” written in Hebrew.<sup>868</sup>

This probably occurred during the invasion of Palestine by the Romans, before the ruin of Jerusalem of the year 70. Specifically when **Vespasianus** troops were approaching in the year 68<sup>869</sup>. This discovery has been considered the most important on the New Testament<sup>870</sup> of the twentieth century. In 1991, a facsimile edition containing 1,787 photographs of these manuscripts was published.<sup>871</sup>

<sup>856</sup> JUAN LEAL, S. I.: *El valor histórico de los Evangelios, I, 5*. Ed. Escelier. Cádiz.

<sup>857</sup> VITTORIO MESSORI: *hipótesis sobre Jesús, VI, 11*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao. 1978

<sup>858</sup> MENÉNDEZ PIDAL: *Historia de España, Tomo I, vol. 3. pg. 267*

<sup>859</sup> LUIS CONDE, S. I.: *Los manuscritos del Nuevo Testamento. PROYECCIÓN Magazine, 27 & 28. Gr.*

<sup>860</sup> TEODORO MOMMSEN: *Historia de Roma, 1º, XIII*. Ed. Aguilar. Madrid.

<sup>861</sup> JUAN IRIGOIN: *Scriptorium Magazine, XIII, 2, (1959) 177-209*

<sup>862</sup> LEON-DUFOUR, S. I.: *Los Evangelios y la historia de Jesús, IV,1*. Ed. Estela. Barcelona

<sup>863</sup> B. MANZANO, S. I.: *La vida de Jesucristo, nº 427* Zaragoza.

<sup>864</sup> FRANCISCO VIZMANOS, S. I.: *Los Evangelios y la Historia de Jesús, IV 1*. Ed. Estela. Barcelona.

<sup>865</sup> VICENTE ZAFORAS: *Un testigo más. PROYECCIÓN Magazine, nº 12. Granada.*

<sup>866</sup> FRANCISCO LAMBASI: *El Jesús histórico, V, 1*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1985

<sup>867</sup> S. BARTINA, S. I.: *Catalogo de los Papiros Neotestamentarios. CULTURA BIBLICA Magazine 17 (1960) 214-22*

<sup>868</sup> JOSE O’CALLAGHAN, S. I.: *Los papiros griegos de la cueva siete del Qumrán*, Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>869</sup> B. MANZANO, S. I.: *Por los caminos de Jesús, IV, 68*. Ed. Verbo Divino. Estella. 1984

<sup>870</sup> YA Newspaper, 16-III-752

<sup>871</sup> YA Newspaper, 21-XI-91, pg. 28



This interpretation of **Fr. O'Callaghan** has recently been confirmed by Oxford's University's eminent German professor **Carsten Peter Thiede**, in the prestigious magazine *BIBLICA*<sup>872</sup> **Thiede** literally says: "According to the rules of paleographic work and actual criticism, it is true that 7Q5 is **Mark, 5:52s**. The 7Q5 is the **O'Callaghan** papyrus. **Thiede** has published a study supporting **Fr. O'Callaghan** titled "*The oldest manuscript of the gospels*"<sup>873</sup>. **Fr. Ignacio de La Potterie, S. L.** said that there are many more who each day accept this identification. during the international symposium in October 1991 in Eichstat where the expert papyrologist **Hunger** of the University of Vienna, and **Riesenfeld**<sup>874</sup> of Upsala University in Sweden supported this opinion..

The text of the 7Q5 has been studied by the IBICUS computer in Liverpool, England, and has demonstrated that the combination of letters, in the bible, is only found in **Mark 6:52s**, which is 7Q5<sup>875</sup>

British paleographer **Roberts** from Oxford University and the foremost world authority on Greek paleography, stated before these papyruses were deciphered, by studying the writing determined that they dated some 50 years after **Christ**<sup>876</sup>, in other words, some 20 years after the death of **Christ** and 10 years after **Mark** wrote his gospel. There is no doubt that is before the year 68, at which time the caves at Qumran were sealed, with the scrolls inside them, before having to flee from the troops of **Vespasianus** who invaded that territory in the year 68<sup>877</sup> It is therefore of the manuscript that is closest to **Jesus** of all known manuscripts<sup>878</sup>

The decoder of these documents has stated that it is no longer possible to affirm that the Gospel is the elaboration of an ancient Christina community, and that it had a more or less lengthy period of word of mouth diffusion before being written, but that we now have the proof of events through immediate sources.

This discovery has knocked down **Bultmann's** theories. The proximity of this manuscript to the original destroys **Bultmann's** hypothesis, which stated that the gospels are a creation of a primitive community which refigured "the historical **Jesus**" to the "**Jesus** of faith" This discovery confirms scientifically what the church has been teaching for nineteen centuries: the historicity of the Gospels.

The onslaught against the historicity of the gospels began with **Friedrich Strauss** in 1835. Renovated by **Ernest Renan** in 1863. In modern times **Rudolph Bultmann** affirms that "we can know nothing about the life of **Jesus**, as the gospels are the idealization of a legend of the following generations. If 7Q5 is from the year 50, this idealization is not possible in the contemporary. The celebrated protestant theologian **Oscar Cullman**, for some time a follower of **Bultmann**, recognizes that he withdrew from **Bultmann** because of the interpretation he had of the bible. For **Bultmann** the only historical element of the gospels which would remain standing is the cross. The rest, including the resurrection, would merely be a symbol.<sup>879</sup> One of **Bultmann's** followers has said about the discovery of 7Q5: "One must throw into the fire about 7 tons of Germanic studies."<sup>880</sup> The time elapsed between the happenings and the composition of the gospels is so short, that it does not allow the formation of a myth contrary to history<sup>881</sup>.

Recently, **Dr. Carsten Peter Thiede** published in the German magazine *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie*, specializing in papyrology, the discovery a papyrus with a fragment of the twenty sixth chapter of the Gospel of **Matthew**, written in the first century of our era. It is the *Magdalene Cr.* of Rome 17, because it is kept in the library of the Colegio de la Magdalena de Oxford. It was donated

<sup>872</sup> *BIBLICA Magazine*, vol. 65 (1984) 538-559

<sup>873</sup> 30 *DIAS Magazine*: 45(1991)14

<sup>874</sup> 30 *DIAS Magazine*: 61(1992)76 and *Civiltá Católica*: III(1992) 464-473

<sup>875</sup> *ABC Newspaper*: 1-VI-95, pg. 64

<sup>876</sup> B. MANZANO, S. I.: *Vida de Jesucristo*, n° 5 Zaragoza.

<sup>877</sup> *BIBLICA Magazine*, vol 53 (1972)

<sup>878</sup> JUAN MANUEL IGARTUA, S. I.: *Los Evangelios ante la Historia*, I, 5. Ed. Acervo. Barcelona. 1981

<sup>879</sup> *IL SABATO*, 20-II-1993

<sup>880</sup> J. BEUMER, S. I.: *El camino de la fe*, III,2.Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>881</sup> *TIME Magazine*, May, 1972

to this school by the Rev. **Charles B. Huleat**, an alumni of the institution, who had been the chaplain of the Iglesia Británica de Luxor, in Egypt<sup>882</sup>. He had purchased it there from an antiques bazaar. They are three fragments from **Matthew** written in the year 70<sup>883</sup>. This was front page news in the TIMES during Christmas 1994. A few months ago, **Thiede** published a book, *Jesus Eyewitness*. Reading it is a true spiritual and intellectual pleasure.<sup>884</sup>

**Fr. B. Manzano, S. I.**, who has written the most modern and well documented book on the life of **Christ**<sup>885</sup>, and who is a specialist on matters pertaining to Palestine, gives us these dates as the approximate dates in which the synoptic gospels were written.

The Gospel according to **Matthew**, between the years 37 and 42

The Gospel according to **Mark**, between the years 40 and 45

The Gospel according to **Luke** between the years 47 and 56

The Gospel according to **John**, as stated before, was written in the year 95.

**H. J. Schultz** professor at the University of Würzburg (Germany) categorically states that no gospel was written after the year 70. This position has been supported by the famous exegete **Rudolf Schnackenburg** “because of the weight of the arguments posed”<sup>886</sup>

Some people think that if the Gospels were written several years after the death of **Christ**, they may not reflect with exactness Jesus’ sayings, but that they may be a free reconstruction of the same. But one must bear in mind the habit of the Jews of memorizing the Bible, the Talmud, the Torah, etc. In this manner we can be guaranteed that the evangelical texts will make us closer to the thoughts of **Jesus** and to his word.<sup>887</sup> In the second century, they are confirmed by **Papias** disciple of **John**; by **Clemens Romanus**, disciple of **Peter**, and Pope from the year 91 to year 100; by **Ignatius of Antioch** also a disciple of **John**; by **Justin, Irenaeus**, Bishop of Lyon and disciple of **Polycarp**, friend of **John**, by **Origen, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hermes the shepherd, etc. etc.** All of them in the second century. The text of the gospels **has been transmitted to us** literally in the essential. It is true that we do not possess the originals But the same thing happens to all writers of that time<sup>888</sup>. This is due to the fragility of the material on which it was written. The sacred texts were copied with such interest and were kept with such love, that this is why there is no book from that time which could be compared in number and quality of manuscripts.

It is also, the exceptional **state of conservation**. Of the Latin authors, the most complete works that we have today are dated after the VIII century. On the other hand, we have seventy eight complete evangelical codices, from the fourth to the sixth century. And gospels were so frequently quoted, that we could reconstruct in their totality the four gospels just by the quotes utilized by the seven writers (**Justin, Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Tertullian, Hipolitus and Eusebius**). Of these we have 26,487 quotes.<sup>889</sup> Facing all of this evidence, the great British critic of classic literature **B. H. Streeter**, confesses that the gospels (as to their authenticity) are in a most privileged position amongst all of the literary works of ancient times.

Therefore, he who does not admit what the gospels say, **has no right** to believe in anything pertaining to ancient history, because what is told to us in the gospels, makes us much more aware of their rigor, than the many things admitted by the history of old times. And one of the things on which the gospels insist most on are the miracles that **Christ** performed to prove he was God.

<sup>882</sup> EL SEMANAL Magazine, 385 (12-III-95) 50-54

<sup>883</sup> 30 DIAS Magazine, 88 (1995) 61ss

<sup>884</sup> EDUARDO GARCIA DE ENTERRIA, ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 18-IX-96, pf 3

<sup>885</sup> B. MANZANO, S. I.: *Vida De Nuestro Señor Jesucristo*. Zaragoza.

<sup>886</sup> 30 DIAS Magazine, 77 (1994)60

<sup>887</sup> JOSE LUIS MARTÍN DESCALZO: *Vid ay misterio de Jesús de Nazaret*, 2º, VI, 2. Ed. Sigueme.

<sup>888</sup> BIRNGRUBER: *Teología Dogmática para Seglares*, 6, B. Ed. Litúrgica Española. Barcelona

<sup>889</sup> Cristo en Casa. Curso Fundamental. I, 9. Ed. Fe Católica. Madrid

9. Nothing is told by the gospel on the **external aspect of Jesus**. It was not a habit of the historians of those days. That is why the evangelists keep silent as to his height, the color of his eyes, the tone of his voice and the features of his face.

We know that his gaze was irresistible, a look capable of doing, with just one look, that men would abandon everything in order to follow him. A deep look, warm, yet penetrating. A gaze full of kindness, of a Being that was all kindness. Of a Being who traveled the land of Judea doing good, Galilee, Samaria...., curing the sick, consoling the outcast of the world, giving himself to everyone, having pity on all, loving all.... Of the Being who would pronounce the sweetest words that ever took form on human lips *"Come to me you who are tired and heavy laden, and I will succor you"*<sup>890</sup>

"I do not believe that there is anything more profound, more attractive, more virile and more perfect than **Christ**" (F. Dostoyevski)

In the National Library of Madrid there is an incunabula in which the Roman consul **Lentulus Publius** writes about the figure of **Christ**. He says: " In our time, there appeared a man "**Jesus**", of great strength, venerable face, serene eyes and abundant beard. His disciples called Him Son of God, as he resurrected the dead and cured the sick"<sup>891</sup>.

The gospels describe an exceptional being, a man who in only three years of public life, in a radius of a few miles, changed the world in such a way that time is now measured in the time that preceded Him, and the years after His coming<sup>892</sup>.

**Christ** illuminated mans life with His doctrine, with a vision of eternity and transformed the values of human thought.

**Jesus Christ** has been the greatest man in History. Geniuses like **Calderon de la Barca** and **Michelango**, military men like **Caesar and Napoleon**, after their deaths have been admired, but not loved. **Jesus Christ** is the only man who has been loved beyond his death. Two thousand years after his death, legions of men and women, leaving their paternal families, and their future families, their wealth and their Country, giving everything up, have lived only for Him.

**Jesus Christ** has been loved with heroism. Thousand upon thousands of martyrs have given their blood for Him. Thousands upon thousands of saints have centered their lives on Him.

Saints of all times, of all ages, of all social classes. Some with crowns of kings, others with bare feet; some with the habit of monks, and others with the belt of a soldier, some with a jacket and tie, and others with the calloused hands of laborers; boys with a pure heart and girls with a clear look and a demure way of walking. All of these loved him heroically and attained the crown of immortality.

**Jesus** has also been the most fought against man in humanity. What does this man have, who died over two thousand years ago, and to this day, bothers many?

10. **Jesus** lived the greater part of his life a worker, earning his sustenance with the sweat of his brow and working with his hands. He worked as a carpenter in a humble and happy workshop of Nazareth. In this fashion he dignified and ennobled work.

**Jesus**, says the bible, *made himself as a man in everything except sin*<sup>893</sup>. When **Paul** says "*that Christ became sin for us*"<sup>894</sup>, he means that **Christ** took upon himself the punishment for our sins, but not the guilt. This would be incompatible with the infinite goodness of God.

The life and doctrine of **Jesus Christ** are for us an example of what we have to do to attain the kingdom of heaven, that is to say, to save ourselves. He taught us the path to Heaven.

<sup>890</sup> Matthew, 11:28

<sup>891</sup> Madrid National Library. Incunabula n° 970

<sup>892</sup> Christ at Home. Beginner's course, Ed. Fe Católica. Madrid.

<sup>893</sup> HEBREWS, 4:15

<sup>894</sup> CORINTHIANS, 5:21

When **Jesus Christ** was a mere thirty years old He began to preach His doctrine. He miraculously cured many sick and needy. His public life can be summarized in this sentence: “He went about doing good works”<sup>895</sup>.

Because of this, many followed him as disciples. Of these He chose twelve in order to form them especially and so that, when He would not be there, they would continue his work.

But the ruling class of the Jews could not tolerate that an unknown man, not educated with them, should displace them from popular favor. Envy grew and with it, hate. They shut their eyes until they could not see even the clearest of things. “This man”, they said, “performs many miracles and they all follow him”. The logical thing would have been, since they recognized the miracles, that they surrender before God’s testimony and follow Him. But no, they became obstinate and they did not stop until they seized Him and turned Him over to the Roman authorities, obtaining from them the sentence of death on the cross, which was the cruelest manner of death known at the time.

Today, we see the Jews approaching the person of **Christ**. There have been several books written by Jews on this matter. One of the better known books is that of **Joseph Klausner**, entitled “*Jesus von Nazareth*”, published in Jerusalem. Recently, several eminent personalities have converted to Catholicism from their Judaism, such as historian **Ludovico Pastor** and **Edith Stein**, a philosopher; **Nadiuska**, a movie actress and **Andre Frossard**, son of the First Secretary General of the French Communist Party, and author of the book “God Exists, I have found Him”, a worldwide best seller.

11. Evangelists wrote from their faith in that **Jesus** was the Son of God. Thus did **Mark** affirm this at the beginning of his Gospel<sup>896</sup>, and **John** at the end of his<sup>897</sup>.

The expression “Son of God” not always supposes the divinity according to the use of this expression among the Jews. But a professor of the Gregorian University in Rome, **Jose Caba, S.I.**, shows in one of his books how in some passages of the Gospels, the divinity of Christ is clearly expressed.<sup>898</sup>

**Jesus Christ** introduced himself as God<sup>899</sup>. No other founder of religions had such daring. **Buddha, Confucius, Muhammad, Lao Tse, Zarathrusta, or Soroaster**<sup>900</sup>, etc., introduced a more or less moralizing religion, but not a single one of them pretended to be God.<sup>901</sup>

**Jesus Christ said that He was God.**

On repeated occasions he presented himself as God; “*You belong to what is below; I belong to what is above*”<sup>902</sup>. “*I existed before the world existed*”<sup>903</sup>; “*Who sees me, sees the Father*”<sup>904</sup>; “*The Father and I are one*”<sup>905</sup>. That is like saying: “The two of us are of one and the same nature, I am God as the Father is God”.

The texts in which **Jesus Christ** shows His inferiority in respect to the Father, are always in reference to His human nature.

Since **Christ** had two natures, that of God and that of Man, the texts of the Gospels sometimes refer to **Jesus Christ** as God and others to **Jesus Christ** as Man. That **Jesus Christ** was a true man is very clear: He was hungry and because of this He approached the fig tree to see if it had

---

<sup>895</sup> ACTS, 10:38

<sup>896</sup> Mark, 1:1

<sup>897</sup> John, 20:31

<sup>898</sup> JOSE CABA, S. I.: *El Jesús de los Evangelios, IV, VII, X*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1977.

<sup>899</sup> John, 5:18; 10:32s

<sup>900</sup> JUAN MANUEL IGARTUA, S.I.: *El Mesías: Jesús de Nazaret, III*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao. 1986

<sup>901</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *La verdad del cristianismo, III, B*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1980

<sup>902</sup> John, 8:23

<sup>903</sup> John, 17:5

<sup>904</sup> John, 14:9

<sup>905</sup> John, 10:30

figs<sup>906</sup>; He was thirsty and He asked the Samaritan woman to give Him water from the well<sup>907</sup> ; He became tired and He fell asleep in the boat<sup>908</sup>, etc., etc.

**Jesus Christ** called Himself **The Son of Man**. It appears this way some eighty two times in the gospel; and always from the mouth of **Jesus Christ** . It is a reference that the prophet **Daniel** was giving to the messiah.

The disciples called Him “Lord” (*Kyrios*). It was a reference to **Yahweh**, the God of Israel, inspired in the 110<sup>th</sup> Psalm who gave the Messiah such name.<sup>909</sup>

**Jesus Christ** also had a divine nature as can be deduced from a multitude of texts. On repeated times he called Himself the Son of God<sup>910</sup> .

But this divine relationship of **Jesus Christ** is in a different fashion from that of the rest of men. Because of this He makes the distinction: “My Father and Your Father<sup>911</sup>” . In the meantime we men are the adopted sons<sup>912</sup>, **Jesus Christ** is a natural Son, that is to say, of His same nature He has divine nature. Being **Jesus Christ**, a natural son of God He has His same nature.

The offspring will always have the same nature as their parents: the son of a fish is a fish, the son of a bird is a bird, the son of a man is a man, and the son of God is God.

We are children by adoption<sup>913</sup>. **Jesus Christ** is by generation. That is why He is called “*only begotten*”<sup>914</sup>. **Paul** says “**Jesus Christ** being of divine nature, did not boast of His dignity, but rather forsaking His category of God, took the nature of man<sup>915</sup>, and **Paul** adds, “**Jesus Christ** did not consider He was usurping being equal to God<sup>916</sup>, as He already was by nature. That is why, when making himself similar to men, “*He humbled himself*”<sup>917</sup>, that is to say, He lowered himself when assuming the nature of man, being God as He was.

12. Apostle **Thomas** called **Jesus**: “*My Lord and my God*”<sup>918</sup> **Jesus** did not make him rectify as if that were an exaggeration.

The Second Council of Constantinople authoritatively declares that Christ has been called God in these passages<sup>919</sup> ..

**Paul** repeatedly affirms that **Christ** is God: he says that he is “*of divine condition*”<sup>920</sup> : that “*in Him, in bodily form, lives divinity in all its fullness*”<sup>921</sup> ; he calls him “*God blessed forever*”<sup>922</sup> and “*Great God*”<sup>923</sup> . **Paul** transmits the belief of the first Christian community. On the contrary the other Apostles would have protested<sup>924</sup> . On the contrary they themselves said the same thing.

<sup>906</sup> Mark, 11:12

<sup>907</sup> John, 4:6s

<sup>908</sup> Matthew, 8:24

<sup>909</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la fe cristiana, 3ª, VII, 97*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>910</sup> Luke, 1:35; John, 1:34; 17:13;20:31, I John, 4:15

<sup>911</sup> John, 20:17

<sup>912</sup> Galatians; 4:5

<sup>913</sup> Romans, 8:14s; 9:4

<sup>914</sup> John, 1:14; 18:3; 3:16

<sup>915</sup> Philippians, 2:6ss

<sup>916</sup> Philippians, 2:6ss

<sup>917</sup> Philippians, 2:7ss

<sup>918</sup> John, 20:28

<sup>919</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 224* Ed. Herder. Barcelona.

JUSTO COLLANTES, S. I.: *La fe de la Iglesia católica, n° 307* Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1983

<sup>920</sup> Philippians, 2:6

<sup>921</sup> Colossians, 2:9

<sup>922</sup> Romans, 9:5

<sup>923</sup> Titus, 2:13

<sup>924</sup> JUAN LÓPEZ PEDRAZA, S. I.: *Cuando se está perdiendo la fe, 1º, IV, c, 2, 3*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

**Peter** calls him God<sup>925</sup> before receiving the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven<sup>926</sup> and at the beginning of his second letter, calls **Jesus**, God and Savior.

**John** said of **Christ**: “*He is the only son of God*”<sup>927</sup>, “*He is the true God*”<sup>928</sup>

**Paul stated**: “*Anyway, whether it was them or I, this is what we preach*”<sup>929</sup>.

If the Apostles had not believed that Christ was God, they would not have given their lives for Him, because no one gives his life up for that which he knows to be a lie.

**Jehovah’s Witnesses** deny the divinity of **Christ** and because of this they have made a translation of the Bible which they call the “*New World*”, where they introduce words which are not in the original text and they change the sense of the sentences where the divinity of **Christ** is spoken of. This introduction of words which change the sense of the original text is an authentic fraud.

13. The Jews understood that **Jesus** held himself to be God, and because of this they wanted to kill him because he made himself “*God’s equal*”<sup>930</sup>. “*We are stoning you not for doing a good work, but for blasphemy: though you are only a man, you claim to be God*”<sup>931</sup>. “*He must die as he pretends to be the son of God*”<sup>932</sup>.

The Jewish people were monotheist and did not consider any other God except Yahweh. **Christ** clearly affirmed His divinity. Because of this they called Him a blasphemer<sup>933</sup>.

To **Caiphas** it also sounded like blasphemy, the answer which **Jesus** gave in the Sanhedrin when He affirmed that He was the Son of God. And for blaspheming they condemned him to death<sup>934</sup>. If **Christ** had called Himself the Son of God, in the same fashion that God is the Father of the rest of men, which would not have sounded like blasphemy. **Christ** identified himself with the Father<sup>935</sup>, because He had the same nature as God.

All of the texts that **Jehovah’s Witnesses** cite to take away from the Catholics their faith in the Christ-God refer to the Christ-Man. To ignore the texts in which it is affirmed of the divinity of **Christ**; is not to know the Bible. or to want to deceive, which is worse. **Jehovah’s Witnesses** do not have the right to call themselves Christians, since they do not believe that **Christ** is God. Because of this they are excluded from the World Council of Christian Churches<sup>936</sup>.

**John** says: “*Whoever denies the Son cannot have the Father either; Whoever acknowledges the Son has the Father too*”<sup>937</sup>.

**Jesus** was convinced of being the Son of God in a special sense, unique. **Jesus Christ** called God His Father in a familiar fashion. He used the word “*abba*” which is the same as “*papa*”. German researcher **Joachim Jeremiahs** in his brief work entitled “*The Prayer of the Lord*” and in his book “*The Essential Message of the New Testament*” gives much importance to the term “*abba*”. He says that “*Until now one has been able to cite a single case within Palestinian Judaism in which God is invoked as “My Father” by an individual. For the Jewish mentality this would have sounded like a lack of reverence. Which makes it unimaginable to call God with this colloquial term. It is something new, exceptional to all of which there never would have been even a suspicion. We find ourselves facing*

<sup>925</sup> JUAN MANUEL IGARTUA, S.I.: *El Mesías, 3º, II, 2*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao. 1988

<sup>926</sup> Matthew, 16:16

<sup>927</sup> John, 4:9.

<sup>928</sup> John, 5:20

<sup>929</sup> Corinthians, 15:11

<sup>930</sup> John, 19:7

<sup>931</sup> John, 10:33

<sup>932</sup> John, 19:7

<sup>933</sup> John, 10:33

<sup>934</sup> Matthew, 26:63-66 ; Mark, 14 :61-64

<sup>935</sup> John, 14:9

<sup>936</sup> Conseil Oecumenique des Eglises. Rapport de la Troisieme Assamblée, pg. 391. Neuchâtel.

<sup>937</sup> 1 John, 2:22

something which is new and unheard of, which breaks all the moulds of Judaism<sup>938</sup>. **Urs von Balthasar** says that the word “abba” (daddy, dad) is loving and exclusive “it is unthinkable that **Jesus** would have given that treatment before to another man named **Joseph**<sup>939</sup>

**Christ** is the Son of God in a real sense. Not a figurative one: a holy man, but not of divine nature. Because of this **St. Augustine** writes: “To those who say that **Jesus Christ** is the Son of God as far as He is a man so holy that he deserves to be called the Son of God, to those who do not believe, as such they should be expelled from our community by the Catholic institution”<sup>940</sup>.

Some want to downgrade the divinity of **Christ**. For them **Christ** was a “divined” man in the affective sense of the word, not the effective. That is why instead of talking about the divinity “of” **Christ**, they prefer to talk about the presence of divinity “in” **Christ**. As if **Christ** were not a true God, but only a man in whom God shone in an extraordinary form. But if we were to read the gospel without prejudice, as said by **Greely**, it is clear that **Christ** feels united with the Father in a unique and extraordinary form; “*Who sees me, sees the Father*” **John** says, putting words in **Christ’s** mouth<sup>941</sup>. What’s more **Jesus** feels He has the authority to change the Old Testament. The prophets of Antiquity backed His words in the authority of God. They would say; “So speaks the Lord”. **Jesus** speaks in His name only and dares to correct the Mosaic law, being superior to it. He speaks on his own right. “*It was said to the elders, but I tell you*”<sup>942</sup>.

**Jesus** spoke with sufficient clarity so that we could discover his divinity, but in a veiled way so as to not scandalize those people, essentially monotheist, who could not accept another God than Yahweh.

That is why **Jesus** discovered His divinity in a gradual form<sup>943</sup>. To state it suddenly would have caused a scandal.

Only at the end of His life does He reveal the mystery of His divine personality. **Jesus** responded to **Caiphas** who questioned him about his divinity: “You have said it” which is a way of speaking, which means “It is as you say”<sup>944</sup>

To be a Christian it is necessary to believe that **Jesus Christ** is the son of God<sup>945</sup>

14. **Jesus Christ** demonstrated with His miracles that which He said was the truth: because only with the power of God can miracles be made<sup>946</sup>. The miracle surpasses the laws of Nature, and this can only be done with the power of God.

**Jesus Christ** had said many times: “*If you do not believe in my words, believe in my works*”<sup>947</sup> “*My works give testimony of Me*”<sup>948</sup>, “*If I had not performed such works among them as no one else has ever done, they would be blameless*”<sup>949</sup>

**Jesus Christ** alluded to the miracles which he performed so that we might believe in Him<sup>950</sup>.

**Jesus Christ** performed the miracles on his own behalf. He says to the wind: *I tell you, stop*; and the wind stops. And to the ocean: *I tell you, be calm*, and the ocean becomes calm. And to the

<sup>938</sup> GREELEY: *El mito de Jesús. V.* Ed. Cristiandad. Madrid, 1973

<sup>939</sup> HANS URS von BALTHASAR: *Puntos Centrales de la Fe, 2ª, XII, 2.* Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1985

<sup>940</sup> SAINT AUGUSTINE: *De agone christiano, 17, 19.*

MIGNE: *Patrologia Latina, 40, 300.*

<sup>941</sup> John, 14:9

<sup>942</sup> Matthew, 5:21s

<sup>943</sup> JESUS MARTÍNEZ GARCIA: *Hablemos de la fe, I, 7.* Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>944</sup> JOSE LUIS MARTÍN DESCALZO: *Vida y misterio de Jesús de Nazaret, 1º, XVIII, 5, K.* Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca

<sup>945</sup> I John, 3:23

<sup>946</sup> John, 3:2; 5:36; 9:16; 10:25, 37s

<sup>947</sup> John, 10:36ss

<sup>948</sup> John, 5:36

<sup>949</sup> John, 15:24.

<sup>950</sup> John, 5:36

lame: *I tell you, get up and walk, and the lame walks*<sup>951</sup>. **Jesus Christ** always performed his miracles in his own name. On the other hand **Peter** did them in **Jesus Christ's** name<sup>952</sup>

15. A miracle is a work, a visible act which can be perceived through the senses and which surpasses the forces of Nature<sup>953</sup>, and which is done by God, whether directly, or through the angels or by men.

God always performs miracles for a good end: as a sign of salvation<sup>954</sup>.

**John**, when referring to the miracles of **Jesus Christ**, calls them "signs"<sup>955</sup>

Miracle is the seal of God. Everything that carries the seal of miracle is true, as God cannot backup his authority with a lie.

The strength of a miracle is the fact that God is the only one who can change the laws of Nature, and He is the Sum of all Truth. Therefore, the miracle is carried out to confirm an affirmation made by human lips, this is an approbation of God to the affirmation of man; and God cannot approve an error or a lie.

A miracle represents the seal of God. All that which bears the seal of a miracle is truth, because God cannot back up with his authority that which is a lie.

Miracles help faith, but do not force it, as the event must be free. If not, it would not be meritorious. Faith transcends reasons, but it is reasonable. If faith were not reasonable, the believers would be stupid.

Miracles, are not those extraordinary acts which come from certain skills of men or from intervention of the devil.

A miracle is not the same as a wonder. A wonder can be the work of a magician or a water diviner who finds springs of water, have nothing to do with miracles. These are tricks, skills, exceptional qualities. But none of this surpasses the laws of Nature. The miracles is a breaking of the laws of Nature, and in a religious context<sup>956</sup>

God can change Natures Laws, as they belong to him. but God cannot make a square circle, as that would be absurd, and God makes any absurdities<sup>957</sup>

Today there are phenomena which we still **do not understand** well, such as water divining, telepathy, telekinesis, precognition, etc., although almost all the scientific world rejects what parapsychology affirms about the ability to influence material by subjective means, both in prediction and telekinesis.<sup>958</sup>

But a miracle is something which we know surpasses the forces of Nature: such as resurrecting a dead person who has been dead for four days and is already in the state of putrefaction.

We may not know the extreme to which in some cases the laws of Nature may get to<sup>959</sup>. But there are things that for certain Nature cannot do<sup>960</sup> a man so tall that he can touch the moon with his hand, obtain gold by rubbing his hands hydrogen and oxygen, or harvest roses by sowing the seed of wheat. There are things which evidently surpass the possibility of man, as **Rabindranath Tagore** said: "You can blow out a candle with one breath; but it is impossible to snuff out the Sun with air puffs."

<sup>951</sup> MARK, 2:11

<sup>952</sup> ACTS, 3:6; 9:34

<sup>953</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Dios y su obra*, 3º, 2ª, III, 2, nº 565. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>954</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *Cristología fundamental*, V, 4, 4, c. Ed. C.E.T.E. Madrid

<sup>955</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la fe cristiana*, 3ª, II, 42. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1975

<sup>956</sup> XAVIER LEON-DUFOUR: *Los milagros de Jesús*, pg 343. Ed. Cristiandad. Madrid. 1979

<sup>957</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN: *Dios y su obra*, 3º, 2ª, III, nº 570. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>958</sup> MANUEL Mª CARREIRA, S. I.: *Metafísica de la materia*, IX. Universidad de Comillas, Madrid. 1993

<sup>959</sup> JESUS Mª GRANERO, S. I.: *Credo-Jesucristo*, II. Ed. Escelicer. Cádiz. 1943

<sup>960</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *Cristología fundamental*, V, 3, 4. Ed. C.E.T.E. Madrid



A pig, no matter how much you train it, will never be able to compete with a race horse; at most, it will be a fast pig..

As Parente says: "Today medical science obtains wonderful cures, by using adequate means, frequently complicated and long. In this there is no wonder, but rather technique and the intelligent use of adequate means to this end. But if a man cures a blind person, or a leper, with a simple word then science and reason are eliminated and it is necessary to find the cause in facts which are outside of the laws and natural means."<sup>961</sup>

16. Some persons **resist believing** in the miracles of **Jesus Christ**. They deny the miracle because they say that it is impossible. But this denial has no value at all. If it can be proven that they are real facts, then some explanation has to be given. The cure of illnesses, they want to attribute to occult and unknown procedures; and when this turns out to be too absurd, then they limit themselves to calmly denying the fact. This procedure is very easy, but it is not very scientific.

The force of **Jesus Christ** is in that he confirmed his doctrine with miracles which we know were realized by the historicity of the Gospels, and because they exceed all human power they are a confirmation of the divine.

"Once we admit the activity of the miracle-worker as an indubitable fact in the life of Christ, there is no basis for making a selection between the miracles of the Gospel, admitting some as historic ones and rejecting others as legends.... Reading the historicity of the Gospels, there can be no doubt."<sup>962</sup>

The **best historical source** is that which was spoken of the fact by the contemporaries who saw or heard from those who witnesses. Well then, the miracles of **Jesus Christ** are told to us by those who saw them with their own eyes and who died for defending the truth of what they said.

St. John says: "*We speak only about what we know and witness only what we have seen and yet the people reject our evidence.*"<sup>963</sup>. Even the same enemies of **Jesus** could not deny the miraculous deeds which **Jesus** performed and because of this they attributed them to Satan<sup>964</sup>. They even decide to kill him because "*this man makes many miracles. If we let him live, many will believe in him*"<sup>965</sup>. And even **Peter** in his speech in Jerusalem, on occasion of Pentecost feast, said: "*Fellow Israelites, listen to what I am going to tell you about Jesus of Nazareth. God accredited him and through him did powerful deeds and wonders and signs in your midst, as you well know*"<sup>966</sup>. The Gospels describe in detailed form the more than forty miracles that were personally made by **Jesus Christ**<sup>967</sup>.

17. Faith, is the acceptance of the word of a trustworthy person. To believe in what has not been seen because it is told to us by one who has seen it or knows about it<sup>968</sup>.

Personal faith in **Jesus Christ** is the acceptance of his own testimony up to the support and the total giving of oneself to his divine Person<sup>969</sup>. It is not mere acceptance of the fact that He lives and exists among us as truly as when he lived in Palestine: neither is it only an adherence of only understanding the truths which the Gospel proposes to us, according to the authorized interpretation of the Magisterium of the Church. It is something much more existential and totalizing.

<sup>961</sup> PARENTE: *De Dios al hombre*, III, 6. Ed. Atenas. Madrid

<sup>962</sup> MANUEL GONZALEZ GIL, S. I.: *Cristo, misterio de Dios*, 2º, XI, 3, C. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1976

<sup>963</sup> John, 3:11 and 1Jn, 1:1s

<sup>964</sup> Mark, 3:22

<sup>965</sup> John, 11:47s

<sup>966</sup> Acts, 2:22

<sup>967</sup> EUSTAQUIO GUERRERO, S. I.: *Jesucristo, la mejor prueba de la fe católica*. VII, 1. Ed. Mensajero

<sup>968</sup> FELIPE CALLE, O.S.A.: *Razona tu fe*, III. Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid

<sup>969</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 176

The First Vatican Council states: “The Catholic Church unfailingly teaches that faith is essentially a supernatural assent of the understanding of the truths revealed by God<sup>970</sup>, but faith is not only accepting a truth by reasoning, but also with one’s heart. It is the commitment of our self with that of **Jesus Christ** in a relationship of intimacy which bears with it demands which an ideology never would be capable of demanding of us. In order to have a real and mature faith one has to pass from the cold concept to the heat of friendship and a decided commitment. Because of this a faith like that in **Jesus Christ** is one which gives strength and efficacy to a Christian life which has been fully renovated, such as that which Vatican Council II wants to promote. The most essential part of faith is to accept a truth through the authority which God has revealed. He who demands a scientific explanation that God is in the Eucharist, does not have faith in the Eucharist.

The only thing that is reasonable is searching the guaranties that take us to accept that this truth has truly been revealed to us by God, These are reasons of credibility<sup>971</sup> Amongst these is the infallible definition of the Church that a determined truth is truly revealed by God.<sup>972</sup>

When the Church, either by dogmatic definition, be it by its Magisterium ordinary and Universal, proposes to the faithful a truth to be believed as revealed by God, it cannot fail in view of the special assistance of the Holy Spirit who cannot allow that the entire Church err in matters relating to faith or customs.<sup>973</sup>

Faith is not only the acceptance of some formulas, but also the personal adhesion to **Jesus Christ**<sup>974</sup>. Faith, more than believing in something that we do not see, believes in someone who has talked to us<sup>975</sup>. More than “an intellectual act, it is an attitude, a vital behavior that implies the whole person. Faith is above all, adhesion to the person who reveals, secure in the faithfulness and loyalty with which God speaks to us<sup>976</sup>

Faith is not only accepting concepts, but, above all, living faithfully to some principles. It is not only “I accept”, but more “I trust you”. Faith means “acknowledging something for true and real in light of the testimony of another person”, because we trust his science and veracity. Supernatural faith gives me the utmost certainty, as I do not have to trust the natural aptitude of human understanding to know the truth, nor of the veracity of a man, but of the science and veracity of God. Because I believe in **Jesus Christ**, I trust his word. I accept **Jesus Christ** as a supreme norm, and I value everything as He values it. One’s acts are the expression of the level of faith of a person. There is no possible acceptance of the program of **Jesus Christ** if it is not through the language of the acts. “To follow **Jesus Christ** means to listen to His words, assimilate his attitudes, behave like Him, identify oneself completely with Him “ “It is not a following in the material sense of the word: one must follow Him in spiritual steps, with one’s heart, with the soul, by **giving one’s self**. “Follow” in this case, means to believe, accept his words, obey His teachings, and turn into being His disciple<sup>977</sup>

Those who truly follow **Jesus Christ** want to be like Him. They make an effort in order to think like Him. To do things that would be of His liking. They wish to do good. Help others, forgive, be generous and to love all<sup>978</sup>. To have faith carries within itself a lifestyle. “Faith is man’s answer to a God who reveals himself<sup>979</sup> “Faith is the human response to the personal God and therefore is the meeting of two persons., In it, man is totally committed. Faith is certain, not because it implies the evidence of something seen, but because it is the adhesion to a person who sees. Transmission of

<sup>970</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1789. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>971</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 1ª, III, 26. Ed. BAC. Madrid .1996

<sup>972</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 1ª, III, 3. Ed. BAC. Madrid .1996

<sup>973</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 1ª, IV, 1. Ed. BAC. Madrid .1996

<sup>974</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Unidos en la fe*, 2º, II, 3. EDICE. Madrid.

<sup>975</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 177

<sup>976</sup> MIGUEL RIVILLA: *Los jóvenes y la fe*, I, III. Ed. Publicator. Alarcón. Madrid. 1991

<sup>977</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la fe cristiana*, 3ª, IV, 68, 3. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>978</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Scholastic Catechism*, 4º EGB, n° 17

<sup>979</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 26

faith is verified through testimonials..... A Christian gives testimony as he commits himself to God and His works... Normally, Christian truth makes itself be recognized through the Christian person.<sup>980</sup>

Who doesn't have faith does not understand he who does. and who knows how to appraise eternal values. It is like talking to a blind person about colors.

18. Today it is fashionable to insist that faith is something insecure. There is some truth in that, because faith is not shown to us with a metaphysic certainty, as a philosophical axiom. But a faith is very reasonable, as we have seen in some preceding pages (3,8). One must not underestimate this security Psychologists affirm that a sense of security is one of the indispensable elements for the human being, in such a fashion that a lack of it is a source of neurosis.

The **desire for security** is inherent to human nature. Nobody puts his money in a bank where there is a danger he might lose it, no one eats rotten food that might make him ill, and no mountaineer would climb up a rope that is not well tied.

Faith is illuminating, optimistic and full of hope because it is reasonable.

Some speak of a faith which is obscure, vague, diffuse and nebulous. "The Church and our experience make us smile when we are faced with this coarse reasoning, which is the fruit of an inferiority complex which today has so many believers, even among those who write and teach."

The following of **Christ** demands an effort to go on assuming the fundamental attitudes which gave meaning to all of His life: to believe in what He believed, to give importance to those things which He did, to defend that which He defended, to live and to die for that which He lived and died<sup>981</sup>. A man without values is an immature man, who flows with the wind and lacks responsibility<sup>982</sup>.

---

<sup>980</sup> JEAN MORROUX: *Creo en Ti, II*, 5. Ed. Flors. Barcelona

<sup>981</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Unidos en la fe, 2º, II*, 3. EDICE. Madrid

<sup>982</sup> Dr. ENRIQUE ROJAS: *Remedios para el desamor*, Ed. Temas de Hoy. Madrid. 1991

## **REDEMPTION**

### **33. GOD BECAME MAN IN ORDER TO REDEEM US FROM SIN AND TO GIVE US LIFE ETERNAL.**

1. To redeem from sin is to ransom for a price.

Since the original sin which **Adam and Eve**<sup>983</sup> committed, the doors of Heaven were closed and no one could enter there.

Through the merits of the Redemption of **Jesus Christ** all of our sins were forgiven and the doors of Heaven were opened:

God sent his son to redeem man<sup>984</sup>: "*For you know that you have been ransomed.....with the precious blood of Christ*"<sup>985</sup> "*For ye have been bought at a price*"<sup>986</sup>. "*For he shall save his people from their sins*"<sup>987</sup>. **Jesus Christ** who offered himself as a ransom for all.<sup>988</sup> The son of man came to give his life for the redemption of all<sup>989</sup> **Christ** died for us<sup>990</sup>. **Christ** died for all<sup>991</sup>

The Father sent his son to be the savior of the world<sup>992</sup>. And **Peter** says that **Jesus** is the only savior of the world.<sup>993</sup>

"Many" in the Bible means "all"<sup>994</sup>.

God has died for all, but for redemption to be applied to each man, depends that he want to take advantage of it<sup>995</sup>. As **Saint Augustine** said: "God, who has created you, cannot save you with out you.

But in order for us to be saved it was necessary to believe in the truths revealed by God and to do good works:

*"Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved; whoever does not believe will be condemned"*<sup>996</sup> *"But if you wish to enter into eternal life, keep the commandments"*<sup>997</sup>.

2. Irish Franciscan philosopher was walking along a road and found a laborer who, perspiring, was sinking the ploughshare into the hard earth. They began to speak about God. After a few words the farmhand interrupted him:

---

<sup>983</sup> See numbers 41-43

<sup>984</sup> Galatians, 4:5

<sup>985</sup> Peter, 1:18s

<sup>986</sup> I Corinthians, 6:20

<sup>987</sup> Matthew, 1:21

<sup>988</sup> I Timothy, 2:6; Mark, 10:45

<sup>989</sup> Matthew, 20:28

<sup>990</sup> Romans, 5:8

<sup>991</sup> II Corinthians, 5:15

<sup>992</sup> I John, 4:14

<sup>993</sup> ACTS, 4:12

<sup>994</sup> HANS URS von BALTHASAR: *Puntos Centrales de la Fe*, 2ª, XI, 3. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>995</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *¿Se salvan todos?*, 2ª, V. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1995

<sup>996</sup> Mark, 16:16

<sup>997</sup> Matthew, 19:17

Do you allow me to ask you a question?

Let us see.

“God knows all. God is infallible. He cannot make mistakes. At this instant God knows if I am going to save myself or if I am going to condemn myself. Well now, if God knows that I am going to save myself, no matter how much I sin, I will be saved; on the other hand, if God knows that I am going to condemn myself, no matter how much I try, I will be condemned. Therefore, why should I worry about doing good works?”

“God knows if you will be saved or condemned, in the same fashion that He knows if this year you will have a splendid harvest or you will lose it all in a freeze. According to your reasoning, since God knows what will happen to your harvest and God cannot make mistakes, it is useless for you to plow and to sow the land. Pick up your plow, go home, and wait to see what happens.”

And opening his prayer book, he continued to walk along the path. The farmhand did not know what to say. In spite of the infallible science of God, if he did not sow it was certain that he would not reap the harvest.

And it is that the reaping or the non-reaping of the harvest; that I will be saved or condemned; does not occur because God already knows it; but rather that God already knows it from now because, in fact, it will happen afterwards.

If you let a stone drop from a window before it reaches the ground you know that there will be a thud. But the thud did not happen because you knew it, but only that you knew it because it necessarily was going to happen. The difference is in that we only can know the future when this depends on physical laws of nature; on the other hand, God also knows the future of free beings, because for Him time does not pass. God already knows the “film” of your life, and he knows how it is going to end. But you yourself make the “film”, freely and voluntarily. It will come out as you wish.

If I watch a football match recorded on a tape after I have seen the match live, I know the results before it finishes playing, but not for that am I responsible of the result. God knows my future, as for Him everything is present. However, my future depends on me.

He who condemns himself it is because he has not wanted to cooperate with the graces which God has given him: “Because I called you and you refused”<sup>998</sup> *“You are guilty of your perdition.”*<sup>999</sup>

3. They asked a child in school:

“Who created the devils?”

He answered:

“God created them angels, but they made themselves into devils.”

Well answered. The same thing happens with us. God created us for Heaven; but we make ourselves worthy of hell should we die in sin.

---

<sup>998</sup> Proverbs, 1:26

<sup>999</sup> Prophet Oseas, 13:9

God does not condemn you. It is you who condemns yourself for not complying. The same way that it is incorrect to say that a professor suspends one. It is the student who fails for not having answered correctly. The only thing that the fair and just professor does is to declare that the student is badly prepared. The same way with God. He creates you so that you will be saved, He desires that you be saved, but if you do not comply, He will have to declare that you are not apt for salvation, but only for hell.

### 34. JESUS CHRIST HAS REDEEMED US OFFERING THE SACRIFICE OF HIS LIFE ON THE CROSS, for the forgiveness of our sins and to return us to the grace and friendship of God.

1. The death of **Jesus Christ** nailed to the cross is the greatest happening which ever occurred in History. For the reparation of humankind, in a plan of strict and perfect justice, it was absolutely necessary for the incarnation and redemption of Christ<sup>1000</sup>.

The offense is increased with the dignity of the offended. While sin is an offense to an infinite God, its malice is infinite. It could not be repaired by a mere man. That is why God made himself as a Man-God, and thus repair the offense of man<sup>1001</sup>

Through the humanity of **Jesus Christ** the Word made Man enters into solidarity with the human race. We are whole with Him. He is one of us. That is how the true redemption can be attained. We offended God, and He pays for all. **Christ** is a link that joins the great with the negligible. Raises humanity to the heights of divinity and it seems that he bends divinity to our earth.<sup>1002</sup>

**Saint Gregory the Great** says: "For God to have lowered himself to the level of humanity, causes to raise the man to the level of divinity"<sup>1003</sup>

God could have sent all the men who had sinned mortally to hell, but for the great love which He has for us, he did not do this, on the contrary, He wanted to become man in order to redeem us.

And although it would have been enough to accomplish this with just one tear in his eyes or one word on his lips<sup>1004</sup>, He wanted to suffer torments so terrible and a death so cruel, so that we might see the value of our souls and that we might have a horror of sin. This to give us proof of his love for us and to serve as an example for in our works and hardships.

2. **Jesus** wants us to correspond the love which He has for us. Because of this, many images of him shows us his Heart, asking that we too love Him and that we consecrate and dedicate all the acts of our life to Him, especially those which cost us the most. The pain and the suffering are a treasure if one knows how to profit from them for another life by offering them to God.

Christian life, even in its most minimal actions possesses an inestimable richness of value, due to the union of everything which is baptized with **Christ**, in whose mission and redeeming merits he participates.

All that value and price can be offered to God to make amends for the sins and to collaborate in the salvation of the world, and even to obtain from the omnipotence of God, graces and favors for oneself and others.

<sup>1000</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Jesucristo y la vida cristiana*, n° 29 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1001</sup> JESUS M<sup>a</sup> GRANERO, S. I.: *Credo – Jesucristo*, V. Ed. Escelicer. Cádiz. 1943

<sup>1002</sup> JESUS M<sup>a</sup> GRANERO, S. I.: *Credo – Jesucristo*, V. Ed. Escelicer. Cádiz. 1943

<sup>1003</sup> SAINT GREGORY THE GREAT. *Homilia II in Ev. N° 2. ML. 76, 1082*

<sup>1004</sup> LEEN, C.S. Sp.: *Por que la cruz*, 2<sup>a</sup>, I. Ed. Rialp. Madrid

**The Apostolate of Prayer** is an outreach of the Church which associates 37 million persons, united in **Christ**, in order to live the great interests of his Kingdom, through the sincere offering of the redeeming value of all their actions, sufferings, joys and prayers.

One has **to sanctify work**. To do the things the best we can for the love of God. The layman cannot sanctify himself on the basis of long prayer and tremendous penance. A prayer must always be said, but not always can a prayer be lengthy. Something always has to be sacrificed, besides the many sacrifices which life entails. But that which is constant, that which will be with us all our days and of all the moments of each day, is to do well that which is being done, and this is to please God by complying with his holy will. In this the layman or laywoman has to find his or her true sanctity<sup>1005</sup>.

Offering yourself to **Jesus Christ**, and with it all of your things, in correspondence to this Infinite Love and in reparation of all the sins and offenses which he continually receives is called the cult to the **Sacred Heart of Jesus**. This cult, which bears with it the veneration of the image of the Heart Wounded by the spear of the soldier is a true compendium of our Religion and the best way of living our faith because it offers us a practical manner of giving ourselves to Christ and our neighbor, loving them truly and making reparations for sins.

Popular religiosity, revalued today, with its specific and sensitive sense, finds in the heart of **Christ** the easiest path to reach the love of God.

The devotion to the Sacred Heart is not one devotion more. It is the answer of **Christ** because He loves men. It is all a form of spirituality.

We must bear in mind the enormous love that God has for us. He loves us as the best of Fathers! Only Christians call God Father. Because of this He became man and died in order to save us. Because of this, after this life He has prepared for us another marvelous one. And this love is symbolized in His Heart.

Let us see the love of God in all the circumstances which surround us, good and bad. Let us trust completely in the immense love of our Father: "**Heart of Jesus**, in you I trust because I believe that you love me<sup>1006</sup>."

3. The devotion to the **Sacred Heart of Jesus** grants us great benefits which have been promised by Him. Above all our eternal salvation, if we take Communion on the nine First Fridays of the month for consecutive months, as He Himself promised to **St. Marguerite Mary Alacoque**.

On 5 October 1986, **Pope John Paul II** said in Paray le Monial that they keep on with the practice of the **Nine First Fridays** of the month, and that the faithful be helped in the participation of the Sacraments<sup>1007</sup>. The reason for the devotion of the Nine First Fridays of the month could be based on the fact that **Christ** died on the First Friday of April<sup>1008</sup>, and he was for nine months in the womb of **Mary**. Thus we commemorate two great facts of the Redemption: Incarnation and Death.

It is evident that he who makes the First Friday and then trusting in this promise dedicates himself to sinning at pleasure is deceiving the **Sacred Heart of Jesus**.

This is not the best way to achieve the fulfillment of the promise. **Paul** said that no one makes fun of God<sup>1009</sup>. Should you go to Communion presumptuously, that is to say, without the proposal of amendment, thinking about sinning afterwards, it is clear that this communion will be sacrilegious, not valid and that you will not gain the promise.

<sup>1005</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 901

<sup>1006</sup> JOSÉ LUIS DE URRUTIA, S. I. *Espiritualidad del Sagrado Corazón*. Ed. Sal Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. Santander. 1972

<sup>1007</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 6-X-86, pg.13

<sup>1008</sup> JOSÉ RICCIOTTI: *Vida de Jesucristo, n° 181*. Ed. Miracle. Barcelona

<sup>1009</sup> Galatians, 6:7

The promise of the **Heart of Jesus** is not an assurance of salvation for those who want to live a life of sin. The Council of Trent condemns and it is of faith - those who presume to have absolute and infallible certainty of being saved. That is unless they have had a special revelation of it<sup>1010</sup>.

One must bear in mind that the promise of the **Heart of Jesus** is only useful for those who wish to be saved, because this promise does not destroy our liberty. He who is determined to go on the path to hell, and does not want to reform, will be condemned even though he has made the First Fridays. But for those who have made them well and who have the good will to follow the paths of salvation, even though they have falls because of weaknesses, there are very solid reasons for believing that God will look after them and will protect them with a special Providence so that they will die in the state of grace.

In your home you should have an image, a painting or a plaque of the Sacred Heart, since He too has promised that he will bless the houses in which there is his image exposed and honored. You would do very well to consecrate you home to the Sacred Heart.

### 35. JESUS CHRIST RESURRECTED AFTER HIS DEATH AND WENT TO HEAVEN.

**1. Jesus Christ**, after being crucified, was dead and buried, and on the third day<sup>1011</sup> he resurrected joining his body and glorious soul so that he never would die again<sup>1012</sup>. Therefore, **Jesus Christ** is now in heaven in body and soul.

The resurrection of **Jesus Christ** is the fundamental dogma of Christianity<sup>1013</sup>

The expression of **Matthew** says that **Christ** was buried for three days and three nights<sup>1014</sup>. This expression was identical to the duration till the third day, when considering the day and night as a unit of one day. To say: "three days and three nights" is equivalent to three days<sup>1015</sup>, or what is the same, "on the third day".

**Jesus Christ** died on a Friday afternoon and resurrected on Sunday morning: in other words, He was in a sepulcher for one whole day and two half days, but for the Hebrew way of talking, this is the equivalent of three days<sup>1016</sup>, **Peter** said: "On the third day, He rose"<sup>1017</sup>

Before He died he had prophesied several times about his resurrection<sup>1018</sup>. Therefore, when he resurrected through his own power, he demonstrated anew, and with a most convincing proof, that He was God.

**St. Matthew** says that the Pharisees ordered their soldiers who had been guarding the tomb, and that they should say: "His disciples came during the night and stole him"<sup>1019</sup>. To this **Saint Augustine** said: "If they were sleeping, they could not see anything. And if they saw nothing, how can they be witnesses?"<sup>1020</sup>

<sup>1010</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 805 & 826 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1011</sup> Matthew, 20:19

<sup>1012</sup> Matthew, 28:6s; Luke, 24:36-43; John, 20:19-29

<sup>1013</sup> SANTOS SABUGAL, O.S.A.: *Credo*, 2ª, II, 4, 19. Ed. Monte Casino. Zamora

<sup>1014</sup> Matthew, 12:40

<sup>1015</sup> JUAN MI. IGARTUA, S. I. *La Resurrección de Jesús y su Cuerpo*, IV, 5. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>1016</sup> JESUS Mª GRANERO, S. I.: *Credo- Jesucristo*, XXVII. Ed. Escelicer. Cádiz

<sup>1017</sup> ACTS, 10:40

<sup>1018</sup> Matthew, 12:39s; 16:21; 17:22; 20:19; LUKE, 9:22

<sup>1019</sup> Matthew, 28:13

<sup>1020</sup> SAINT AUGUSTINE. *Enarratio in psalmum*, 63(64) MIGNE patrologia Latina, 36.767



"Modern theologians seek several explanations to the fact of the resurrection of **Christ**. But whatever the interpretation may be, it must include the revivification of the body, unless you want to sink the theology of resurrection<sup>1021</sup>

Some say that resurrection of **Christ** is not an historic fact, since there are no witnesses. This way of talking is ambiguous and can be confusing; since "not historic" can be confused with "not real". Because of this, it should not be used, as recommended by **Fr. Jose Caba, S. I.**, professor at the Pontifical Gregorian University of Rome in his book "The Resurrected Christ, My Hope<sup>1022</sup>" The resurrection of Christ is something that has really happened.

Even if there is no witness of the fact of the resurrection, as such, the reason is historical because of the tracks left behind, and of which the apostles give testimony<sup>1023</sup>. Should a car appear at the bottom of a ravine, and the rail guard on the curve is destroyed, I do not need to have seen the accident, to understand what has happened. In this same fashion, I can recognize the resurrection of **Jesus Christ**

For others it can be considered as historic because it can be located in space and time. According to Pannenberg, all events which can be located in coordinates of space and time are historic.<sup>1024</sup>

That is why, for **Fr. Ignacio de la Potterie, S. I.** probably the greatest specialist in the Gospel of **John**, the resurrection of **Christ** had a physical and historic reality<sup>1025</sup>.

**Max Meinertz** states: "The resurrection enters into the field of historic reality<sup>1026</sup>

**Christ's** resurrection is referred to by **Paul** in the letter to the Corinthians, in year 57, that is to say, to contemporaries of the facts: "**Christ** died for our sins, was buried and rose on the third day<sup>1027</sup>. And, as attested by **Peter**: "Of **Jesus Christ** resurrected, we are all witnesses<sup>1028</sup>. **Luke** emphatically affirms it: "The Lord is truly risen"<sup>1029</sup>.

## 2. Christ was dead on the cross.

That is why the executioners did not break his legs as they used to do to finish off those crucified.

But if he had not been dead, He would have been killed by the lance which opened the right auricle of his heart, as the doctors say was what happened, according to the account of **St. John** who was present there.<sup>1030</sup>

**On the third day the sepulcher was empty:** The body of **Christ** was not to be found.

The faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ begins with the empty tomb.

**Oscar Cullman**, a Protestant from the University of Basle says: "The empty tomb will continue to be an historic event.<sup>1031</sup>"

The apostles would not have believed in the resurrection of **Jesus** if they had found the body in the sepulcher.<sup>1032</sup> The four evangelists connect the empty tomb with the resurrection of **Christ**.

<sup>1021</sup> BALDOMERO JIMÉNEZ DUQUE. *Volver a lo esencial*, XXXVIII. Ed. Tau. Ávila

<sup>1022</sup> JOSÉ CABA, S. I.: *Resucito Cristo, mi esperanza*, IX, 1, 4º, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1986

<sup>1023</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYÉS.: *Cristología fundamental*, VII, 2, 1. Ed. C.E.T.E. Madrid. 1985

<sup>1024</sup> CÁNDIDO POZO, S. I.: *Teología del mas allá*, pg. 69. Ed. BAC. Madrid 1980

<sup>1025</sup> IGNACIO DE LA POTTERIE, S. I.: *30 Días Magazine*, 62(1992)76

<sup>1026</sup> MAX MEINERTZ: *Teología del Nuevo Testamento*, 1ª, IV, 5. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>1027</sup> I Corinthians, 15:3s

<sup>1028</sup> Acts, 2:32

<sup>1029</sup> Luke, 24:34

<sup>1030</sup> JORGE LORING, S.I.: *La autenticidad de la Sabana Santa de Turín*, Madrid, 1990

<sup>1031</sup> JOSÉ LUIS CARREÑO, O.S.B.: *El último reportero*, XVII. Ed. Don Bosco. Pamplona. 1975

- a) **Matthew**: “He is not here, for He is risen<sup>1033</sup>”  
 b) **Mark**: “He has risen, He is not here<sup>1034</sup>”  
 c) **Luke**: “He is not here, He has risen<sup>1035</sup>”  
 d) **John**, upon seeing the empty grave and the placing of the shrouds “saw and believed”<sup>1036</sup> that He had risen, as if someone had stolen the body, would have not left the linens so well placed.

**John** saw the shroud, which had covered the body of **Christ**, on the ground, and folded nearby the shroud that had covered his head

According to specialists<sup>1037</sup>, the word “*ozonia*” used by **John** must be translated to “linens” and not to “bandages” as some do in error. It is true that bandages are linens, but not all linens are bandages.

The empty sepulcher has only two explanations. Either someone took the body of **Christ** resurrected.

The body was not stolen by the enemies of **Christ**, because when the news circulated about the resurrection, the best way of refuting it would have been to show the body of Christ. If they did not do it, it was because they did not have it.

Neither did his friends have the body, because the Apostles died for their faith in the resurrected Christ, and no one gives his life for what he knows to be a hoax.

It is possible to give your life for a mistaken ideal, but not to defend something which one knows to be a lie.

It is evident that the Apostles did not hide the body.

Then, if **Christ** was dead, and the sepulcher was empty, and no one stole the body, there is only one explanation: **Christ** resurrected<sup>1038</sup>.

**Paul** also speaks of the resurrection of **Christ** in the first letter to the Thessalonians in the year 51 of our era<sup>1039</sup> “Jesus died and resurrected<sup>1040</sup>”, and in Corinthians of year 55: “Christ rose on the third day”<sup>1041</sup>

A confirmation of the resurrection of **Christ** is the Holy Shroud of Turin, where his image has been imprinted by heat from a radiation at the moment of the resurrection.

There is no clearer explanation.

<sup>1032</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYÉS: *Cristología fundamental, VIII, 3, 1, e*. Ed. C.E.T.E. Madrid. 1985

<sup>1033</sup> Matthew, 28:6

<sup>1034</sup> Mark, 16:6

<sup>1035</sup> Luke, 24:6

<sup>1036</sup> John, 20:8

<sup>1037</sup> M- BALAGUÉ: *Estudios Bíblicos Magazine* 25(1966)169-192

<sup>1038</sup> JOSÉ CABA, S. I.: *Resucitó Cristo mi esperanza, 3ª, IX, pg. 349*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1986

<sup>1039</sup> JOHANNES BEUMER: *El camino de la Fe, IV,3* Ed. FAX. Madrid.

<sup>1040</sup> Thessalonians, 4:14

<sup>1041</sup> Corinthians, 15:32

The resurrection of **Jesus Christ** is totally different from the resurrection of **Lazarus** or the son of the widow of Naim: these resurrected in order to die again, but **Christ** resurrected in order to never die again<sup>1042</sup>. **Christ** resurrected from among the dead, He will not die again<sup>1043</sup>

It was the encounter with **Christ** resurrected what provoked the faith of the disciples in the resurrection and not vice versa. "The resurrection was not the consequence, but the cause of the faith among the disciples **Jesus Christ** was restituted with his humanity to God's glorious life, complete and immortal. It is all about the glorious transformation of the body<sup>1044</sup> "

After resurrecting, he ascended to the heavens with His father<sup>1045</sup>, he spent several days appearing before the apostles<sup>1046</sup>, who ate<sup>1047</sup> with Him, and touched Him with their own hands.

Ghosts do not eat, nor they allow themselves to be touched.

The resurrected **Christ** dined with the Apostles<sup>1048</sup> and let Himself be touched by **St. Thomas**<sup>1049</sup>. **Christ** said: "*It is I. Touch me and see, a Ghost does not have flesh and bone, as you can see that I have*<sup>1050</sup>".

**St. Peter** recalls: "*We have eaten and drunk with Him after his resurrection from the dead*<sup>1051</sup>".

On one occasion He appeared to more than five hundred who were together. Thus does **St. Paul** relate in writing to the Corinthians and adding that many of those who saw Him were still alive when he wrote that letter<sup>1052</sup>, in the year 55-56 A.D.<sup>1053</sup>

The verb used by **Paul** excludes a subjective interpretation of the term "apparition"<sup>1054</sup>

The apparitions of **Jesus** are a reason for credibility in the resurrection of **Christ**<sup>1055</sup>

In the National Library in Madrid I have read incunabula in which **Pontius Pilate** writes to **Emperor Tiberius** about **Christ**. It says: "After being scourged, they crucified him. His tomb was guarded by my soldiers. On the third day he resurrected. The soldiers received money from the Jews in order to say that the disciples stole his body. But they did not want to keep quiet and they testified to his resurrection."<sup>1056</sup>

<sup>1042</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 616

<sup>1043</sup> Romans, 6:9

<sup>1044</sup> VV. AA.: *El Salvador del mundo*, VI, 3s. Ed. BAC. Madrid . 1966

<sup>1045</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO.: *Exposición de la fe cristiana*. 3ª, VII, 96. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1046</sup> Mark, 16:19

<sup>1047</sup> Acts, 1:3

<sup>1048</sup> Luke, 24:41ss

<sup>1049</sup> John, 20:27

<sup>1050</sup> John, 24:39

<sup>1051</sup> Acts, 10:41

<sup>1052</sup> I Corinthians, 15:4ss

<sup>1053</sup> JOHANNES BEEUMER: *Camino de la Fe*, IV, 2. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>1054</sup> JOSÉ CABA, S. I. *Resucitó Cristo mi esperanza*, 2ª, II, 2, 4, 3. Ed. BAC. Madrid . 1986

<sup>1055</sup> JOSÉ CABA, S. I. *Resucitó Cristo mi esperanza*, 3ª, VIII, pg. 316. Ed. BAC. Madrid . 1986

<sup>1056</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 645

We know with certainty that there were some official writings from **Pontius Pilate** Fiscal for Judea, to Emperor **Tiberius**, as was obligation and custom in the empire<sup>1057</sup>, through the testimony of **Tertulian**<sup>1058</sup>(Third Century).

### 36. THE ONLY TRUE RELIGION IS THAT OF JESUS CHRIST.

1.- The word "religion" has its roots in the Latin word "religare", which means to "bind together strongly". That is why religion is the bond that man has with God.<sup>1059</sup>

The way to God is the way that he himself has shown us by revealing his religion.

The true religion can only be one, because religions contradict each other, and the truth can only be in one of two camps: If no one specific point, and from the same point of view, some say yes and some say no, they both cannot be right at the same time.

If one says that **Cervantes** was born in Spain, and another says that he was born in England, it is evident that they both cannot be right at the same time. One of the two is mistaken.

We Catholics say that Christ is God. Others deny this. It is clear that all of us cannot be right. Because of this there is **only one true religion**.

But in order to know it we need to study the other religions. It is enough to know the motives of credibility of Christianity to know that it is the true religion. It would be absurd to think that God had revealed various religions which would contradict each other.

The only true religion is that which God has revealed, and which we can know by certain signs, such as the miracles of **Jesus Christ**.

The Catholic Religion was founded by **Christ-God**.

All other religions have been founded by men. Nor **Buddha**, nor **Confucius**, nor **Muhammad**, nor **Luther**, etc., pretended to be God.

**Jesus Christ** repeatedly affirmed during his life that He was God (see No. 32). The most solemn occasion was before the Sanhedrin when faced with the plea from **Caiphas**. **Caiphas** faced with the affirmation of Christ, called Him a blasphemer and condemned him to death. Blasphemy was punishable with the pain of death among the Hebrews.

To confirm the truth of what he said, Jesus Christ performed various miracles. Above all was his own resurrection. (see No. 35).

<sup>1057</sup> National Library of Madrid, Incunabula n° 970

<sup>1058</sup> JUAN MANUEL IGARTUA, S. I.: *La Resurrección de Jesús y su Cuerpo*, 2º, I, Note 1. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao. 1989

<sup>1059</sup> FELIPE CALLE, O.S.A.: *Razona tu fe*, I, 1. Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid

2.- Before resurrecting **Lazarus**, Jesus directed to his Heavenly Father this brief prayer: *"Father, I thank you for hearing my prayer. I myself knew that you hear me always, but I speak for the of all these who are standing around me, so that they may believe it was you who sent me"*<sup>1060</sup>.

The miracles of **Jesus Christ** are known to us by the historicity and authenticity of the Gospels which scientifically demonstrate much better than other books of which no educated person doubts.

The systematic prejudice of suspicion which has fallen upon the Gospels, during almost a century, falls at present, thanks to a study of the criteria of the authenticity, upon those who deny said authenticity.

This inversion of positions is not a return to ingenious criticism, but rather of a consequence that the Gospels have found new credit in the eyes of historic criticism<sup>1061</sup>.

---

<sup>1060</sup> John, 11:41ss

<sup>1061</sup> RENE LA TOURELLE: SELECCIONES DE TEOLOGIA Magazine, 15(IV-VI-1976)118

## Church

**37.** The Catholic Church has been founded by Jesus Christ for the salvation of all mankind.

1. **Christ** founded His Church so that His saving mission on earth were to continue to the end of days<sup>1062</sup>. He made her depository of all His doctrine and of the other means of salvation which he wished to grant to men<sup>1063</sup>.

The Catholic Church **is the only one** founded by **Christ-God**. All the rest of the Churches and Religions were founded by men.

The perpetuity of the Catholic Church can be considered as an authentic miracle. One might say that the major miracle is that rustic, as Jesus Christ was, without any more human aid than twelve ignorant fisherman, and without arms of any kind, could transform an empire so powerful as the Roman Empire, overthrowing its false idols, ending its customs and vices, and make it fall to its knees, adoring a Jew who suffered and died on the cross.

The Roman Empire has been the most powerful empire known to History. The universal domain of Rome lasted for 1,200 years. Well then, at the peak moment of its power, not only was it unable to avoid that Christianity extend itself, but rather in spite of its ten bloody persecutions - which lasted, with its ups and downs, 249 years and in which more than 100,000 martyrs died<sup>1064</sup>. Christianity had acquired so much strength than in the Edict of Milan (February 313 A.D.) paganism stopped being the official religion of the Roman Empire and peace was granted to the Church. Later on, Emperor **Theodosius the Great**, Spanish by birth, in the year 380<sup>1065</sup> made Christianity the official Religion of the Roman Empire. Is this not marvelous and unique?

And this, preaching a doctrine which was completely opposed to human passions. The Catholic Church predicates forgiveness, doing away with material goods and the purity of customs<sup>1066</sup>.

No wonder that **Leon XIII** calls the Church, in his encyclical *Inescrutabili*, "*Mother of Civilization*", as there is no other institution in the world in the field of culture, which should merit so much gratitude from Humanity as the Catholic Church. And **Fallmeter** "Occidental Europe is the creation of the Latin Church<sup>1067</sup> ..

There is **nothing greater in the world** than the Catholic Church. In spite of the terrible persecutions which it has suffered during the almost two thousand years of its existence, it has always triumphed. There never has been a religion more persecuted, nor one more victorious. The great empires and the cruel persecutors have passed on, but she is still standing. It is because **Christ** promised that it would last until the end of the world and that the powers of hell never would overcome it<sup>1068</sup>. The Church may be combated, but it will never be defeated.

---

<sup>1062</sup> Matthew, 16:18; 28:20

<sup>1063</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA: *Hablemos de la Fe. II. 1*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1064</sup> Daniel Ruiz, *Acta de los Mártires*, introduction, 3. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1065</sup> BERNARDINO LLORCA, S. I.: *Historia de la Iglesia Católica, 1º, 4ª, VII, 2, 1*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1066</sup> JOSÉ Mª RODRÍGUEZ IZQUIERDO, S.I.: *Valor apologético de la vida de la Iglesia Proyección, 38(X, 1963) 178-187*

<sup>1067</sup> TIHAMER TOTH: *Cristo y los cristianos, 3ª, II, 4*. Ed. Atenas, Madrid.

<sup>1068</sup> Matthew, 16:18, 28:20

Many of the persecutors of the Church have affirmed that they would finish her off forever. Nevertheless, they were the ones who were finished off; not the Church. The same thing will occur with all of the persecutors of the present and the future.

Roman Emperors, **Nero**, **Decius** and **Diocesan**, made martyrs of thousands of Christians. Those three are in their tombs, and Christianity continues to be on foot, two thousand years later. **Hitler** and **Stalin** also wanted to end Catholicism. They are in their tombs, and the Catholic Church continues on. The same thing happens with those who want to end the Church in the world. They will all end in their tombs and the Church will remain standing, as **Christ** has promised that it will stand till the end of the days, and no one can go against God, and win.

It is frightening to see that the majority of men live on the frill of their religious duties. Many deny it shamelessly, many other forget it. How many of the put God in their place? How many are those who love him above all things, as ordered by the first commandment<sup>1069</sup>? The majority of men have nothing but aloofness, apathy and indifference towards God. They sometimes even will combat God, to openly declare war. They try to dethrone him, to remove him from the minds of people, and of their hearts. They mock Him and His laws. He is insulted and blasphemed<sup>1070</sup>.

He who hates God, denies him with his lips, and confesses with his heart; as what does not exist cannot be hated. **Lenin** said that he hated God as a personal enemy<sup>1071</sup>.

In Russia, after 70 years of atheistic communism in power, faith persists in millions of beings against which there have been used all sorts of methods to take it away: prison, death, Gulag, propaganda, education, social and political coercion in careers, employment and promotions<sup>1072</sup>. Only 20% of the youth considers themselves to be atheists<sup>1073</sup>. One third of the citizens of the former Soviet Union, practice, in one form or another, Christianity<sup>1074</sup>.

In our days, after 60 years of enormous atheistic propaganda of Russian Communism, it turns out that today in the USSR 50% of the children are baptized.

Even **Stalin**, who has been one of the most ferocious persecutors of the idea of God in our times, could not prevent that his number one in the Kremlin, **Georgi Malenkov**<sup>1075</sup> convert to **Christianity**, and was unable to avoid that his daughter **Svetlana** should be baptized in 1962, when she was 38 years old and said: "When I grew up I realized that it was very sad to live without God in the heart"<sup>1076</sup>. She is in a religious order in Italy since 1993<sup>1077</sup>.

**Edward Shevernadze**, former minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, and an atheist, as any communist, has converted to Christianity and has been baptized. He has placed an icon of the Holy Virgin in his office<sup>1078</sup>.

According to the soviet newspaper, "*Sovietsa Ya Kirghiza*", the persistence of the religious sentiments in the Soviet Union is starting to be a serious political problem. "The favorable

<sup>1069</sup> Matthew, 22:37s

<sup>1070</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Dios y su obra, Apendix. III. 6. n°658*. Ed. BAC. Madrid .1963

<sup>1071</sup> CELSO COLLAZO: *GEO Magazine*, 17 (VI-88) 126

<sup>1072</sup> *ECCLESIA Magazine*, 2354 (16-I-88) 5

<sup>1073</sup> KOLOGRIVOF.: *Suma Católica contra los Sindiós. I. 2*. Ed. Litúrgica Española. Barcelona

<sup>1074</sup> *ECCLESIA Magazine*, 1546 (19-VI-1971) 37

<sup>1075</sup> VITTORIO MESSORI: *Hipótesis sobre Jesús, IX*, 9 Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao. 1978

<sup>1076</sup> *YA Newspaper*, 3-XI-84, pg. 2; 12-X-87, pg. 21

<sup>1077</sup> *ECCLESIA Magazine*, 2775 (10-II-96)

<sup>1078</sup> *ECCLESIA Magazine*, 2623 (13-III-93) 17

acceptance of religion on behalf of the communists and of the Komsomol youth raises a particular worry<sup>1079</sup>.

Already in 1986, Dr. **Luka Brajnovic** said: "Notwithstanding the generalized atheist communist propaganda, there is a religious rebirth, especially amongst the young". **Victor Ivanovich Gorodash**, Director of the Scientific Institute for Atheism of the Moscow Academy of Sciences, recognizes that: "lately the number of believers with a university or academic degree has increased noticeably. Young people are interested more each day into religious matters. The Churches in our country are being attended by young people and educated people, an evident sign that religious faith, after 70 years of the October revolution, and contrary to all expectations, has not waned<sup>1080</sup>.

**Tatiana Gorisschewa**, a professor of Philosophy at Leningrad University, and a member of the Russian Communist Party, converted to Catholicism upon knowing that God is Forgiving Father.

Recently, we have seen, in the years 1990, 1991, **the downfall** of Communism in all of the East European nations, and that religion resurges after 70 years of bloody religious persecution in the Soviet Union. During the Bolshevik Revolution, 200,000 religious men and women were assassinated<sup>1081</sup>.

Cardinal **Swiatek** arrested by the KGB, imprisoned at Minsk, and had twelve years of hard labor in Siberia, says: **Stalin** eliminated 90% of priests<sup>1082</sup>. On **Stalin's** orders, seven million Ukrainians were starved to death, just for being Catholic<sup>1083</sup>.

Fourteen thousand temples were closed in Soviet Russia<sup>1084</sup>.  
In Moscow, in a single year (1935), eleven million atheist books were printed<sup>1085</sup>.  
But Communism has not succeeded against faith. Against God, no one can.

2. We must not confuse that which we call the town Church (which is the temple, that is to say, the place where the Catholics meet for their religious ceremonies) with the Catholic Church (which is the people of God formed by Catholics of the whole world, under the authority of the Roman Pontiff)<sup>1086</sup>.

We Catholics form a great family because, through faith and baptism, we have been made children of God and brothers of **Jesus Christ**.

3. **Jesus Christ** founded only one Church. "*There shall be only one flock and one shepherd*"<sup>1087</sup>. This Church is the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church.

All of the other Churches and religions have been founded by men. Some, do not recognize the true God—as Buddhism--; others, because they became separate from the Church - like Protestantism.

<sup>1079</sup> YA Newspaper, 19-I-82 pg. 26

<sup>1080</sup> YA Newspaper, 4-VI-86. pg 42

<sup>1081</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2766 (9-XII-95) 27

<sup>1082</sup> Proyección Mundial Magazine, 38(1995) 62 México, D.F.

<sup>1083</sup> MIR Magazine, 6(1995)8. Tijuana, México.

<sup>1084</sup> TIHAMER TOTH: *Cristo y los cristianos*, 3<sup>a</sup>, II, 2 Ed. Atenas, Madrid.

<sup>1085</sup> TIHAMER TOTH: *Cristo y los cristianos*, 3<sup>a</sup>, IV, 6. Ed. Atenas, Madrid.

<sup>1086</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 752

<sup>1087</sup> John, 10:16



We should pray for non-Catholics, so that they will be converted, and that they and we will be united in the only true Church of **Christ** which is the Catholic one.

In the decree of Vatican Council II on **ecumenism**, in which norms are given for Catholics so that they treat the separated brethren with comprehension and cordiality, it is said that the desire for union should not lead us to be silent or to tolerate the discrepancies: "It is totally necessary that all doctrine be exposed with clarity. Nothing is so foreign to Ecumenism as a false indifference which attempts to counteract the purity of the Catholic doctrine and to confuse its genuine and true sense<sup>1088</sup>".

Because of this we are going to see here the reasons for which we believe that the Catholic Church is the one which **Christ** founded, while the Protestant Churches do not bring together the necessary conditions for it. Not with the desire to offend those who are Protestants, but rather with the desire to expose all to the truth.

According to the first Council of Constantinople, held in 381, the Church, as it was founded by **Jesus Christ** has four characteristic marks, that is to say, four distinctive signs which are four essential properties which all together, are exclusive and manifest the true Church of **Jesus Christ**. These distinctive signs are: unity, sanctity, Catholicity and apostolicity<sup>1089</sup>.

4. That is to say, according to the mind of **Christ**, His Church must be:

**ONE: Jesus Christ** founded one Church, which he founded on **St. Peter**: "You are Peter and on this rock I will build my community<sup>1090</sup>". **Jesus Christ** spoke in the singular, that is to say, only one Church.

In the Aramaic language which **Jesus** spoke, **Peter** and rock were expressed with the same word:- cepha. **Jesus** made a play on words to express that **Peter** was the fundamental rock of his only Church.

The authenticity of these words has been denied in different manners by Protestant critics. But recently the celebrated Protestant theologian **Oscar Cullmann** has confirmed it in a convincing manner<sup>1091</sup> ..

**Christ** changed **Simon's** name to the name **Peter**, which means "rock, stone", (cepha), as He was going to make him the foundation of his Church. When in the Bible, God changes the name of someone it is because the word is an effective mutation of what the name means<sup>1092</sup>

**Jesus Christ** wanted to be the only Pastor of the only flock which is his Church<sup>1093</sup>. This flock was handed over to St. Peter before he left this world<sup>1094</sup>. And he has already warned us that any kingdom divided within itself will not subsist<sup>1095</sup>, will be headed for ruins. That is to say, that if the Church is to last to the end of time, it must remain absolute.

**HOLY**: To sanctify - or to give a life of grace - was the first objective of the coming of **Christ**<sup>1096</sup> and therefore to sanctify is the first objective of the Church<sup>1097</sup> which does it through the Sacraments.

**Paul** says: "**Christ** loved his Church and sacrificed himself for it in order to sanctify it... to make it holy<sup>1098</sup>". **Christ** chose us so that we might be holy<sup>1099</sup>. This is the will of God, your

<sup>1088</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Unitatis redintegratio*. Decree on Ecumenism, n° 11

<sup>1089</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 811

<sup>1090</sup> Matthew, 16:18

<sup>1091</sup> M. OSCAR CULLMANN.: *San Pedro, discípulo, apóstol, mártir*. Ed. Delachaux et Nestlé. Pagers 154ss

<sup>1092</sup> JUSTO COLLANTES, S.I.: *La Iglesia de la Palabra, 1º, 3ª, XII, 2, a*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1093</sup> John, 10:16

<sup>1094</sup> John, 21:15

<sup>1095</sup> Matthew, 12:25

<sup>1096</sup> John, 10:10; Titus, 3:4-7

<sup>1097</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 824

sanctification<sup>1100</sup> The same **Jesus Christ** said that he had come” so that through him the world might be saved<sup>1101</sup> “I have come, said the Lord, not to judge the world but to save it<sup>1102</sup>”. Upon sending his Apostles out through the world he said: “Go, therefore, make disciples of all nations; baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teach them to observe all the commands I gave you<sup>1103</sup>”. “Go out to the whole world; proclaim the gospel to all creation. Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved; whoever does not believe will be condemned<sup>1104</sup>”..

The Church founded to lead men to Glory needs to be Holy, because sanctification is the way to salvation.

**CATHOLIC:** The name **Catholic** goes back to the beginning of the first Century<sup>1105</sup>. It was first used by **St. Ignatius of Antioch**, a disciple of **St. John**.

Catholic signifies universal<sup>1106</sup>: **Jesus Christ** founded his Church for all men for all times: “Make disciples of all nations” “Preach to all people<sup>1107</sup>” Go out to the whole world<sup>1108</sup>.. “I am with you always; yes, to the end of time<sup>1109</sup>”.

This evidently supposed that the Apostles would have successors, since they in their short lives, neither could preach through the whole world and to all men, nor would they live until the end of the world.

**APOSTOLIC:** The true Church has to be connected with the Apostles, upon whom **Christ** founded his Church<sup>1110</sup>. To them he gave his authority: “So am I sending you<sup>1111</sup>”. “Anyone who listens to you is listening to me<sup>1112</sup>”

5. Evidently **Jesus Christ** founded his Church to remain throughout all time”, “I am with you always; yes, to the end of time<sup>1113</sup>”.

This means that the Church founded by **Christ** is infallible. It will last until the last day and will remain just as it was constituted by **Christ**. If it should disappear, or if it were to be transformed in to another different one, then the presence of **Christ** would have failed, or **Christ** would have been impotent.

Well then, the Catholic Church is the only one which has the four distinctive signs which **Christ** places upon his Church.

6. The Catholic Church is **ONE** in its doctrine, in its government and in its Sacraments<sup>1114</sup>.

<sup>1098</sup> Ephesians, 5:26S

<sup>1099</sup> Ephesians, 1:4

<sup>1100</sup> Thessalonians, 4:3

<sup>1101</sup> John, 3:17

<sup>1102</sup> John, 12:47

<sup>1103</sup> Matthew, 28:19

<sup>1104</sup> Mark, 16:15

<sup>1105</sup> H. PINARD DE LA BOULLAVE

<sup>1106</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 830

<sup>1107</sup> Matthew, 28:19

<sup>1108</sup> Mark, 16:15

<sup>1109</sup> Matthew, 28:20

<sup>1110</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 863

<sup>1111</sup> John, 20:21

<sup>1112</sup> Luke, 10:16

<sup>1113</sup> Matthew, 28:20

<sup>1114</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 815

**Unity of faith**, our Creed is the same from 2,000 years ago.

**Unity of doctrine**, created unanimously by one thousand million Catholics, of all races, cultures, languages and regions of the world.

**Unity of government**, with one universal Head, the Roman Pontiff.

**Unity of Sacraments**, which are exactly the same for all Catholic's in the whole world.

Unity of all bishops under the Pope. This unity is not broken even if some abandon it. The unity is in the union to **Peter's Teachings**. Unity in the essential, does not impede variety in the accidental.

According to Vatican Council II: "The separated brethren, however, and particularly its communities and Churches, do not enjoy that unity which **Christ** wished to give those whom he regenerated and lived with in one body and in one new life<sup>1115</sup> .

"It goes on to say: "These ecclesiastical Churches and communities because of the diversity of their origins, of their doctrine, and their spiritual life, differ quite a bit not only from us, but also among themselves<sup>1116</sup> ."

The free interpretation of the Bible by the Protestants, brings with it, naturally, disunion, a multitude of errors and heresy. Individual interpretation of the Bible leads to arbitrary subjectivity which makes union of doctrine practically impossible. There are many divisions in the determination of what are fundamental points in which to believe. They are not in accord either in the number of the sacraments, nor in the eternity of hell, nor even in the divinity of **Jesus Christ**.<sup>1117</sup>

On the other hand, the Magisterium of the Church, leads to unity. This unity of doctrine is attained through the infallible authority of the Pope and the Councils. All councils are Church Doctrine, but the Second Vatican Council is especially the council of the Church, as it made the Church the central point of its deliberations. Thus the First Vatican Council was the council of the Pope, Trent the Council of counter-reform, Ephesus the one of the Virgin and Chalcedon the one of **Christ**.

Protestant denominations number more that four hundred<sup>1118</sup>, independent of one another. **Enova's witnesses** separated from the Adventists, and these from the Baptists, and these from the Anglicans. Protestant Churches of today come from **Luther, Henry VIII and Calvin**<sup>1119</sup>. There are many divisions in the determination of which are the fundamental points that are to be believed. Nor do they agree on the number of sacraments, nor on the eternity of hell, not even on the divinity of **Jesus Christ**<sup>1120</sup>.

Recently in Protestantism has awakened a movement of union, because they understand that **Christ** established the unity of his Church. This movement which has arisen in Protestantism we have to thank God for, because it may be the effective road to reach that unity which **Christ** asked his Father for his Church<sup>1121</sup> Vatican Council II has recognized that it is a movement "inspired by the Holy Spirit"<sup>1122</sup>. We must pray a lot so that the desire of **Jesus**, of all of us that believe in Him will form "a single flock with a single shepherd"<sup>1123</sup>.

7. The Catholic Church is **HOLY** in its doctrine, in its ethics, in its means for sanctification the Sacraments and in its fruits. This does not mean to say that all Catholics are saints. This is

<sup>1115</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Unitatis redintegratio*. Decree on Ecumenism, n° 3

<sup>1116</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Unitatis redintegratio*. Decree on Ecumenism, n°19

<sup>1117</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia, III, 29* Ed. BAC. Madrid 1979

<sup>1118</sup> CAMILO CRIVELLI, S. I.: *Diccionario de las Sectas Protestantes*. Ed. EAPSA. Madrid.

<sup>1119</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *En busca de las verdades fundamentales, VI, D, c*, Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1988

<sup>1120</sup> CAMILO CRIVELLI, S. I.: *El mundo protestante, Sectas, XVIII, 12*. Ed. Atenas. Madrid.

<sup>1121</sup> John, 17:20ss

<sup>1122</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Unitatis redintegratio*. Decree on Ecumenism, n° 4

<sup>1123</sup> John, 10:16

impossible, given human liberty<sup>1124</sup>. The Church condemns the bad conduct in all persons whoever they may be. Precisely, the bad ones, are this way for not obeying what the Holy Catholic Church mandates. It is not the rotten fruit fallen from the tree, but the one left hanging on its branches that manifest the bounty of the tree

In the history of the Church, light and shadow are interwoven. The Church has always recognized that she, in spite of being a holy community, takes all sinners to her bosom. All the members of the Church are exposed to temptation, to infidelity and to sin<sup>1125</sup>. The mission of the Church is to make saints<sup>1126</sup>. But those who have lived the plenitude of Catholicism have been saints, heroes, well-doers of Humanity. It is enough to cite names like **St. Vincent de Paul, St. Raymond of Pennafort, St. Peter Nolasco, St. Peter Claver, St. John of God, St. John Bosco....**, and so many other thousands of saints who the Church venerates on the altars.

The Catholic Church is admirable for the greatness of its saints, the zeal of its missionaries and the heroism of its martyrs.. The Catholic Church is, throughout history, the institution that has done most works of charity, (old people's and orphans homes, help for the sick etc.), had most people offer their lives to God (priests and nuns), and offered up most blood for the love of **Christ** (hundreds of thousands of martyrs).

We do not deny that there can be **virtuous Protestants** of good faith, because there are, but the Protestant principle that good works are not necessary in order to be saved, leads to naturally, an indifference and a cold religiosity.

8. The Catholic Church is **UNIVERSAL**. It has no boundaries, it is open to all men. Its message of salvation is directed to all people. It has spread through all the regions of Earth. Catholicism is practiced by people of all races and nationalities. In Vatican Council II, more than 2,500 Bishops of 100 different nationalities met<sup>1127</sup>.

To belong to the Catholic Church it is not necessary to belong to a given country, civilization, race or social class. In the Catholic Church there are no races, nor "color", nor nations, nor parties, or social classes. The Catholic Religion is the most universal. It is at the top of all of the world's religions.

According to the last statistic of the Catholic Church (I.C.I.A. Rome), this is the membership of the most numerous religions:

Catholics.....	1,808	million
Muslims.....	800	"
Hindus.....	750	"
Protestants.....	669	"
Buddhists.....	323	"
Confucians.....	321	"
Orthodox.....	150	"
Jews .....	18	"

Of the 5,251 million inhabitants of the Earth, 18% are Catholic. In Europe they are 40%, and in South America they are 89%<sup>1128</sup>.

<sup>1124</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO LABURU, S.I.: *La iglesia en los momentos actuales, II*. EAPSA. Madrid

<sup>1125</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Esta es nuestra fe, 1ª, IV, 2*. EDICE. Madrid. 1986

<sup>1126</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYÉS: *Razones para creer*. Paulinas. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1127</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, , 1111(27-X-62)

<sup>1128</sup> YA Newspaper, 10-VI-92. pg. 21

The Catholic Church today is not sufficiently implanted in all the people of the Earth. The wish of Christ is, nevertheless, that there be established amongst them, so that all men and women of all peoples have access to salvation.... Because of this the Church will always have to be a missionary one and all Christians are obliged to collaborate in this missionary action of the Church in evangelization<sup>1129</sup>

Protestant Churches are much smaller than the Catholic Church. A small Church cannot be the true Church of **Christ**.

9, The Catholic Church is **APOSTOLIC**, it has its roots in the Apostles; the Pope - our chief connects in a perfect and never interrupted concatenation with **Peter** – head of the Apostles. The Popes have been legitimately elected by the Church with the guarantee of fidelity to the faith received from the Apostles<sup>1130</sup>. The Pope is the legitimate successor to **St. Peter. Cardinal Newman**, who was a Protestant, converted to Catholicism upon studying this point thoroughly.

On the other hand, Protestantism was born with **Luther** some 1500 years after **Christ. Martin Luther** was born in Eisleben, a small village of Turingia, on November 10, 1483- He died on February 18, 1546, in his home town.

There have always been heresies. But they have been independent of each other. Although some have coincided in some of their errors, not for this have they stopped being independent among each other. It is enough to study their history to see that they have not had any unity in their doctrine, nor continuity in their government, nor have they formed one community in time. The only thing that they all coincide in, is that of having separated from the true doctrine of **Christ** and of the authority of the legitimate successor to **Peter**.

There are celebrated preachers in the Catholic Church dating from the first and second centuries, such as **Clement Roman** (year 96), **Ignatius of Antioch** (year 107), **Polycarp of Smyrna** (year 110), **Ireneus of Lyon** (year 185), etc. No protestant Church can produce documentation of its presence in those first years of Christianity.

The table below shows the name, place of origin, founder and date of the main protestant Churches:

NAME	ORIGIN	FOUNDER	YEAR
Lutheran	Germany	Martin Luther	1517
Anglican	England	Henry VIII	1534
Presbyterian	Scotland	John Knox	1560
Baptist	England	John Smith	1611
Episcopalians	U.S.A.	S. Seabury	1700
Methodists	Oxford, England	J. Wesley	1729
Mormons	U.S.A.	Joseph Smith	1829
Adventists	U.S.A.	William Miller	1831
Theosophist	U.S.A.	Blavatski-Steele	1875
Jehova's Witnesses	U.S.A.	Carlos Russel	1890

The schism of the Orient was consummated in 1054 through the works of **Cerularium**, who died in 1058. It had been initiated by **Focius**, Patriarch of Constantinople, in year 863. Focius died in 897. They wanted to establish Constantinople as the primate see of the Church when **Constantine** transferred his court there.

<sup>1129</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Esta es nuestra fe*, 2º, I, 9,2 Ed. EDICE. Madrid 1986

<sup>1130</sup> YVES CONGAR: *Propiedades esenciales de la Iglesia*, IV, I, 2. Mysterium Salutis, IV, I. Ed. Cristiandad. Madrid. 1973

10. If the Roman Catholic Church is **the only one** who has these distinctive marks of unity, sanctity, Catholicity and apostolicity<sup>1131</sup>, she will be the only one really founded by **Christ**. Now then, **Christ** founded his Church upon **Peter**, as the foundation rock. If **Peter** is the foundation, he must live on through his successors. The foundation cannot disappear without the building which it supported, falling down. The time that the Church lasts will be equal to the time that she remains upon her foundation<sup>1132</sup>. That is why **St. Ambrosius** said: "Where ever **Peter** is, there is the Church of **Christ**<sup>1133</sup>. What **Christ** instituted in the Apostle **Peter**, is the need that he last perpetually in the Church<sup>1134</sup>.

This foundation is **authority**. A society without authority will disintegrate. "Authority is an essential element in all societies, which, without it will crumble and will end up disappearing in anarchy<sup>1135</sup>. Any group, to subsist, needs to organize itself. And any organization requires an authority to serve the common good<sup>1136</sup>. An authority gives unity, cohesion and efficacy to any human group<sup>1137</sup>.

Any society is composed of as a whole, of rational and free beings, which in a stable manner, and under the direction of an authority, have a common goal as a purpose. In all society an authority is needed in order to attain the goal for which it was constituted. As God has created men to be sociable by nature, and as no society can subsist without authority to guide it to the common good, this authority comes forth from nature, and therefore comes from God.<sup>1138</sup>

**Jesus** makes **Peter** the foundation giving to him supreme, universal and full authority<sup>1139</sup>. "*Whatever you bind on earth will be bound in Heaven*<sup>1140</sup>" The power to bind is a metaphor that means the power to order, allow or forbid. It is the power to legislate<sup>1141</sup> I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven<sup>1142</sup>.

The giving of the keys is a sign of transmission of power<sup>1143</sup> and of authority<sup>1144</sup>. The symbol of surrender is the giving of the keys.

**Christ** has made the Church hierarchal, not democratic<sup>1145</sup>.

The Church is a hierarchal society organized by **Christ** himself<sup>1146</sup>.

The power of the hierarchs does not come from the community of the faithful. To affirm the contrary is heretic<sup>1147</sup>.

While in civil society everything is subject to opinion and is discussable, in the Church, in the fundamental truths, a free opinion is not possible.. as one must subject oneself to the revealed doctrine<sup>1148</sup>.

<sup>1131</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 870

<sup>1132</sup> CHARLES BOYER, S. I.: *Razones de ser Católico*, V, 3s. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>1133</sup> MIGNE: *Patrologia Latina*, XIV, 1082

<sup>1134</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1821 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1135</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *En busca de las verdades fundamentales*, VI, E. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

<sup>1136</sup> *Con vosotros está*, 3<sup>a</sup>, XLVI. Madrid. 1976

<sup>1137</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1919

<sup>1138</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *ROCA VIVA Magazine*, 318 (I-95) 6ss

<sup>1139</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*. Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n°22

<sup>1140</sup> Matthew, 18:18

<sup>1141</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA: *Hablemos de la Fe*. II. 5. Ed. RIALP. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1142</sup> Matthew, 16:19

<sup>1143</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 553

<sup>1144</sup> JUSTO COLLANTES, S.I.: *La Iglesia de la Palabra*, 1<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup>, XIII, 2, b. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1145</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGU, C.P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso*, VII, 5, VIII, 5, IX. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid.

<sup>1146</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 966s Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1147</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1502 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1148</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *ROCA VIVA Magazine*, 318 (I-95) 6ss

Nowadays some want to accommodate the Catholic doctrine to “the signs of the times”. But the “signs of the times” are not a fountain of Revelation, but a consequence of the opinions of men, that is why it must be the contrary: one must examine the “signs of the times” in the light of the Revelation to see if they are acceptable or not. “one cannot substitute the divine message with human words, no matter how wise they may be. To try to has bred many heresies<sup>1149</sup>”.

And as the Church of **Christ** has to last to the end of the centuries such as He instituted it<sup>1150</sup>, also his Pontificate which is its foundation will last until then.

Therefore the true Church of **Christ** is found where the Supreme Pontificate is found: this Pontificate only is found in the Popes of the Roman-Catholic Church.

During almost two thousand years, up to the present Pope, we Catholics preserve a series of an uninterrupted line of more that two hundred and sixty legitimate Popes successors of **Peter**. Pope **John Paul II** makes number 265.

The list of the 265 Popes and their respective pontificates is to be found in a book by Ronald Lawler entitled “The Doctrine of **Jesus Christ**”, published in the United States<sup>1151</sup>.

At some point in time there were “anti-popes”, but in a short time the legitimate line of succession was regained

What society in the world has this antiquity, this tradition, this unity?

The primacy of **Peter** is a Dogma of faith. It is defined in the First Vatican Council. **Christ** instituted in **Peter** a perpetual principle of unity and visible foundation of the Church<sup>1152</sup>

Protestants do not have a **papacy**, consequently they are not in a Church founded by **Jesus Christ**.

They have been deceived: some knowing it and others without knowing it, but all are duped. **Christ** is where **Peter** is; and today **Peter** is in the Pope in Rome. To each anything else is error or bad will.

The General Synod of the Anglican Church, meeting in London from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> if February 1985, approved by an absolute majority (238 votes in favor, 38 against and 25 abstentions) the final report regarding the union with Catholics in which the Pope was recognized as the supreme head of the two Churches<sup>1153</sup>.

**Robert Runcie**, Archbishop of Canterbury, on occasion of his visit to **Pope John Paul II** in September 1989, said: “We are beginning to recognize in the Pope, the Primate of Peter<sup>1154</sup>”

In the Anglican High Church, it is believed that the Holy Virgin Mary is the Mother of God, they have images of Her in their Churches and they sing the same Hail Mary than the Catholics.

The reason, precisely, why the Vatican Basilica in Rome was built there, is because there below it is the tomb of **St. Peter**. The studies carried out for the scientific identification of the remains of **St. Peter** are most interesting<sup>1155</sup>.

We have found the tomb and the bones of **St. Peter**. There is the foundation stone upon which **Christ** founded his only Church.

<sup>1149</sup> BERNARDINO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso*, I, 7. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid.

<sup>1150</sup> Matthew, 28:20

<sup>1151</sup> ROLAND LAWLER, O.F.M, *The Doctrine of Jesus Christ*

<sup>1152</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1821ss. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1153</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, n° 2210 (23-II-85) 28

<sup>1154</sup> YA Newspaper 22-IX-89, pg. 16

<sup>1155</sup> JORGE Loring, S. I.: *La Tumba de San Pedro*: The scientific identification of the tomb and bones of the First Pope of the Catholic Church

He who is above it is His legitimate successor.

He who wants to be in the Church which **Christ** founded in Peter, has to be in the Catholic Church, directed by **John Paul II**, the 265<sup>th</sup> legitimate successor of **St. Peter**.

Following is a list of the 21 Ecumenical Councils celebrated by the Catholic Church through the time:

Number	Celebrated in:	Year(s)
First	Nicaea	325
Second	Constantinople I	381
Third	Ephesus	431
Fourth	Chalcedon	451
Fifth	Constantinople II	553
Sixth	Constantinople III	680-81
Seventh	Nicaea	787
Eighth	Constantinople IV	869-70
Ninth	Lateran I	1123
Tenth	Lateran II	1139
Eleventh	Lateran III	1179
Twelfth	Lateran IV	1215
Thirteenth	Lyon I	1245
Fourteenth	Lyon II	1274
Fifteenth	Vienne (France)	1311-12
Sixteenth	Constanza	1414-18
Seventeenth	Ferrara-Florence	1438—45
Eighteenth	Lateran V	1512-17
Nineteenth	Trent	1545-63
Twentieth	Vatican I	1869-70
Twenty First	Vatican II	1962-65

11. Today we live in times of **ecumenism** in which all of us desire the union of all Christians in one single Church. But union with the Protestants, as John XXIII used to say, cannot come from sacrificing part of the truth, but rather from penetrating more deeply into the knowledge of the truth. We cannot sacrifice a dogma of our doctrinal patrimony in order to obtain a deceitful union.

The declaration regarding religious liberty of Vatican Council II warns that it is not the same to practice one religion as another. Because they are not equally good, since they contradict one another.

Vatican Council II says “All men are obligated to seek the truth, above all if it refers to God and to his Church, and once known, to embrace it and to practice it”. Vatican Council II says: No one has a just cause for leaving the Catholic Church”.

Vatican Council II also says: “Although outside of the Catholic Church one can find part of virtue and of truth.”

It also goes on to say: “The only true religion is in the Catholic Church”. But it adds that all those who have received Baptism and have faith in **Christ**, in some manner also belong to the Church of **Christ** in a broad sense. But in the strict sense “the Church of **Christ** subsists today in the Catholic Church”.

This is the reason because of which the Holy Congregation of the Clergy in its Directory says: “Propose the arguments in favor of the Catholic doctrine with charity at the same time with the firmness that is just.”

The Council says that **religious liberty** consists in immunity from coercion, that is to say, that no one should, be forced to practice a religion, neither to impede it. But the public exercise of a



religion should be subordinated to the “just public order” which consists in the “effective safeguard of the rights of all the citizens... an interest which is proportionate through a authentic public peace..... and an adequate guardianship of public morality.

In the spreading of the religious faith and in the introduction of customs one has to abstain always from any kind of class of acts which might have the flavor of coercion or of an immodest persuasion or one less straight, above all when we are dealing with simple or needy persons. Such behavior should be considered as an abuse of another’s right and an injury to another’s rights.”

The Spanish Episcopate, meanwhile “asks its apostolic collaborators, that they never fall into this defect, it begs them that with the greatest charity possible they attempt that the faithful of a simple faith are never victims of such a procedure, should this occur.”

Recently, Spain has been invaded by a multitude of sects that are very active in their proselytism, which with decoys that are more or less attractive to the young, have misled a great number of them

The French Episcopate has issued this warning to the Catholic: “Catholics must build a dike to this invading tide”. That is why to buy, read or keep these publications constitutes a grave imprudence. To go to their reunions and participate in their cult is even more dangerous. And to publicly and fully adhere to them is a grave sin against the faith”.

12. An abundance of salvific means are found within the Catholic Church, but some of the acts of the separated brethren also can produce grace. In the separated brethren one also can find virtue and part of the truth.<sup>1156</sup>

In those brethren who have separated from us, we also can find virtue and part of truth<sup>1157</sup>

Catholics should recognize this with pleasure “the truly Christian treasures which proceeding from the common patrimony are found in our separated brethren”.<sup>1158</sup>

“The Christian, far from judging or condemning those who are outside of the Church, should offer them his help and love. If he is happy for finding salvation within the Church, he also should be certain that the goodness of the God saves, through **Christ** all the generous souls of good faith who without visibly belonging to the Church, loyally follow the dictates of their conscience.<sup>1159</sup>” “Those who with seriousness attempt in their heart to do all that God demands of them are not excluded from the hope of eternal life<sup>1160</sup>”.

The Second Vatican Council says: “The divine purpose of eternal salvation reaches all men: and those who, ignoring, without guilt, the Gospel of **Christ** and His Church, seek God with a sincere heart and make an effort, under the influence of grace, to carry out works of His will, known by the directorate of the conscience; they also can, in a number that only God knows, reach eternal salvation. : “Divine Providence does nor deny the necessary assistance for salvation to those who without fault on their part did not come to a clear knowledge of God, and who, nevertheless, make an effort, helped by divine grace in achieving an unswerving life.<sup>1161</sup>” In other words, we can say that the non-believers of good faith, who always obeyed their conscience can be saved.

**Martins Veiga** says: It is a great joy to think that there are many people of good will that are saved without belonging to the Church. [However, it does not stop to pain us that there are so many men that do not know or live the mystery of the Church in its entirety, because without it, they can never reach their total and complete realization in God.<sup>1162</sup>

<sup>1156</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Unitatis Redintegratio*: Decree on Ecumenism, n° 3

<sup>1157</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dignitatis Humanae*: Declaration on Religious Liberty, n° 34

<sup>1158</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Unitatis Redintegratio*: Decree on Ecumenism, n° 4

<sup>1159</sup> Pontifical Secretariat for the non Christians: *Presentación de la Fe cristiana*, n°32. Ed. PPC. Madrid

<sup>1160</sup> RONALD LAWLER, O.F.M.: *La Doctrina de Jesucristo*, XIII, 6, b. Ed. Galduria. Jódar (Jaén) 1986

<sup>1161</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n 16

<sup>1162</sup> AMÉRICO MARTINS VEIGA: *Creer hoy*, VI, 3, 1, Ed. Perpetuo Socorro. Madrid.

The well known phrase “there is no salvation outside the Church”, goes back to the **Origins** and has been constantly repeated. It is even incorporated into the Fourth Council of Lateran<sup>1163</sup>. But one must understand it in its context. It is to those who knowing it reject it<sup>1164</sup>. Not those who have no guilt in not knowing it.

But “those who knowing that the Catholic Church was instituted by **Jesus Christ** as necessary, disdain to enter or do not want to remain in it, cannot be saved<sup>1165</sup>”.

Considering this, for eternal salvation, it is not sufficient to be in the Church, it is necessary to be in grace. The Church is the means of salvation, not the cause<sup>1166</sup>

13. The **miracles of today** are proof in favor of the Catholic Church.

**Saint Augustine** says: If in the Catholic Church there are miracles, it is because it is true, and if there are no miracles, it is a great miracle that without miracles, the Roman Empire believed in it.<sup>1167</sup>

Since 1882, an Office for Medical Verifications functions in Lourdes. Up until 1955, a total of 32, 663, physicians had passed through this Office. This Office accepts the inscription of all doctors who demands it, whatever their religious beliefs might be, nationality, etc. As a matter of fact, there have been Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Hindus, and even rationalistic atheists. In thousands of cases they have declared that the cure was inexplicable from the medical point of view. The ill person was examined by doctors before and after the cure. The existence of the illness had to be clear before the cure with clinical proofs: radiographs, biopsies, encephalograms, bacterial analyses, etc., according to what is demanded by the nature of the illness. All illnesses which are purely of nervous origin are excluded in advance. It has to be an illness which is organic, and not purely functional. The cure must be instantaneous and lasting. The sick person as to be placed under observation for one year.. Only then will the Office for Medical Verification affirm that the cure is inexplicable, scientifically speaking.

Up until 1954, more than a million sick and ailing passed through Lourdes. Of these, in the Archives of the Medical Office in Lourdes there are 3,184 records of inexplicable cures from the Medical point of view. Of these, the Ecclesiastical Committee, after 19 years of investigation, only has accepted fifty-four cases as authentic miracles<sup>1168</sup>.

It is not that the rest are not miracles. It is that the Church is most rigorous before declaring a fact as miraculous, and a miraculous real fact cannot be recognized as such by the Church because of the lack of some requisite. God does not perform miracles so that they can be recognized as such scientifically, but rather as the answer to the prayers of persons who ask for them with faith, although some requisites may be lacking for a scientific verification. The rigor of the Church in accepting miraculous facts should give us confidence in the cases which the Church accepts as miracles.

There is the famous case of the ill person **Marie Bayllie** who was examined by **Alexis Carrel**, Nobel Prize winner in Medicine. He himself tells of the case in his Book *Voyage to Lourdes*. Out of curiosity he accompanied a group of sick pilgrims going to Lourdes. He was skeptical. Among the sick he picked **Marie Bayllie** out because she seemed to him to be the most desperate case. He went so far as to say: “If this ill person is cured, it will be a true miracle. Then I would believe.” The sick person had tubercular peritonitis in the last stages. He himself had declared her to be past recovery and a lost case. Nevertheless, in Lourdes before the amazed eyes of Alexis Carrel that bloated abdomen shrunk instantaneously and its volume became normal. He examined the ill person

<sup>1163</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 430 (802)

<sup>1164</sup> JUSTO COLLANTES, S. I.: *La Iglesia de la Palabra*, 2°, 4ª, XVI, 3,b. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1165</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 14

<sup>1166</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso*, V. 7. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid.

<sup>1167</sup> SAINT AUGUSTINE: *La Ciudad de Dios*, 1ª, XXII, 5. ML, 41, 756s

<sup>1168</sup> JUAN LÓPEZ PEDRAZ, S.I.: *Cuando se está perdiendo la fe*, 1ª, IX, 3. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

and found her to be cured. He was good to his word. He became a convert to Catholicism, and **Alexis Carrel**, Nobel Prize Winner in Medicine, died a Catholic.

Doctor **Leuret**, Chief of the Medical Office in Lourdes has published a book entitled "*Miraculous Modern Cures*" where he narrated various cases with names of the sick persons, reproductions of radiographs, etc., and the signatures of the physicians who have certified the cures as inexplicable from the scientific point of view.

The miracles confirm our faith in **Christ**, in the Virgin and the Catholic Church.

14. A confirmation that the Catholic Church is the true one, are the enormous number of converts to Catholicism from Protestantism and from atheism, after a thorough study of the Catholic religion<sup>1169</sup>. To give two examples we shall cite the names of the well-known historian **Ludovic Pastor** and **Henry Shlier** who at present is the Professor of the New Testament at the University of Bonn (Germany) and who is one of the person's who has the best knowledge of **St. Paul** in all the world. His commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians is one of the best that exists. He, **Shlier**, converted to Catholicism studying the faith of the Catholic Church, and witnessing that it is identical to that of the Fathers of the Church.<sup>1170</sup> What led him to the Catholic Church was the impartiality of a loyal historical investigation<sup>1171</sup>

The number of conversions to Catholicism from Anglicanism is notable<sup>1172</sup>. From Cardinal **Newman** and the celebrity writers **Chesterton and Graham Greene** to the **Duchess of Kent**, cousin to the Queen of England, baptized on the 14<sup>th</sup> of January 1994 by Cardinal **Hume**<sup>1173</sup>. New converts to Catholicism include two ministers of the British Government: **John Gumer and Ann Widecombe**<sup>1174</sup>, and London's Anglican Bishop **Dr. Graham Leonard**<sup>1175</sup>. A local parish priest, of Bath, **Michael Fountaine**, aged 34 years, converted to Catholicism together with all this parishioners<sup>1176</sup>.

**38. JESUS CHRIST** founded the Catholic Church in order to communicate through her the necessary aids to make us better people and to save us eternally. to accomplish this he made her the depository of doctrine and of all the means of salvation.

1. In Hebrews it says: "God has spoken to men"<sup>1177</sup>

God wanted that what He had revealed for the salvation of all people, should always be kept whole, and be transmitted throughout time<sup>1178</sup>

The mission of the Church is the **eternal salvation** of men through the means of the doctrine of **Christ** and the sacraments which were instituted by Him.

**Jesus Christ** was on earth for a few years. So that His redeeming should continue throughout time, He left behind an institution to take care of His doctrine, and help men to attain eternal salvation<sup>1179</sup>. As **Peter** and the Apostles were going to live a limited number of years, so that the Church would last to the end of time as **Christ** promised<sup>1180</sup>, they needed to have successors.

<sup>1169</sup> JUAN RIVAS, L.C.: *Fe y Evangelio, III*. Ed. Hombre Nuevo. P. O. Box 5445. Los Angeles, CA.

<sup>1170</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYES: *Razones para creer, III, I* Ed. Paulinas, Madrid. 1992

<sup>1171</sup> 30 Días Magazine, 93 (1995) 63

<sup>1172</sup> PALABRA Magazine, 241-242 (VIII-IX-1985)18; 243(X,1985)13.

<sup>1173</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 15-I-94- pg. 7

<sup>1174</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2675 (12-III-64) 24.

<sup>1175</sup> ABC Newspaper, 27-VI-94. pg. 8

<sup>1176</sup> ABC Newspaper, 5-II-94. pg. 67

<sup>1177</sup> Hebrews 1:1-3

<sup>1178</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum*: Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, n<sup>o</sup>7

<sup>1179</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *¿Cual es la Iglesia verdadera?, I, E*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona. 1982

<sup>1180</sup> Matthew, 28:20

2. Man cannot know God well unless God manifests Himself to man. This manifestation is called Revelation<sup>1181</sup>.

God by revealing Himself wanted to make men capable of responding to Him, of knowing Him and of loving Him more than they were capable of doing so by their own strength<sup>1182</sup>

**The doctrine revealed** by God is found in the Holy Scriptures and in tradition.

Not all truths of faith are in the Bible. We know of some of them through tradition. For example: we all know that **Jesus Christ** was a bachelor, but this is not found in a single verse of the Bible.

The Bible and tradition are closely entwined and tend towards a common goal; that is why the obscure passages of the Holy Scriptures are illuminated with tradition. This is expressed in the Second Vatican Council through these words: The Church does not draw from the Scriptures the certainty about all that is revealed; that is why the Holy Scripture and tradition must be received and respected with the same devotional spirit. The Sacred tradition and the Sacred Scriptures constitute a single sacred deposit of the word of God, entrusted to the Church.<sup>1183</sup>

The Holy Bible transmits the written word of God.

Tradition transmits the oral teachings, transmitted through voices from one generation to another<sup>1184</sup>. The Apostles teachings were basically oral, as they had been taught by our Lord. **Jesus Christ** wrote nothing. He limited Himself to preaching. And to the Apostles He did not say "write down" but said "preach"<sup>1185</sup> **Jesus** taught them many things that are not included in the Holy Scriptures, but have reached us transmitted from generation to generation, through the oral tradition of the Church. **Paul** when writing to the Thessalonians, tells them: "*Brothers, be constant and faithfully keep the teachings you have received from us, be it by word or be it by writing*"<sup>1186</sup> "*When you received the word of God, which we preach, you have accepted it not as a word of man, but what is truly the work of God, who is with you the believers*"<sup>1187</sup> And to the Corinthians he said: "*I praise you brothers, as you observe my everything and the traditions that I have entrusted to you*"<sup>1188</sup>. To **Timothy** he says: "*Keep alive the doctrine that you have heard from me*"<sup>1189</sup>.

The Holy Scriptures are contained in the Bible. The Bible contains seventy three books, divided between the Old and the New Testament. The Old Testament has forty six books, and the New Testament has twenty seven books. What divides these two collections of books is the person of **Jesus Christ**. What was written before Him, is the Old Testament. What was written after Him, is the New Testament.

To assist in the search of the passages of the Bible, the text has been divided in Chapters and within these; the paragraphs have been numbered (verses). These divisions are after the evangelists. The division in chapters was made by **Stephen Langton**, in the eighteenth century, and the division in verses was done by **Robert Estienne** in the sixteenth century.

**Jesus Christ** has entrusted the Church with the interpretation and vigilance of the Holy Scriptures and Tradition, in order to avoid error<sup>1190</sup>. For this reason, not all translations of the Bible can be read, only those that have the ecclesiastical approval, and therefore are sure to not contain any errors.

<sup>1181</sup> FELIPE CALLE, O.S.A. *Razona Tu Fe, V*. Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid

<sup>1182</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 52

<sup>1183</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum Dogmatic Constitution on the Divine Revelation, n° 9s*

<sup>1184</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA: *Hablemos de la Fe, I. 10*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1185</sup> AGUSTIN PANERO. Expert on Redeeming *No a los Testigos de Jehová'a, IV, 12, 4*. Ed. Perpetuo Socorro. Madrid

<sup>1186</sup> II Thessalonians, 2:15

<sup>1187</sup> I Thessalonians, 2:13

<sup>1188</sup> I Corinthians, 11:2

<sup>1189</sup> II Timothy, 1:13

<sup>1190</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum Dogmatic Constitution of the Divine Revelation, n° 10*.

There are passages in the Bible which are difficult to understand, as **St. Peter** has warned<sup>1191</sup>

To discover what the religious author wants to affirm, one must take into account the way of thinking and talking of those times<sup>1192</sup>.

“The office of authentically interpreting the word of God as written or transmitted has been entrusted only to the live Magisterium of the Church, whose authority is exercised in the name of **Jesus Christ**. This Magisterium, evidently, is not above the word of God, but rather it serves it, only teaching that which it has been entrusted to. By divine mandate and with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, it listens to it with piety, it guards it with exactitude and exposes it with fidelity, and out of this unique deposit of faith, it takes out that which it proposes as the truth revealed by God which is to be believed<sup>1193</sup>”.

The open interpretation of the Bible the Protestants gives way to a multitude of erroneous concepts conflicting with each other, as not all the world is prepared to know the literary concepts of the different Biblical passages, nor to understand the language in which the original biblical text was written in.

. One must take into account the way of thinking and of expressing oneself in use at the time of the writer<sup>1194</sup>.

That is why an expert Magisterium is necessary, to direct biblical interpretation with authority.

**Christ** said “the *truth will make you free*<sup>1195</sup>”. He who is in objective truth steps surely, and feels certain. Whoever believes that truth is relative, that each one has his own truth, is in error. Truth has an absolute value. Whoever does not adjust himself to the objective truth is in error. The objective truth does not depend on our opinion nor on our desires. With the desire of being a conciliator and tolerant, I cannot say that the truth is the middle of two opposing opinions.

If a person says that the capital of The United States is New York and another that it is San Francisco, this does not mean that the true capital is Saint Louis due to its being in the middle.

When talking of subjective values, each one can have its truth. But when you talk about objective values, the objective truth is the same for all. For example: when one can sleep better with the window closed, and the other with the window open. The ideal temperature to sleep can vary according to the persons but the temperatures of the boiling point of water and of its solidification are always 212°F and 32°F respectively.

In face of multiple errors, there is no objective truth.

When facing objective truth we are not free. We have the obligation of subjecting ourselves to the objective truth. All the doctors of the world have the obligation of telling us that the organ of vision is the eye, none can say that we see through the nose. All the chemists of the world have the obligation of saying that water is H<sub>2</sub>O and none can say that it is NaCl. All mathematicians of the world have the obligation of saying that  $\pi$  is the relationship of the circumference to its diameter, a constant which in the decimal system is 3'141592..., and not 8'2432....

If a child is given a map showing all of the cities in Europe so that he can point out the Capital of each Nation, and he chooses the cities which he likes more because of their name, this does not change the truth. The capitals will continue to be the ones they are independently of the desire of the child.

Truth does not permit us to freely give an opinion on what I prefer. Truth orients liberty it does not take it away. As in railway tracks which orient the path of the train, but they do not impede its advance, but rather help it. A train running off its tracks has no direction

To subordinate truth to my liberty is ridiculous. No one with common sense is interested in a lie: we want real coffee, not dirty water; real medicines, not inefficient brews; true friendship, not

<sup>1191</sup> II Peter, 3:16

<sup>1192</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum* Dogmatic Constitution of the Divine Revelation, n° 12

<sup>1193</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum* Dogmatic Constitution of the Divine Revelation, n° 10.

<sup>1194</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum* Dogmatic Constitution of the Divine Revelation, n° 12

<sup>1195</sup> John, 8.32

traitors. All this is indisputable for a normal person. The same occurs with religious truth. The good of religious liberty is not having the liberty to choose error, but to freely choose the truth without feeling oneself coerced.

Objective truth is dogmatic, invariable. An error has freedom. To find the truth there is only one way. To err there are many. There is a single train at the train station that will take me to my destiny. All others will go elsewhere.

Nowadays some change the objective truth for the personal opinion (for me this is a sin), esthetical beauty for fashion torn & dirty jeans), ethical kindness for pleasure (sexual freedom). But what will remain standing always are the three great human values: truth, beauty and good.

Even in some accidental things we cannot always change them to our whim. The order of the letters of the alphabet is what it is, and I cannot alter it to my liking, although in the absolute it could be another. But it is established this way for all. It does not depend on the will of each one.

Faith is free, not in the sense that it is the same to believe as to not believe, but not being axiomatic, it does not override reason, but is at liberty to accept or reject it even though it is reasonable<sup>1196</sup>. As faith is obscure. The Bible says it. *Faith is the guarantee of what is awaited and proof of the realities of what is not seen*<sup>1197</sup>.

It is obscure because it is not evident. However it is true and evident because they are truths revealed by God, who cannot fool himself nor fool us.

And the motives of credibility make it reasonable<sup>1198</sup>

3. Sometimes the Church defines some truths as a **dogma of faith**. It is not that they then begin to be true. They are truths that have always existed; but that the belief in them has begun to be obligatory upon being defined.

The definition of a doctrine is not its invention, but rather the authoritative declaration that it has been revealed by God; that is to say, that it is a part of the whole of truths which constitute the Christian Revelation. Sometimes the apparition of new errors forces the Church to define and declare again that which always has been truth, but which the circumstances of the moment demand clarification.

Dogmas are not truths arbitrarily imposed by the Church. They are illuminations of objective truth. They are not barriers for our intelligence, but rather windows on the light of truth.

Some say: *Life is movement. To stand still is to die Petrified ideas do not let humanity advance*. This is partially true. There are definite truths –and dogmas are- and to change them is to retreat. Whoever wants to change the “sum of the angles of a triangle equal two straight angles” does not advance, but rather goes back to the error.

The content of a dogma is immutable, but the formulation of its content may evolve in order to accommodate itself better to the contemporary way of speaking.

The Magisterium of the Church can improve the way of expressing the truths in which we believe<sup>1199</sup>. Any dogmatic formulation can be improved, increased and deepened<sup>1200</sup>. But no future dogmatic formulation can contradict the sense of the prior formulation, but only complete what is already expressed by them.

Other times, a more profound study makes us progress in our knowledge of the Revelation and makes us more clearly see the truths which did not appear to be so clear before<sup>1201</sup>. The Church, assisted by the Holy Spirit, penetrates more profoundly each time into the contents of Divine

<sup>1196</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia, 1ª, VI, 4*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1996

<sup>1197</sup> Hebrews, 11:1

<sup>1198</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia, 1ª, VI, 2b*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1996

<sup>1199</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA: *Hablemos de la Fe, I, 10* Ed. Rialp. Madrid 1992

<sup>1200</sup> GERMAN EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE. *Catecismo Católico para Adultos, 1º, I, 4*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1201</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dei Verbum* Dogmatic Constitution on the Divine Revelation, nº 8.

Revelation, discovering new aspects which were implicit in it. Such as the Dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the assumption.

Revelation was a historical fact and the revealed truths which are contained in the deposit of the Revelation cannot grow, which are the Holy Scriptures, as this deposit was closed with the death of the last Apostle<sup>1202</sup>. No other truth can be added to the Catholic faith that is not contained, either explicitly or implicitly, in this revealed deposit. The only thing that can be included is a greater explanation of the dogmas, but conserving the same sense, which is definite and not deformable once defined by the Church<sup>1203</sup>.

Our knowledge of the dogma can and must grow continuously and harmoniously, passing from the implicit to the explicit. And the Church upon growing with the times and human knowledge, can infallibly approve this discovering. This is not creating new revealed truths; it is discovering that which was enclosed in the legacy of the Apostles. The same way in which the stars in the heavens which we now know about them, when they have existed for many centuries.

In order for something to be a dogma of faith, it must have been revealed by God, and the Church must declare that this is so<sup>1204</sup>. But in the matter of the truths faith it is much more ample than the one of expressly defined truths. There are truths that we call of "divine faith" because they are found in the Holy Scripture on tradition, which are to be equally believed, but which have never been defined, as in the case of the resurrection of **Christ**. No one in history has denied this truth, and therefore the Church has not found the need to define it<sup>1205</sup>.

Public Revelation ended with the Apostles<sup>1206</sup>. Whatever other revelation is entirely private and cannot have any value unless it is in accord with the Public Revelation which God made to the Apostles.

Christian faith cannot accept "revelations that try to correct the Revelation of Christ. This is the case of certain non Christian religions, as well of other recent sects"<sup>1207</sup>.

The Revelation has ended, but "we must use our intelligence to explore the information revealed, drawing truths that at first sight are not clearly explicit in themselves, but nor for this fact are not virtually contained in it. (...) The guarantee of what we discover is in the Church, bearer of all the Christian tradition and authorized interpreter of the Holy Scripture. (...) It is the function of the Magisterium to define the contents of the Revelation. (...) Theology must not supplant the Magisterium. (...) The last word is that of the Magisterium"<sup>1208</sup>

"Some theologians who criticize the doctrine of the Magisterium of the Church, later on want their personal opinions to become infallible doctrine"<sup>1209</sup>

Broaching on this subject, Pope **Paul VI** told the participants of the First International Congress of Theology of the Second Vatican Council: Theologians must investigate the information revealed to illuminate the articles of faith. But their contributions are subject to the teachings of the authentic Magisterium. (...) Their purpose must be to propose the universal truth believed in the Church under the guide of the Magisterium, more than to promote their personal ideas.

One must obey the Magisterium of the Church, not only in matters of faith, but also when it refers to opinions that can disorient the people of God, as in these cases it is also protected by the authority received from God, which the theologian, as such, does not have, no matter how much science he may possess<sup>1210</sup>. That is why the Bishops Synod of 1967 said: "It is not up to them to authentically teach".

<sup>1202</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1836, 2021 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1203</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1836, 2021. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1204</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA *En Busca de las verdades fundamentales, V.B.I* Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

<sup>1205</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYÉS *Razones PARA creer, XII, 5.1* Ed. Paulinas. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1206</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA.: *Hablemos de la Fe, I. 9.* Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1207</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 67

<sup>1208</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, II,2.* Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

<sup>1209</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, I,2.* Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

<sup>1210</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, II,4.* Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

Those who exercise the Magisterium of the church are exclusively the Pope and the Bishops; because only to them has **Jesus Christ** given the power to teach<sup>1211</sup>. Outside the legitimate successors of the Apostles, (Which are the Pope and the Bishops) there are no other Teachers of divine right in the Church of Christ<sup>1212</sup>. When the Pope speaks in an encyclical he teaches as an authentic Master and not as another doctor. That is why it is not valid to appeal to the authority of another theologian to sustain the contrary of what the Pope has taught. The faithful Catholics are to accept the teachings of the Magisterium of the Church with religious obedience, knowing that it obliges them in conscience<sup>1213</sup>.

The mission of the Magisterium of the Church is to watch over the people of God so that they may remain in the truth<sup>1214</sup>.

The Church is comprised by the people of God and the Hierarchy: plurality in the subjects and authority that unifies seeking the common good of all<sup>1215</sup>, as one has to harmonize the pluralism in the accidental with the unit in the essential. They are not two churches, but two parts of a single Church. To separate these two parts would be the death of the Church, as it is the death of a person, to separate the soul from the body.

Catholics must accept all dogmas of faith revealed by God. He cannot reject a single one. Either he is completely Catholic or he ceases to be Catholic. One cannot be “Almost Catholic”, in the same way that one cannot be “almost alive”, as that is being dead. If I “almost” win the lottery, I am not entitled to collect the prize: either I get the whole prize or I have not won! The “almost” is not valid.

This submission to the Holy Father is also demanded of priests and theologians. Those who instruct others in the faith, have to teach the authentic message of the Church. The Catholic has a right to be taught by a priest who is in accord with the Pope<sup>1216</sup>. Whosoever disobeys the Church hierarchy disobeys **Jesus Christ** himself. He told us: “*Whoever listens to you, listens to Me, and whoever rejects you rejects Me, and he who rejects Me, rejects the one who sent Me*”<sup>1217</sup>

The Roman Pontiff and the Bishops as authentic teachers predicate to the people of God the faith that must be believed and applied to customs. It is up to them to pronounce themselves on moral questions which are related to the natural law and to reason<sup>1218</sup>

4. The Church is **our Mother** who seeks our good, not only in this life but also in the next. The Church is our mother as in her womb we are engendered as “children of God” and She feeds us spiritually and helps us grow so that we may be mature for the “kingdom of heaven”.

The doctrine which the Church teaches **is holy**, and the world would be a much better place if men paid attention. But, unfortunately, there are many also among those who give themselves the name of Christians who disobey in order to follow their passions and selfishness. The Church illumines the world with the light of the message of **Christ**. If somebody rejects this light, it is not the Church’s fault, but the fault of man. The virtue and the path of Heaven are at times costly to our nature which has fallen into sin. But **Jesus Christ** already said that the path to Heaven is not easy, broad and downhill, but rather it is narrow, difficult and uphill. That which is worth a lot is difficult to achieve<sup>1219</sup>.

All in all, in spite of the sins of the **bad Christians**, the holiness of the Church and its doctrine stand, because there are many who because of her have become saints. They are not the rotten

<sup>1211</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 25

<sup>1212</sup> PIUS XII, May 31, 1954

<sup>1213</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 25

<sup>1214</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 890

<sup>1215</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso*, V, 3. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

<sup>1216</sup> RONALD LAWLER, O.F.M. *La Doctrina de Jesucristo*, XIV, 7, Ed. Galduria. Jódar (Jaén) 1986

<sup>1217</sup> Luke, 10:16

<sup>1218</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2050

<sup>1219</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2015



apples fallen from the tree, but rather those which hang from the branches, those who tell us, this is a good tree. The Church always condemns sin although it cannot prevent us from the freedom of sinning. When the Church orders or forbids, it does not pretend in any way to bother us or to make life less agreeable. The Church in everything seeks our good, and because of this it prohibits that which does us harm, even though we would enjoy doing it. Neither do good parents who bring up their children well, give to them everything that they desire.

One must obey the laws of the Church with true fidelity as they are given with the authority of **Christ**, which He communicated to the Apostles<sup>1220</sup>.

The Catholic Church is the institution which **has most contributed** to the moral progress of Humanity. She regenerated the individual, freeing him from slavery; regenerated woman, giving her back her dignity; regenerated the family, demanding all the rights which correspond to it; regenerated society, transforming the despotic and tyrannical State into a State which receives its authority from God and which only can exercise it in the good of its subjects.

The Catholic Church is the Mother of the western civilization. She has inspired the medieval architecture, the paintings of the Golden Century, the sculptures of all times and even the great musical works. The Church founded the first hospitals, asylums and orphanages in history. The first schools in Europe were born in the shadows of the religious convents and the most celebrated universities have been founded by the Popes. Of the fifty-two universities founded before the year 1400, forty were founded by the Popes. Paris, Montpellier, Oxford, Cambridge, Heidelberg, Leipzig, Cologne, Warsaw, Krakow, Vilna, Livonia, Rome, Padua, Bologna, Pisa, Ferrara Alcalá, Salamanca, Valladolid, etc.<sup>1221</sup>

Europe has come to be what it is due to Christianity. If we were to allow it to de Christianize, it will crumble. **Dostoyevsky** has said already: "The occident has lost **Christ** and therefore it will perish".

God does not grant anyone privileges for all eternity. If people cease to do His will, He will call on other people and trust them with that mission, leaving those to go down to the grave that they have dug<sup>1222</sup>.

Some censure the riches of the Church. It is true that the Vatican Museum has a tremendous value. But it cannot be sold. It belongs to all humanity, even though it may be in the hands of the Church. The same way that the US Government cannot sell the Capitol. This belongs to all generations, not only ours.

On the other hand, the Church contributes heavily to remedy the needs of humanity. Besides what Catholics do privately and the Religious orders, the Vatican in 1966 dedicated 600 million in humanitarian help<sup>1223</sup>. And there are over one hundred organizations in the Vatican who are dedicated to distribute alms to the poor of the world.

It is fashionable today to rebuke everything. However, the Pope is obligated to watch over the doctrine and the proper performance of the church<sup>1224</sup>. To oppose our criteria to the Magisterium of the Church, to ridicule all ascetic type of resignations, from the voluntary mortification of the body to the resignation of your own criteria, etc., is to not know the Christian values that are considered crazy by the world but which have the consistency of the knowledge of the cross. We cannot forget that the Incarnate God ended in the Calvary. Christianity without a cross would be very human, but it is not that of **Jesus**.<sup>1225</sup>

<sup>1220</sup> JOSÉ RIVERA IRABURU: *síntesis DE Espiritualidad Católica, XXVII, 5*, Ed. Gratis Date. Pamplona

<sup>1221</sup> TIHAMER TOTH: *Cristo y los cristianos, 3ª, II, 4* Ed. Atenas. Madrid.

<sup>1222</sup> TIHAMER TOTH: *Cristo y los cristianos, 3ª, II, 9* Ed. Atenas. Madrid.

<sup>1223</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 14-II-1997, pg. 73

<sup>1224</sup> Timothy, 2:1-5

<sup>1225</sup> JUSTO COLLANTES, S. I.: *La Iglesia de la Palabra, 2ª, 4ª XXIV, 3.c. d.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

Some say: “Christ, yes; Church, no” But **Saint Augustine** has spoken: “You cannot have **Jesus Christ** as Father, if you do not have the Church as Mother”<sup>1226</sup>. You cannot be of Christ if you are not of the Church, which is **The Mystical Body of Christ**, of which He is the head<sup>1227</sup>. We incorporate ourselves into Christ **by and through** His Church, and only through it does the life of **Christ** truly become our life<sup>1228</sup>. That is why the Second Vatican Council calls the Church “Universal Sacrament of Salvation”<sup>1229</sup>. Cardinal **Newman**, who was Anglican and converted to Catholicism used to say: “Whosoever rejects the Church is wrong”<sup>1230</sup>, and goes on to say: “makes useless all of that which God put there for our good”<sup>1231</sup>. The phrase: “outside the Church there is no salvation” is attributed to **Saint Cyprian**, when fighting the excision movements in his community<sup>1232</sup>. “Who knows the Church and rejects it, is compromising his salvation”<sup>1233</sup>, a quote from the Second Vatican Council.

Today, there is an abundance of all types of people who rebuke and take the stance of protesting about everything. One cannot but stop to think in that passage of the Gospel: “Why do you see the speck in your brother’s eye and not the plank in your own eye”<sup>1234</sup>. Wouldn’t it be better to see one’s own defects before protesting those of others?

Some renege from the Church because they say that there are bad Catholics. And according to that, they cannot be Protestants, because there are also bad Protestants. And, consequently, Buddhists, Canadians, nor French, not even men, as there are bad ones too. Absurd.

If the Catholic Church is the only one founded by **Christ-God**, she is the only true one, even if all Catholics were bad.

Today it is common to have a type of “**free**” Catholic who lives outside the Church, dispenses with the institution, with the Magisterium, etc. This is as absurd as to say that one feels Spanish, but he has no passport, nor are you included in the census, nor a registered voter, nothing. This person may be a country-less individual, but he would not be Spanish. It is true, the principal thing is in the heart, but one must institutionalize the situation.

Sometimes we hear: “I am a Catholic, but not a practicing one”. This is incoherent. Whoever belongs to an association, if he is coherent, will follow the rules established. It does not do much to affirm that one is a Catholic in one’s heart, if afterwards the works are not of a Catholic. As though one who says to be a Catholic, then gets married by the civil authorities. This is a contradiction. Because of this the Catholic Church prohibits this person the Eucharistic communion. All ideology, in order to be sincere, demands a life commitment...

Affirmations must be supported by actions and works. It would be ridiculous to say “I am a writer, but I have never written a line”, or “I am a football player, but I have never touched a football”.

An authentic religious life must contain four things: a) a creed: a system of truths; b) an ethic: moral values; c) rites: behaviors; d) a social answer: commitment. All four things are necessary. Whoever forgets one of them will live a deformed religious life.

**Monsignor Elias Yanes** at the Rome Synod in 1994, said: “Some maintain an attitude towards the Magisterium of the Church as if it were a threat from which one must defend oneself. This attitude weakens or breaks the ecclesial communion, destroys the fervor of faith and charity, making the evangelization action a sterile effort. The Magisterium is a gift of God to His Church which we must receive with gratitude and humility. The testimony of fidelity of the Magisterium of the

<sup>1226</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, III, 5*. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

<sup>1227</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, V, I*. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

<sup>1228</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, IV, I*. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

<sup>1229</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 48.

<sup>1230</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, IV, 3*. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

<sup>1231</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, VIII, 1*. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

<sup>1232</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYÉS: *Razones para creer, XIII, 2*. Ed. Paulinas. Madrid 1992

<sup>1233</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 14

<sup>1234</sup> Matthew, 7:3

Church must be manifested with special clarity in the catechism, in the teaching of theology, in the publications and in the means of communication<sup>1235</sup>

5. There is much talk today about **freedom**. Freedom is the faculty of practicing the good without any external or internal obstacle. The faculty of being able to do bad is not freedom but depravation, libertine and slavery to passion<sup>1236</sup>. Psychologist **Enrique Rojas** says: “You are not freer when you carry out your whim, but when you do that which makes you more of a person”<sup>1237</sup>.

In May 1986, the Vatican’s Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith published an instruction on *Christian liberty and liberation*, where it says: “Authentic freedom is not to do anything, but to do good. Freedom and Justice constitute the measure of authentic liberty. Man, falling into deceit and into injustice, instead of realizing himself, destroys himself. Freedom is manifested as a liberation of moral turpitude. Man’s sin is the radical cause of the tragedies that mar the history of freedom. The lack of knowledge of God unleashes a rush of passions which are a cause of a lack of equilibrium and disorders which affect the family and society.. Basic communities and other Christian groups are an asset to the Universal Church, that is if they are faithful to the teachings of the Magisterium, to judicial order and to the sacramental life”<sup>1238</sup>

### **39. THE HEAD OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS HIS HOLINESS THE POPE, WHO IS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF CHRIST ON THE EARTH, WHO HAS PLACED HIM THERE, AT THE FRONT OF HIS CHURCH, SO THAT HE MAY GUIDE IT AND TAKE CARE OF ITS UNITY.**

1. The Pope is the Supreme Pontiff of Rome, the successor to **St. Peter**<sup>1239</sup>, whom we all are obliged to obey<sup>1240</sup>, not only on matters pertaining to faith and customs, but also to those of the regimen and discipline of the Church<sup>1241</sup>.

He is the Infallible Master, because when he speaks as Head of the Universal Church, exercising the **supreme degree of his authority**, and defines as obligatory truths of faith and morals, he cannot make mistakes<sup>1242</sup>. **Infallibility** is the preservation of error, a fruit of divine assistance. Its foundation is the assistance of God. All truth is found in God, and God does not lie<sup>1243</sup>. He has wanted to give His Church the gift of remaining in the truth<sup>1244</sup>.

If the Pope could make mistakes in teaching what is obligatory to believe or to be saved, he would lead us astray from the path of salvation; and God, who orders us to obey the Pope, would be culpable of our condemnation. This is absurd. One then understands that the Pope has to be infallible when he draws out the path to salvation. He promised this spiritual assistance when **Jesus Christ** said: “*I am with you always; yes, to the end of time*”<sup>1245</sup>.

The Infallibility of the Pope is a dogma of faith. Vatican Council I says: “We define as dogma that which is divinely revealed which when the Roman Pontiff speaks “**ex cathedra**” which is, when

<sup>1235</sup> ABC Madrid, 11-X-94, PG. 68

<sup>1236</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Jesucristo y la vida cristiana*, n° 146. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1237</sup> ENRIQUE ROJAS: *El amor inteligente*, VIII. Ed. Temas de hoy. Madrid. 1997

<sup>1238</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Instruction of Christian Liberty and Freedom*. Vatican City. 1986.

<sup>1239</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 694 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1240</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 22

<sup>1241</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1831 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1242</sup> *New Catechism of the Catholic Church* n° 891

<sup>1243</sup> *New Code of Canon Law*, n° 749, 1

<sup>1244</sup> Numbers, 23:19

<sup>1245</sup> JESÚS GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ. *Hablemos de la Fe. I. 11*, Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

fulfilling his charge of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, he defines by his supreme apostolic authority, that a doctrine regarding faith and customs has to be sustained by the Universal Church..., enjoys that infallibility which the Divine Redeemer wished to have in His Church"<sup>1246</sup>.

The infallibility of the Pope was defined as dogma of faith in 1870. Since then there have been eleven Popes (**Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius XV, Pius XI, Pius XII, John XXIII, Paul VI and John Paul II, Benedict XVI**). In all of this time, only the dogma of the Assumption was defined as such in 1950. And this dogma has been in the faith of the Church since the VII Century.

In order to be saved it is necessary to believe and to accept all the doctrine of **Jesus Christ**.: The authentic doctrine of **Jesus Christ**, and no other: "*Go out to the whole world; proclaim the gospel to all creation*", said **Jesus** to his Apostles - "*Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved; whoever does not believe will be condemned*"<sup>1247</sup>". This supposes a guarantee that those who transmit the teachings of **Jesus Christ** will not be mistaken<sup>1248</sup>.

If the Church were not infallible, God would force men to accept the error under penalty of eternal condemnation., This is absurd. If He obliges us to believe what the Church teaches it is because He is committed to always teach the truth. "*I will be with thee to the end of time*"<sup>1249</sup>.

Now well, what guarantee could we have after twenty centuries, and after so many human theories and opinions, that the doctrine that we are taught today by the Church is the authentic doctrine of **Jesus Christ**?

**Jesus Christ** founder of the Church wanted to effectively build a Church that carried His message throughout all times and to all men, had no other recourse than to give it an adequate control, that would certainly impede that its doctrine would be deformed through the passage of time. This control is a special assistance of the Holy Spirit, with which the error is absolutely barred in His Church, so far as to the authentic revealed Doctrine. **Jesus Christ** tells **Peter**: " I have prayed for you, that your faith not fail. And you confirm your brothers"<sup>1250</sup>.

The Pope is infallible when he determines or declares *Ex Cathedra* the authentic revealed doctrine. But outside of this – for example—if he were to predict the weather, the Pope could commit an error as any other man. That is to say, the Pope, in his ordinary life, even though he is a very prudent and trustworthy man, is not infallible. Infallibility is reserved to certain teachings carried out with a special solemnity, in a definite way, which theologically is called "ex-cathedra", in which he expresses his will to oblige all of the Church to believe the truth defined by him.

This does not mean however, that the Pope can pull Dogmas out of his pocket; he can only define that which is included in the Holy Scriptures or in tradition<sup>1251</sup>. All in all, we must obey the Pope always, even in those things in which he is not infallible<sup>1252</sup>, the same way that children must obey their parents, even though they are not infallible. The Magisterium of the Church **must be accepted**, even in that which is non infallible, with religious submission; more than by the arguments which support it, because of the authority that **Christ** gave His Church to determine the way to the Kingdom of Heaven. This religious submission of the will and of the understanding is due to the authentic Magisterium of the Roman Pontiff, so his Supreme Magisterium must be recognized reverently, even if he is not speaking "ex-cathedra"; and sincerely adhere to the thoughts expressed by him, according to the will manifested by him, as can be discerned, be it by the context of the document, be it by the insistence with which the same doctrine is repeated, be it also, by the formulas used<sup>1253</sup>..

<sup>1246</sup> DENZINGER: Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 1839, Canon Code Law, n° 749

<sup>1247</sup> Matthew, 28:20; Mark, 18:15s

<sup>1248</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2035

<sup>1249</sup> Matthew, 28:20

<sup>1250</sup> Luke, 22:32

<sup>1251</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYPES: *Razones para creer. XII, 4*. Ed. Paulinas. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1252</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n°25.

<sup>1253</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n°25.

A theologian may disagree and continue investigating; but will not publicly discredit the Church, but will maintain a respectful silence<sup>1254</sup>.

When attacking the infallibility of the Church, what normally comes up is the condemnation of **Galileo**. With all, it is convenient to warn that the condemnation of **Galileo** was the work of a Roman Congregation, not of the Pope in an *ex-cathedra* definition, which is the only infallible one. Apart from this, the Church, at that time, judged **Galileo** as one of the best astronomers of the time. All who study the arguments of **Galileo (1569-1642)** affirm that he did not prove his hypothesis. That is why he did not convince **Tycho-Brahe (1546-1601)**, a contemporary of his who continued to be a geocentrist like **Tholomeus**<sup>1255</sup>. On the other hand **Galileo** had the intuition of not literally interpreting the biblical texts as did the theologians of his time, but as we interpret them today, not knowing anything about literary genre. It is paradoxical that **Galileo** made mistakes in the field of science, and the theologians in the field of theology<sup>1256</sup>. But we must clarify that **Galileo** was not condemned because of his theory, as **Copernicus** said the same one hundred years earlier, and the Church did not mess with him. What's more, his fundamental work, *The Revolutions of the Celestial Worlds*, published in 1543, is dedicated to Pope Paul III. But **Copernicus** presented his ideas as a scientific hypothesis<sup>1257</sup>.

**Galileo** was condemned because of his insistence in interpreting the Scriptures. The Church told him that he should limit himself to present his ideas as a scientific hypothesis<sup>1258</sup>, and he did not heed<sup>1259</sup>. Even though the condemnation of the Church towards **Galileo** was disciplinarian and not dogmatic<sup>1260</sup>, the thought today is that it was inopportune.

2. Infallibility does not signify without fault. The Pope as all men can have his faults. Furthermore, in History there have been some not so exemplary Popes; although they have been few. They may have been sinners, but always upright in their teachings, since they have always been infallible<sup>1261</sup>. Still, thanks be to God, we have in the Catholic Church a long history of Saintly Popes. There are seventy seven Popes who are venerated in the altars<sup>1262</sup>. The last Pope to have been made a saint was **St. Pius X** who died in 1914.

#### 40. The Pope is in place of **Jesus Christ**.

1. **Jesus Christ**, before rising to Heaven, left **St. Peter** at the head of his Church, communicating to him all the necessary powers to carry out his task.

The Pope has the authority of the Christ-God to interpret the divine law. **Christ** said so to **St. Peter**: "*I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven: whatever you bind on earth will be bound*

<sup>1254</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYPES: *Razones para creer*. XII, 4. Ed. Paulinas. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1255</sup> MANUEL CARREIRA, S. I.: *Metafísica de la Materia, Apéndice, III* Universidad de Comillas. Madrid

<sup>1256</sup> WALTER BRAND MULLER: *Galileo y la Iglesia. Epilogo*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1967

<sup>1257</sup> VITTORIO MESSORI: *Leyendas Negras de la Iglesia, IV, 28* Ed. Planeta. Barcelona

<sup>1258</sup> VITTORIO MESSORI: *Leyendas Negras de la Iglesia, IV, 28* Ed. Planeta. Barcelona

<sup>1259</sup> WALTER BRAND MULLER: *Galileo y la Iglesia .II, 6*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1967

<sup>1260</sup> WALTER BRAND MULLER: *Galileo y la Iglesia. III, 5*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1967

<sup>1261</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO LABURU, S. I.: *¿Qué es la Iglesia? V*. Ed. EAPSA. Madrid

<sup>1262</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA: *Hablemos de la Fe, II. 4*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

*in heaven; whatever you unbind on earth will be unbound in heaven*<sup>1263</sup>. This means power to legislate and impose obligations<sup>1264</sup>.

The Pope is the successor of **St. Peter** and the Vicar of **Christ** on the Earth<sup>1265</sup>.

Because of this all Catholics must obey the Pope in everything that he decides for the wellbeing of the Church.

**Christ** gave his Church all the necessary means in order to attain its goal. For this He made it hierarchical<sup>1266</sup>. Authority is necessary. There is no human grouping that does not need an order that makes it possible to have life in common. Wherever there is a community, there forcibly must be an institution as a means of properly saving life in common, and to efficiently reach the goals that are sought. The establishment of some behavioral norms are necessary, as is the obligation of being subjected to them. Institutional norms are a defense against anarchy<sup>1267</sup>. What would happen to New York or Los Angeles without traffic laws.

The mission of the hierarchy is to guarantee authenticity in the faith and in Christian life – so that what God wants and how God wants can be believed, as to administer the sacraments that **Christ** wanted how **He** wanted<sup>1268</sup>.

All human groups: families, associations, peoples of nations need an authority - of whatever type - in order to organize, coordinate forces, defend rights, especially of the weakest and to take responsible decisions. A society without authority ends up by dissolving itself.

A just and responsible authority is one of the better services which can be offered to a people. A just and reasonable authority when it does not seek its own interests, but those for the good of all.<sup>1269</sup>.

2. **Bishops** are charged with governing the dioceses under authority of the Pope<sup>1270</sup>. They exercise their own power and they are, in truth, the chiefs of the peoples whom they govern<sup>1271</sup>., since as Bishops they are the successors of the Apostles<sup>1272</sup> and the administrators of God<sup>1273</sup>.

Already in the II Century, **St. Irenaeus** called the bishops the successors of the Apostles: “We can count on those who have been placed by the Apostles as bishops and successors of theirs until our days<sup>1274</sup>”.

The first and foremost responsibility of the Bishops is to combat heresy and be depositors of the faith<sup>1275</sup>.

“Bishops when they teach in communion with the Roman Pontiff, must be respected by all as witnesses of the divine and Catholic truth; the faithful, on their part, have the obligation of accepting and following with religious submission of the spirit, the opinions of their bishop in matters of faith and of customs, when he exposes them in the name of **Christ**<sup>1276</sup>”.

In an ecumenical council, all bishops of the world meet to discuss general Church affairs under the authority of the Pope. 21 have been held. The first was in Nicaea in 325 A.D., and the latest from

<sup>1263</sup> Matthew, 16:19

<sup>1264</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup>. CIURANA. : *En busca de verdades fundamentales V. C. E.* Ed. Bosch. Barcelona.

<sup>1265</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 882

<sup>1266</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, VIII, 1.* Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid.-

<sup>1267</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, VIII, 5.* Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid.

<sup>1268</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, VIII, 1.* Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid

<sup>1269</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: Catecismo escolar 4º. EGB. n° 15

<sup>1270</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1558ss

<sup>1271</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 27

<sup>1272</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 20

<sup>1273</sup> Titus, 1:7

<sup>1274</sup> SAINT IRENAEUS: *Adversus Haereses, III, 3, 1.* MIGNE: *Patrologia Griega, 7, 848, A.*

<sup>1275</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYÉS: *Razones para creer, XI, 4, 2.* Ed. Paulinas. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1276</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 25

1962 to 1965 in Rome. The list of all Ecumenical Councils of the Church is found in the Book “En busca de verdades fundamentales”<sup>1277</sup>

3. **Priests** consecrate themselves to God to assist the Pope and the Bishops in the care of souls, preaching the Word of God and in administering the Sacraments<sup>1278</sup>. They too, are the representatives of **Jesus Christ**<sup>1279</sup>, and because of this they deserve all of our respect. The mission of the priest is to preside over the Eucharistic Assembly and to help the Bishops to maintain the unity of the faith and in fraternal charity to conduct the Christians to God the Father<sup>1280</sup>.

What distinguishes the ministerial priest from the common priest, is that the first one has received the Holy Orders, which will give him the power to say mass and forgive sins, and of the lay priest, proper to all baptized persons, “whose life must be a cultural act to God”<sup>1281</sup>, and must give testimony to **Christ**<sup>1282</sup>. These two not only differ in degree, but essentially, as has been said by the Second Vatican Council<sup>1283</sup>. That is why there is a special sacrament for the ministerial priesthood. Today as yesterday, the specific mission of the priests is to communicate the bread of the word; of distributing, as ministers of cult, the pardon, the grace and the holiness. Times and methods may change according to the evolution of customs, but the content of the message will continue to be the same: the apostolate will always be the transmission of the spiritual life<sup>1284</sup>.

**Jesus Christ** says in the Gospel; “You must call no one on earth your father”<sup>1285</sup>. But this he said to his disciples, because among them they were all brothers. But it is logical that the people should call the priests Father for respect to the person who transmits to them the doctrine and the grace of God<sup>1286</sup>. The same **St. Paul** who knew very well how to interpret the words of **Christ**, had himself be called Father: “I am writing all this not to make you ashamed but simply to remind you, as my dear children; for even though you might have ten thousand slaves to look after you in Christ, you still have no more than one father, and it was I who fathered you in Christ Jesus, by the Gospel”<sup>1287</sup>. He called **Timothy** son in two letters<sup>1288</sup>. The same with **Titus**<sup>1289</sup>. Therefore it is logical that they call him “Father”. The same as **St. John** calls “his children” those who walk in truth<sup>1290</sup>.

4. In order to help priests “in ministries which although not priestly are necessary for the good of the Church”<sup>1291</sup>, Vatican Council II has permitted the Episcopal Conferences, with the approval of the Supreme Pontiff, to establish a **deaconate** “for men of mature age, even though they be married, and for suitable young men, but the latter must remain firm in the law of celibacy”<sup>1292</sup>. These deacons “serve the people of God in the ministry of liturgy, of the Word and of charity”<sup>1293</sup>.

<sup>1277</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup>. CIURANA: *En busca de verdades fundamentales, V, B, d, b'*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona

<sup>1278</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 28

<sup>1279</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1563

<sup>1280</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1562

<sup>1281</sup> BERNARDO MONSEGÚ, C. P.: *La Iglesia que Cristo quiso, VII, 2*. Ed. Roca Viva. Madrid.

<sup>1282</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 10

<sup>1283</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 10

<sup>1284</sup> PAUL VI, to the priests and seminarians in Spain, on October 13, 1965

<sup>1285</sup> Matthew, 23:9

<sup>1286</sup> AGUSTIN PANERO, Redentorist: *NO to Jehovah's Witnesses*. Ed. Perpetuo Socorro. Madrid.

<sup>1287</sup> Corinthians, 4:14

<sup>1288</sup> Timothy, 1:2; 2:1

<sup>1289</sup> Titus, 1:4

<sup>1290</sup> II John., 1:4

<sup>1291</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Esta es nuestra fe, 2º, I, 9, 3, d*. EDICE. Madrid 1986

<sup>1292</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 29

<sup>1293</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1637 (7.IV-73) 419

In 1972, the Church gave permission so that when there were many parishioners and few priests<sup>1294</sup> some suitable persons picked by the priest, with the permission of the Bishop, could help to give Holy Communion, so that this act would not be unduly prolonged. These persons can also take Communion to the sick if there are not priests or deacons to do it<sup>1295</sup>.

## **SUPERNATURAL LIFE.**

### **Sanctifying Grace**

**41.** In the Church there is a supernatural life, which is called grace.

The Church founded by Jesus Christ is not only a visible family. In it there is an **interior life**, invisible, supernatural and divine that Jesus Christ himself communicated.

God made man in his own image and likeness, giving him an immortal and spiritual soul, capable of knowing and loving Him and achieving a happiness that only He can give. But in His infinite love, God has wanted to call us to higher destinies. He wanted to give us the highest distinction of all. He made us His beloved children and made us participants of His own happiness in this glory. This binds us to Him in the divine person of His Son, made man, **Jesus Christ** - of whose Mystic Body we are living members. This divine life in us is called Sanctifying Grace. Because of this **Christ** lives in us and we live in **Christ**.

**Christ** is who vivifies through grace, the body of His Church. That is why **Paul** says that **Christ** is our life<sup>1296</sup> and that the Church is the **Mystical Body of Christ**<sup>1297</sup>.

Because of this we call the Church "**The Mystic Body of Christ**".

**Christ** is the Head. We are its members, or as **Christ** said "*I am the vine and you are its shoots*"<sup>1298</sup>.

And the shoots need the sap of the vine, and thanks to that the vine produces the grapes –as we receive from Jesus Christ His grace. It is the sap that makes us live a supernatural life, the same way that our soul vivify our body and give us our everyday life.

As **John Paul II** said to the youth in Poland: "**The Church is the Mystical Body of Christ**", because it is the social body of Christ<sup>1299</sup>

2. The doctrine of the **Mystic Body** has enormous importance in the order of evaluating our behavior. A street sweeper who performs his work in the grace of God, has far more value than the conference at the highest scientific level-that possibly can only be understood by half a dozen men in the world-but is pronounced by a scholar who is not in the grace of God. The reason why the actions of men who are not in a state of grace, although they have an indubitable value as the 2nd Vatican Council teaches<sup>1300</sup>, is that they do not exceed human limitations. On the other hand, when a man is in a state of grace he is a member of the **Mystic Body of Christ** and then his actions, however simple, belong to a supernatural plan, infinitely superior to anything human.

If people knew more about this, who would live in a state of mortal sin?

<sup>1294</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 26-VII-86, pg. 48

<sup>1295</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1637 (7.IV-73) 419

<sup>1296</sup> Colossians, 3:4

<sup>1297</sup> Ephesians, 1:23

<sup>1298</sup> John, 15:5

<sup>1299</sup> KAAROL WOJTYLA: *Ejercicios espirituales para Jóvenes, 2ª, VI*, Ed. BAC. Popular. Madrid

<sup>1300</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic constitution on the Church, nº 34



Each one of us is a cell of the Mystic Body of Christ. With our virtue we collaborate to its vitality. By our sins, apart from turning us into dead cells we obstruct the life of the other cells of our brothers in Christ.

We are cancerous cells.

**42.** Sanctifying grace is a supernatural and free gift<sup>1301</sup> that makes us true children of God<sup>1302</sup> and heirs to eternal life<sup>1303</sup>

1. **Sanctifying grace** is a quality that makes man rise above the norm, giving him a superior second nature<sup>1304</sup>. It is like a "seed of God". **St. John** made this comparison<sup>1305</sup> "that grows in the soul and produces, in a certain way, a divine life<sup>1306</sup>, just as if we had been given a transfusion of divine blood. Sanctifying grace is the supernatural life of the soul<sup>1307</sup>. It is also called the grace of God.

Sanctifying grace transforms us in a way similar to the steel in the forge, that remaining steel, takes on the characteristics of the fire<sup>1308</sup>

The grace of God is **the most valuable thing in this world**. It lets us participate in the divine nature<sup>1309</sup>, this is something marvelous, very difficult to understand, but true. It is like a diamond that is hidden because it is covered by mud. In the nineteenth century **Van Wick** built a shed on his farm at Dutoitspan (South Africa) using some clumps of earth. A day later, after a strong rainfall, he discovered that those clumps of earth were diamonds: the falling water had cleaned them of the mud. That is how a great diamond mine in South Africa was discovered<sup>1310</sup>. Grace is a diamond that cannot be seen.

Grace makes us participant of the divine nature<sup>1311</sup>, but does not make us men-God, like **Christ** who was God, because His human nature participated of the divine personality, and this does not happen in us<sup>1312</sup>.

God, when making us His children and participants of His divinity, puts us above all other creatures that are also a work of God, but do not participate in His divinity. The same happens with the sculpture made by the artist and his own son, to whom he communicates his nature<sup>1313</sup>

When we live in sanctifying grace we are living temples of the Holy Spirit<sup>1314</sup>. Sanctifying grace is absolutely necessary for men to achieve eternal life. It is lost through grave sin.

One cannot be meritorious in the state of mortal sin. It is like the stone that has fallen in the field, Grass will not grow under it. In order for it to grow, you must remove the stone first

Whoever has lost this sanctifying grace cannot live a serene life, because he is in **imminent danger** of being condemned. This state of grace can be recovered by the sacrament of confession, making a good confession, or by making a perfect act of contrition and the promise of going to confession as soon as possible.

<sup>1301</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1998s

<sup>1302</sup> John, 3:1

<sup>1303</sup> Romans, 8:17

<sup>1304</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1997

<sup>1305</sup> John, 3:9

<sup>1306</sup> JOSÉ SÁNCHEZ COVALED, S. I.: *Breviario Teológico de la Salvación*, 1º, VII, 1. Salamanca

<sup>1307</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Somos hijos de Dios*, 1º, III, 4. Ed. Ed. BAC. Madrid. Madrid. 1977

<sup>1308</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O. P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 1º, III, n° 70. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>1309</sup> II Peter, 1.4

<sup>1310</sup> JESUS MARTINEZ GARCIA: *Hablemos de la Fe*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1311</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1042 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1312</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Jesucristo y la vida Cristiana*, 403. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1313</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teoría de la Salvación*, 1ª, III, n° 70 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1314</sup> 1 Corinthians, 6:19

To lose this sanctifying grace is the **worst of all misfortunes**, although one does not realize that at the moment. Without the grace of God, all our life is useless if we wish to enter into heaven<sup>1315</sup>. Outwardly everything seems the same, but inwardly it does not work. It is like an electric bulb without electric current. **St. Augustine** says “As the human eye cannot see without the help of light, man cannot function supernaturally without the help of divine grace”.

In the supernatural order there is **essentially** a bigger difference between a man in a state of mortal sin and a man in a state of grace, than between the latter and one that is already in heaven<sup>1316</sup>. The only difference in heaven is that the state of grace, there, in full plenitude, produces a superhuman happiness that is impossible to achieve in our life on earth.

This life is the way to achieve eternity. Eternity for us means heaven or hell.

To follow the way to heaven means to live in a state of grace. To follow the way to hell means to live in mortal sin. If we want to get to heaven we must not follow a stupidity. However this stupidity happens to many people, one day they will wake up to this foolishness but perhaps by then it will be too late.

2. Apart from sanctifying grace, God grants other graces called **Present Graces**<sup>1317</sup> that are transitory supernatural helpers; this means that, given in each individual case, they help us to achieve something towards our salvation<sup>1318</sup>. Because by ourselves we can do absolutely nothing. We cannot have sufficient faith or sufficient repentance that produces our conversion.

The present graces enlighten our understanding and move our self-will to achieve goodness and avoid evil. Without this grace we cannot start, continue, or stop anything with regard to eternal life<sup>1319</sup>.

Man cannot **fulfill all his obligations**, nor do good works in the hope of achieving eternal glory, without the help of God's grace. **Saint Augustine** said, “God made you without your help, so he will not save you without your help<sup>1320</sup>”.

God has wanted to give us Heaven as a reward to our good works. Without them, it is impossible for the adult, to attain the eternal salvation. Our eternal salvation is absolutely personal and non transferable. He who does what he can, God does not deny His grace. And without the free cooperation of this grace the salvation of the adult man is impossible<sup>1321</sup>. With His inspirations, God predisposes man to do good works, and as man is cooperating, God continues to increase the graces which help him to practice those good works, with which he will reach eternal glory.

“The goodness of God towards us is so great that He wants His gifts to appear as our merits<sup>1322</sup>”

This grace that lifts us above our fallen nature deserved the sacrifice of **Our Lord Jesus Christ** on the cross. We can obtain it by prayer and the sacraments.

<sup>1315</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Somos Hijos de Dios, 1ª, III, 6*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1316</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Somos Hijos de Dios, 1ª, III, 7*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1317</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2000

<sup>1318</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 797s Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1319</sup> DENZINGER-SCH: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 1546* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1320</sup> SAINT AUGUSTINE. Sermon 169.11 PL: 38, 923

<sup>1321</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 1ª, II, n° 26*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1322</sup> SAINT AUGUSTINE, Epistle 144, V, 19 MIGNE. *Patrologia Latina*, 33, 880

**43.** We begin to live a life of grace when we receive the sacrament of Baptism.

1. When we are born into this world, we are born dead to the state of grace because we are born in the state of **original sin**. This is washed away in our baptism. Baptism is like a second birth. A birth that leads to the supernatural life.

God created our first parents in a state of grace. As a sign of his sovereignty He gave them a commandment so that they, by obeying it, showed their acceptance. By yielding to the temptation of the devil they disobeyed God<sup>1323</sup>. Because the purpose of the commandment was to test their obedience, we cannot measure the gravity of the fault by the external action in which it manifests itself<sup>1324</sup>... Man was created by God to be just; however by the instigation of the devil, at the very start of our History, man abused his freedom by revolting against God<sup>1325</sup>.

This sin of disobedience<sup>1326</sup> was the original sin, it is called thus, because it was the first sin to be committed on earth at the beginnings of humanity and it is the origin of many others. Original sin is the root of all other sins of men<sup>1327</sup>. The reality of original sin **is dogma**<sup>1328</sup>.

Our first parents because of their sin of disobedience lost the state of grace for themselves and their children<sup>1329</sup>, just as the heirs of someone who loses his fortune by playing roulette. If a king grants a family a title on the condition that the head of that family does nothing to shame that privilege, who can protest, if after the ungratefulness of the head of the family, the king withdraws the title from the whole family?

Original sin is transmitted by inheritance, generation after generation. In the state of original sin, man lacks the grace and friendship of God, his freedom is weakened and he is disposed to evil, we cannot totally control ourselves or our actions.

Just as the ambassador of a nation who signs a treaty, obligates his whole country, is same way that Adam's sin affects us, as he was the head of humanity.

In his will, our destiny was included. Waters run putrid because the source is contaminated<sup>1330</sup>

The Council of Trent, the most transcendental in the history of the Church<sup>1331</sup> defines as of faith the fact that the original sin is transmitted through generations by heritage<sup>1332</sup>

**Paul VI** in the *Creed of the People of God*, says: We maintain, following the Council of Trent, that original sin is transmitted together with human nature through generation<sup>1333</sup>

2. We, ourselves, **are not responsible for original sin** because it is not our personal sin<sup>1334</sup>, but we inherit it when we are born<sup>1335</sup>.

<sup>1323</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 397

<sup>1324</sup> BIRNGRUBER: *Teología Dogmática para Seglares, n° 16* \_Ed. Litúrgica Española. Barcelona

<sup>1325</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*. Constitution on the Church in the Actual World., n° 13

<sup>1326</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 397

<sup>1327</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Catecismo Escolar*. 5° EGB, n° 4

<sup>1328</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 787- 792* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1329</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 789* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1330</sup> JESÚS M<sup>a</sup>. GRANERO, S. I.: *Credo – Jesucristo. VII* Ed. Excelicer. Cádiz. 1943

<sup>1331</sup> ROCA VIVA Magazine, 315 (X-1994) 415-418

<sup>1332</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 790, & DS. 1512s* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1333</sup> PAUL VI: *Creed of the People of God. N° 16*

<sup>1334</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 405

<sup>1335</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 403

That is why the original sin is called “original”, and in an analogous way: it is a sin that was “contracted” not “committed”; it is a state, not an act<sup>1336</sup>

Thanks to Adam’s law, because he is the head in a physical and legal<sup>1337</sup> sense of human solidarity, we are deprived of the gifts that God had given in the beginning to Adam so that he could pass them on to his descendents<sup>1338</sup>.

In the same way that between Adam and his descendents, if they had been faithful, solidarity would have existed, this solidarity also exists but in his rebelliousness<sup>1339</sup>. The greatest disaster of Adam’s sin was that he dragged all human nature down with him<sup>1340</sup>. In the same way that if Adam had committed suicide before having children, he would have deprived mankind of life, his sin has deprived us of grace. It was spiritual suicide.

We must not complain because we suffer the consequences of Adam’s sin. Would we have been capable of conserving God’s gifts<sup>1341</sup>? Are not our personal sins a proof that we would have fallen also?

The original sin was **the sin of pride**.<sup>1342</sup> Adam and Eve’s sin is very frequent to-day. Man and woman self sufficient, independent, rebellious about set standards, order or laws, although they come from the Pope himself. For them they only obey what they think is right and what they want. They obey nobody or anything. They want to be like Gods. This was Adam and Eve’s sin.

3. Before sinning, the Devil told Adam and Eve that if they sinned they would be like gods. They sinned and they realized that the Devil (Satan) had deceived them. But Satan had achieved what he had set out to do, destroy Adam’s privileged state. Satan is “*The origin of deception*”<sup>1343</sup>. He seduced Eve<sup>1344</sup>. When someone sins, he surrenders himself to the spirit of deception.

In the same way that we are sinners, so we are deceitful<sup>1345</sup> because sin is forsaking the truth, which is God, for deception<sup>1346</sup>.

The devil also **deceives us** in our temptations<sup>1347</sup> when he offers us sin in an attractive way and later leaves us always disillusioned and empty and wanting more. Because sin never satisfies. But Satan has achieved his object: To chain us to Hell.

The Devil tempts us, encouraging us to evil<sup>1348</sup>, because he is envious<sup>1349</sup>, because we can attain Heaven which he has lost<sup>1350</sup>.

All of the devil’s temptations can be overcome with the help of God<sup>1351</sup> The devil is like a chained dog, he can bark, but he can only bite the one who goes near.

In the state of original sin, man lacks the grace and friendship of God, and his liberty is weakened and swaying towards sin, we cannot be totally owners of ourselves and our acts<sup>1352</sup>.

<sup>1336</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 404

<sup>1337</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 404

<sup>1338</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 416

<sup>1339</sup> EDWARD LEEN, C. S. Sp *¿Por qué la Cruz? 1ª, VIII*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid

<sup>1340</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la Fe Cristiana, 1ª, I, 7, 4*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1341</sup> LELLOTTE, S. I. *La solución al problema de la vida*. Ed. Librería Religiosa. Barcelona

<sup>1342</sup> LEO J. TRESE: *La fe explicada, 1ª, v. 3*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1981

<sup>1343</sup> John, 8:44

<sup>1344</sup> I Timothy, 2:14

<sup>1345</sup> Romans, 3:4.7

<sup>1346</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 394

<sup>1347</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 414

<sup>1348</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 391

<sup>1349</sup> Wisdom, 1:13; 2:24

<sup>1350</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 395

<sup>1351</sup> ANTONIO TAPIES: *Nuestra Salvación, 1ª, I, 4*. Ed. Claret. Barcelona, 1987

<sup>1352</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Esta es Nuestra Fe. 2ª, IU, 3* WEDICE. Madrid. 1986.

This state of grace which begins at our Baptism needs to breathe to not choke, the same as our body needs air or it will suffocate. **St. Augustine** said that the breath of life of our soul is prayer.

## Prayer

44. Prayer is speaking with God, our heavenly Father, to adore Him, praise Him, give thanks to Him and to ask Him all types of favors.

**1. Prayer is talking with God** to show Him our love, to give Him the honor He deserves, to thank Him for his favors, to offer Him our work and sufferings, to ask His advice, to ask Him to take care of the people we love, to confide our problems to Him, and to relieve ourselves of our burdens by talking about them to Him.

Talk to God simply and naturally  
Talk to Him in you own words  
One can pray by using set prayers, or spontaneous ones  
Always repeating the same phrase

Prayer is conversation. We fully well know that you can talk in different ways. Sometimes a conversation is a simple exchange of words. But a deep conversation is when we interchange thoughts, heart and feelings. When we exchange our inner “me”<sup>1353</sup>

Why should we pray?

Because I believe in God, I know He loves me and I want to tell Him that I LOVE HIM

To talk to God it is not necessary to mouth words, one can speak through one’s heart.

Prayer is not learnt, it pours forth by itself. The same way that one does not learn to laugh or cry.

Prayer comes naturally from the heart that loves God.

Prayer must be done with attention, reverence, humility, confidence, fervor, perseverance and resignation accepting God’s will. One must pray with great faith but accepting the fact that God will grant what we are asking for it is for our own good. We cannot put our will before God’s<sup>1354</sup>. Apart from irreverent and absurd, it would be useless and quite sterile.

**Paul** says: “*Pray unceasingly*”<sup>1355</sup> and **Saint Augustine** gives the solution: “Pray with desire. Even if the tongue remains silent. If you wish to love, you are already loved. Your wish is your prayer. If you always wish, your prayer is continuous”

Prayer is very necessary and we must pray often because God said “ask and you will receive”<sup>1356</sup> “you must pray constantly and not be faint-hearted”<sup>1357</sup>. God normally never gives us either spiritual grace or material things if we do not ask for them by praying.

How marvelous it would be if you could have time for chats with Our Lord before His presence in the sanctuary.

At least don’t forget to pray each day the prayers you have learnt. But I must warn you that to pray properly does not mean reciting prayers automatically with our lips, true prayer stems from our hearts. **Saint Theresa** says: “praying is a loving treat with God”<sup>1358</sup>

<sup>1353</sup> JOHN PAUL II: *Ejercicios Espirituales par jóvenes, 2ª, I Ed. BAC.- POPULAR* Madrid. 1982

<sup>1354</sup> OTTO ZIMMERMANN, S. I.: *Teología Ascética, n° 30*. Seminario Metropolitano. Buenos Aires.

<sup>1355</sup> Thessaolnians, 5:17

<sup>1356</sup> Matthew, 7:7

<sup>1357</sup> Luke, 18:1 Luke, 18:1

<sup>1358</sup> SAINT THERESA, *Vida. VIII. 2*

We don't pray to make God change His plans for us, which is impossible. Nor do we pray to tell Him that we need - He already knows that, nor to convince Him to help us he desires that above all things we pray because He wants us to do so, so that we can collaborate with Him in those things that He wants to grant us.

God has decided to grant us some things, but on the condition that we must ask for those things in a proper way, linking our requests to our prayers.

If we do this properly we are almost certain to obtain our requests, but if we don't ask for them we will not be granted these things. This does not mean that God suddenly changes His mind, it means that we do not fulfill the conditions that He has laid down to grant us those graces<sup>1359</sup>.

The doctrine of the Catholic faith teaches the following:

- a) to save ourselves, prayer is necessary,
- b) without prayer we cannot resist sin for too long,
- c) in many every-day situations prayer is necessary and convenient,
- d) if we pray frequently asking God for our salvation, we are sure to be saved. **Paul** says: "that with prayer you can defeat all temptations"<sup>1360</sup>

If we ask properly for something that is necessary for our salvation, the efficacy is **certain**<sup>1361</sup> **Thomas**<sup>1362</sup> says: that prayer is infallible if what is asked for eternal salvation is done properly. If what we ask is for the salvation of others, the efficacy depends on the free will of the other, but our prayer will get him graces from God so that so He will be inclined to the good. But not only ask. You must also praise and adore God.

It is far better to pray a little but well than a lot but badly.

If you decide to recite a long series of prayers but you pray in a routine, distracted way, it is far better that you only say half or a quarter part of those prayers but concentrating and thinking about what you are doing.

You glorify God and you enrich your own soul much more by an intense act of fervor rather than praying carelessly, superficially and monotonously<sup>1363</sup>

We should all dedicate some time in the day to perform some internal act of love to God. In these brief instants you can garner more merit than in the rest of the daily work journal<sup>1364</sup>. The most opportune moment to do this is after receiving communion and at bedtime. We must ask God to give us the effective grace to be able to do these acts of love with fervor.

On the other hand, a good son is never ashamed of his father, and God is my Father and Creator. No Father is as much Father as the Father-Creator of his children.

It is ungrateful to bargain with God our manifestations of love and reverence. Emperor **Charles IV** used to say: "Man is never as great as when he is kneeling before God". Animals cannot pray.

2. Each family should find some time each day to pray together; for example, the following hints could help:

<sup>1359</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La Virgen Maria, 4º, V, 4, nº 401* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1360</sup> Corinthians, 10:13

<sup>1361</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, nº 101*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1362</sup> Saint Thomas, 2ª, 2ae, q 83 ad 2

<sup>1363</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la perfección Cristiana, nª, II. 2*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1364</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Somos hijos de Dios, 2ª, II, 2*. Ed. BAC. Madrid 1977

1) every so often read short pieces of the gospels and then comment on them;  
 2) say grace before meals; ask God that we may never lack the essentials of life;  
 3) Recite a mystery of the rosary every day. Perhaps on the week-end when all the family is together in the car you could say the whole rosary or, at least, a few mysteries. This custom grants us God's protection when we are traveling.

In your happiness, give thanks to God

-In your sorrows, offer them to God, for love of Him

-In your labors, do them always with good intentions.

-In your sins, beg forgiveness

-And in your dealings with others, have a spirit of service

3. Prayer is fundamental in the practice of religion. Its parting point is the faith; it takes off in its dialogue with God, and culminates in the delivery of love. *Our master of Prayer is **Jesus Christ*** **Jesus** prayed continuously, reverently, piously. Outstanding in **Jesus'** prayers were a revering attitude, brotherly trust, love to all mankind and His adhesion to the love of God.

**Jesus** gave His disciples ways and means as to the practice of prayer, He insisted on the need of prayer, and to persevere in prayer. He took care of the spirit that must animate prayer. As prayer is a dialogue in which God calls man to His friendship and offers him salvation<sup>1365</sup>

During the day we should be united to God like two people who are in love.

In a happy marriage, both man and woman know that they live for each other and for their family.

They know that, even when they have little time to think of each other in the hustle of everyday life.

The state of love exists continuously and influences the behavior of the couple.

A woman's loving support helps the man to do his work (very often boring) day after day. Because he knows why and for whom he is working.

A woman also knows this and this helps her to do the painstaking monotonous every day work of the home.

Both live in an atmosphere of union even though they have very little time to dedicate to each other.

Each one lives for the other and this existence "one for the other" forms the hidden background of their everyday life.

In this type of marriage every so often there are spontaneous loving celebrations in which everything that makes that marriage tick, often unnoticed but very real, is expressed in very explicit ways and the background of this marriage is elevated to the very forefront.

The actual vitalization of this background and forefront are not opposed to each other, they coincide and complement themselves<sup>1366</sup>.

This can be considered as our love to God.

#### 4. The value of prayer is very great.

By praying we work, more than anyone else, in favor of our fellow beings, we convert more sinners than the priests, we cure more sick people than the doctors, we defend our country better than the army does; because through our prayers God helps the army, the doctors and the priests to achieve what they have set out to do.

<sup>1365</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO. *Exposición de la fe cristiana*, 3ª, III, 59. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1975

<sup>1366</sup> HEGGEN: *La penitencia, acontecimiento de salvación*, 1ª, III, 4. Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca



Christian prayer should not be confused with **Zen** or **Yoga**. Such oriental meditation practices are in fashion today, but they are risky for Catholics. That is why the Vatican has published a document warning Catholics that “**Zen** and **Yoga** degrade Christian prayer and can lead to a cult of the body<sup>1367</sup>”.

In his book “Crossing the Threshold of Hope”, Pope John Paul II warns Christians against such oriental meditation and prayer<sup>1368</sup>

5. You **must make a habit** of taking all your sorrows and all your joys to God. Your sorrows so that He can console and help you, and in your joys so that you can thank Him and ask Him that they might last.

Properly, a prayer **is made to God**, but many times we take the Virgin or the saints as mediators.

The same way we take the private secretaries of important people. God listens to the Virgin and to the Saints better than to us, as they merit more<sup>1369</sup>.

God knows our needs and many times remedies them without our asking Him.

But **ordinarily** He wants us to approach Him, as with prayer we practice many virtues: adoration, love, trust, humbleness, thankfulness, conformity, etc.

The efficacy of prayer and its necessity, is not the influence that is exerted over God, it is the person who prays who does that. God is always ready to fill us with all graces but we are not always disposed to accept them. Prayer makes us competent to receive them<sup>1370</sup>

I shall **never become tired of asking** God for everything I need.

Not that God does not realize my necessities.

He wants me to come to Him.

If he does not grant me what I want, it is because I have not asked Him properly for it, or because I do not deserve it or because it is not good for me.

If this is the case He will give me something else; a prayer that reaches heaven never returns unanswered.

It is like a child who asks its mother for a knife to play with, the mother knows that the child could cut itself with the knife so she does not give it to him; she gives him a toy instead.

And in the case that in the plans of God there is a plan to leave us a cross, He will give us strength to carry it. **Saint Augustine** said: “Lord give me strength for what you ask of me, and ask what you want<sup>1371</sup>”

In all our petitions **one must understand** this condition “if it is worthy of my eternal salvation”.

There is one thing that God always wants to grant us when we ask for it. This is the inner strength to overcome sin. Above all if we ask him this often and heartily. God will grant us the eternal salvation for our soul.

<sup>1367</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 4\_III-95. pg. 41

<sup>1368</sup> JOHN PAUL II *Crossing The Threshold of Faith, XIV*, Ed. Plaza y Janés. Barcelona. 1994

<sup>1369</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 2º, 2ª, I, nº 346*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1370</sup> ESTANISLAO LYONNET, S. I.: *Libertad y ley nueva, I, 2*. Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca

<sup>1371</sup> Saint Augustine, *Confesiones, 10, XXIV*

When one asks for things that are **absolutely good** for oneself and if it is asked properly, the efficiency of prayer is infallible. Even though God sometimes modifies the request in circumstances, time etc.

If we ask for someone else the other person could refuse the grace; e.g. conversion of a sinner. God demands a minimum of good will. He puts “nearly everything” but there is always “a little something” that depends on us.

A nice prayer would be:

- Lord give me
- the courage to change the things I can change
- the patience to accept the things I cannot change
- the intelligence to know the difference.

6. But the life of grace, besides needing to breathe, needs, -the same as natural life- to be fed<sup>1372</sup>. God has also given us food for the supernatural life of grace. This food is the Holy Communion, the true body of **Jesus Christ** in the appearance of bread, which is kept in the sanctuary, and is the Holy Eucharist. It is the remembrance that **Jesus Christ** left us before going to Heaven. He was leaving, but at the same time wanted to remain with us, until the end of days, in the tabernacle.

---

<sup>1372</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1392

**THE EUCHARIST****45. - JESUS CHRIST IS NOW GLORIOUSLY IN HEAVEN AND IN THE TABERNACLE<sup>1373</sup>**

**1. Jesus Christ** is God and true man. As God He is everywhere. As Man He is only in heaven and in the tabernacle, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist

**The tabernacle** is the main part of a Church, even though sometimes it is not on the main altar. The tabernacle is like a little house, with its door and its key. **Jesus Christ** is there, and therefore, next to it there is always a small lamp. Whenever we pass in front of it, we must genuflect, or put our right knee to the floor, as a sign of adoration, whether the door is open or closed<sup>1374</sup>

**2. The images** merit our veneration and respect<sup>1375</sup> because they are in the place of the Lord; the Virgin and of the Saints, whom they represent. They are their pictures, their statues. But what is in the tabernacle is not a picture or statue of **Jesus Christ**, but **Jesus Christ** himself, alive, but glorious: as he is now in Heaven.

Images are not adored, they are venerated. **Jesus Christ** in the tabernacle, He, we adore. Adoration consists in giving tribute to the person or thing. The honors corresponding to a God, is called latria, it is different from the cult of **dulia** which consists in the veneration given to anything that is not God, but is related to Him (images, relics, etc.) Saints are given the cult of **dulia**, which is, of intercession with God. Adoration is only given to God<sup>1376</sup> Bending the knee has different meanings; in accordance with the will of who is doing it; in front of Kings it is reverence. The veneration of images is not directed to the matter which it is made of. Stone, wood, canvas or paper? But to the person it represents<sup>1377</sup>. When you kiss the photograph of your mother, your kiss is not directed to the photographic paper but to your mother in person.

Idolatry directs itself to the image.

The Second Council of Nicaea says: "the honor paid to the image is really for who it represents.

The God in the Old Testament did not have a body. It was invisible. It could not be represented in images. The images of those days were idols. Since **Jesus Christ** made himself "in the visible image of the invisible God", as said by **Paul**<sup>1378</sup>, it is logical that we should have a representation of Him in order to give Him praise<sup>1379</sup>.

Bible texts that prohibit the making of images<sup>1380</sup> belong to the Old Testament, because of the danger they had of falling into idolatry as their neighboring townships. They are no longer valid today<sup>1381</sup>, the same way as other Laws of the Old Testament, for example, circumcision,<sup>1382</sup> and the death penalty for adulterers<sup>1383</sup>.

<sup>1373</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 883 . Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1374</sup> Eucharist Exposure and Benediction Ritual

<sup>1375</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Sacrosantum Concilium*. Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, n° 111

<sup>1376</sup> GERMAN EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE *Catecismo Católico para Adultos*, 2ª, II, 2. 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1377</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2132

<sup>1378</sup> Colossians, 1:15

<sup>1379</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1159ss, 2129ss

<sup>1380</sup> Exodus, 20:4

<sup>1381</sup> Galatians, 4:4s; Deuteronomy. 5:9

The New Testament perfects the Old Testament<sup>1384</sup>.

The texts of the New Testament<sup>1385</sup> that speak of idols refer themselves to the authentic idols adored by the pagans, but not to just simple images. That is why, the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea in the year 787, justifies the cult of the sacred images<sup>1386</sup>.

The images are the Bible of the people. **Gregory the Great** used to say: "The images are useful so that the illiterate can see in them what they are not capable of reading in books

**Jehovah's witnesses** consider that even to salute the national flag is an act of idolatry<sup>1387</sup> - this is absurd.

3. It is very important to consider that **Jesus Christ** in the tabernacle is not a thing, but a person who feels, who loves and who is waiting for you. He wants us to visit Him. We should visit Him frequently to confide in Him our problems, our needs, and to ask for His help and advice.

It is a good custom when we go past a church, to enter for a moment to greet **Jesus** even just for a minute, at least once a day. Even when you are in a hurry, there is always time to go in and say:

"Lord, thank you for everything.

I believe that you are here, present in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

I adore you with all my heart, as the only true God

I love you above all things

I give you thanks for all the gifts that I have received from You

I ask for everything, for all my intentions, I pray for your help in all I need

Please help me in everything I do, Amen".

This does not even take up a minute of your time.

Sometimes the Holy Sacrament is exposed. The faithful kneel before Him, to adore Him, give thanks for His love and ask for His help. After the exposition of the Holy Sacrament, benediction is declared so that Jesus Christ can bless the faithful and lavish His graces over them.

**46. - JESUS CHRIST IS REALLY AND TRULY PRESENT IN THE TABERNACLE ALTHOUGH UNDER THE APPEARANCE OF BREAD IN THE CONSECRATED HOST**

**47.- JESUS CHRIST IS ALSO THERE IN THE APPEARANCE OF WINE IN THE CONSECRATED CHALICE.**

---

<sup>1382</sup> Leviticus, 12:3

<sup>1383</sup> Leviticus, 20:10

<sup>1384</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1984

<sup>1385</sup> Corinthians, 10:7; I John,5:21

<sup>1386</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2131

<sup>1387</sup> G. HERBERT, S.I.: *Los Testigos de Jehová, su historia y su doctrina*, VI, 3. b. Ed. PPC. Madrid. 1975

1. The color, odor and flavor of the bread and wine remain in the Eucharist; but their substance has converted to the Body and Blood of **Jesus Christ** <sup>1388</sup>.

Substance is that for which something is what it is. What there is of a permanent nature in the being, for which it subsists. Not what is transitory and accidental, which is not essential and constant, and needs of a substance where to reside, as are color, odor and flavor <sup>1389</sup>

2. The Host, before Consecration, is wheat bread. The Host, after Consecration, is the **Body of Jesus Christ**, with His blood, His soul and Divinity. Of the bread, only the appearance remains, which is called "Sacramental Species".

3. There is grape wine in the Chalice before consecration. After Consecration, it is the **Blood of Christ**, with His Body, His soul and Divinity. Of the wine, only the appearance remains, which is called "Sacramental Species".

**Jesus Christ** because of His unique being is whole in each one of the two Sacramental Species, that is why, to receive Him, it is not necessary to communicate with both forms of bread and wine. It is sufficient to have one or the other to receive it whole <sup>1390</sup>

4. The Greek word "soma" in Hebrew anthropology means "body" as a whole, not in counterposition to blood. Similarly, the word "aima" (blood) means what is man as a whole. **Christ** repeats the same idea to confirm it, to rivet in. It is a parallelism called "climatic" very frequent in the Hebrew way of talking.

#### 48.- THE BREAD AND WINE TURN INTO THE BODY AND BLOOD OF **JESUS CHRIST** DURING THE HOLY MASS THROUGH THE WORDS PRONOUNCED BY THE PRIEST AT THE TIME OF CONSECRATION, THE CENTRAL FOCUS OF THE MASS <sup>1391</sup>.

1. That is why liturgical norms establish that during the consecration, the faithful must kneel, unless there is a valid reason that doesn't allow it.. This has been mentioned by several bishops <sup>1392</sup>.

During the elevation of the Host, you can pray in silence saying: "My Lord that your Holy redemption may grant my eternal salvation and that of everyone who are to die today. Amen.

**49.- Jesus Christ** instituted the Eucharist, to perpetuate for all time, until His coming again, the sacrifice of the cross, and to feed our souls for eternal life.

1. At the Last Supper, **Jesus Christ** instituted the Eucharistic sacrifice of His Body and Blood. That day at the cenacle, **Jesus Christ** offered the same sacrifice He soon would be suffering at the Calvary; with anticipation, He gave Himself for all men under the appearance of Bread and wine.

Authors are not in agreement on the date of the Last Supper. The most recent place it on Holy Thursday. But some authors set it on Holy Tuesday, as there were two different calendars to indicate the celebration of the Paschal Supper. By placing it on Holy Tuesday, there is more time for the development of the events that took place at Gethsemane and the Calvary. "**Christ** would have

<sup>1388</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1374ss

<sup>1389</sup> JOSÉ M<sup>a</sup> CIURANA: *En busca de las verdades fundamentales, II, c, b'*. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona.

<sup>1390</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 885 and 934ss*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1391</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1413

<sup>1392</sup> ABC Newspaper, 7-III-94. pg. 71

eaten the Paschal dinner on Tuesday afternoon, would have been made prisoner on Wednesday, and crucified on Friday<sup>1393</sup>.

With the words “Do this in remembrance of me”<sup>1394</sup> **Jesus** gave the Apostles and their successors the power and mandate to repeat that same thing which He had done: to convert the Bread and Wine, into His Body and Blood, offer there same gifts to the Father and distribute them as gifts to the faithful.

2. **Jesus Christ** is in all consecrated Hosts, complete in each one<sup>1395</sup>. Even though it be small<sup>1396</sup>. Even though a large landscape can be enclosed in a much smaller photograph. It is not the same, but this comparison may help you understand it.

The presence of **Christ** in the Eucharist is inextense, in other words, the whole in every part. That is why, when parting the Sacred Host, **Jesus Christ** does not divide, but remains whole in each part, no matter how small it is<sup>1397</sup>. The same way as when one talks and two listen, even if two more come to listen, they too hear the whole voice. The voice is “divided” in twice the number of ears, but losses nothing. This comparison, which comes from **Saint Augustine**, may help you understand it.

All of this is a great mystery, but that is how **Christ** did it, because, being God, e can do it all. The same way that with His word, He made miracles in this way, with His word only. He converted wine and bread into his Body and Blood when He said: “Take, eat, this is my body..... Drink this all of you, for this is blood , the blood of the new Covenant<sup>1398</sup>

At another occasion He said: “My flesh is really food and my blood is drink<sup>1399</sup>. And those who heard these words understood them in their real meaning, and they could not contain themselves and said: “these words are hard”<sup>1400</sup>. The disciples that heard them understood them I their real sense, not in a symbolic one. That is why **John** said when some of them heard **Jesus Christ** speak in this manner; they were scandalized, and abandoned Him saying, “This is unacceptable”. It sounds anthropophagical. If they had understood it in the symbolic sense. They would not have been scandalized.

**Paul** himself understood it likewise. That is why, after relating the institution of the Eucharist, he soundly adds: “ *Therefore, if anyone eats of the bread of drinks from the cup of the Lord unworthily, he eats and drinks his own condemnation*<sup>1401</sup> .

That is why all Catholics strongly believe that in the Eucharist, the true Body of and Blood of **Christ** are found. The allegoric and symbolic interpretations of non Catholics are inadmissible.

The presence of **Christ** in the Eucharist is real and substantial<sup>1402</sup>.

The sense of the words of **Jesus Christ** cannot be clearer. If **Jesus Christ** had spoken symbolically, one must say that His words are deceitful. There are circumstances in which it is not possible to admit a symbolic language. What would you think of a dying person who promises to leave you his house as his heir, and after dying, you find out that all he left you was a photograph of his house! If we do not want to say that **Jesus Christ** deceived us, we have ho other recourse than to admit that His words on the Eucharist really mean what they express.

<sup>1393</sup> MAX MEINERTZ: *Teología del Nuevo Testamento, 1ª, VII, 7*. Ed. FAX. Madrid. 1996

<sup>1394</sup> Luke, 22:19ed.

<sup>1395</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1377

<sup>1396</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 885* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1397</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 885* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1398</sup> Matthew, 26:26ss

<sup>1399</sup> John, 6:55

<sup>1400</sup> John 6,61

<sup>1401</sup> I Corinthians, 11:27ss

<sup>1402</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1374

The **Jehovah's Witnesses'** Bible falsely translates the story of the Last Supper; "this signifies my body". However, all manuscripts and versions without exception translate it as "This is my body"<sup>1403</sup>. It is not the same to use the verb "to be, or is" than to use the verb "signify". The flag signifies the country, but it is not the country.

It is true that we cannot comprehend how the bread and wine are converted into the Body and Blood of **Jesus Christ**, but we cannot comprehend how it is possible for the fruit, the bread, the egg, a tomato or a potato to turn into our flesh and blood, and yet this happens every day in our bodies. It is true that the transformation of the food in our stomachs is of the natural order, but the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of **Jesus Christ** is of a mysterious and supernatural order.

This mystery is called the Holy Sacrament of the Altar, and also, The Holy Eucharist.

3. The presence of **Jesus Christ** in the Eucharist is confirmed through several Eucharistic miracles, which, because of the doubts of the celebrating priest or other circumstances, the sacramental species turned into human flesh and blood, as is stated by the scientific examinations performed on the miracles of Lanciano, Casia and others<sup>1404</sup>

**50.** Mass is the most important act of our religion, because it is the renovation<sup>1405</sup> and perpetuation of **Christ's** sacrifice on the Cross.

1. In Mass we are reminded<sup>1406</sup> of the sacrifice that Christ made on the Cross by giving his life up to His eternal father, so that He would forgive the sins of men and, thereby, let us enter into Heaven.

In Mass we are reminded of the redemption of the world. That is why, Mass is the biggest, most sublime and saintly act celebrated daily on earth.

**Saint Bernard** said: "He who devoutly listens to Mass in a state of grace of God, merits more than if he were to give all of his earthly possessions as alms.

To hear Mass when alive is much more beneficial, than those said after the person has died.

With each Mass that you hear, you increase your degrees of glory in Heaven.

The only difference between the sacrifice of Mass and the sacrifice of the Cross is in the way it is offered<sup>1407</sup>: on the Cross it was cruel (with the shedding of blood). In Mass, it is not cruel (no shedding of blood) under the appearance of bread and wine. The sacrifices of the Last Supper, of the Cross and the Altar, are identical<sup>1408</sup>.

All the faithful who attend the Holy Eucharist offer this to the Father through the priest who, in the name of everyone and for everyone does the consecration<sup>1409</sup>.

As mankind in general, we like to celebrate great events, baptisms, first communions, weddings, anniversaries, etc. These celebrations normally consist of banquets. The Eucharist is a

<sup>1403</sup> G. HERBERT, S. I.: *Los Testigos de Jehová, su historia y su doctrina*,

<sup>1404</sup> BOB-PENNY LORD: *Milagros de la Eucaristía, I, V, XV*. Librería Niño Jesús. San Jorge 357. Santurce, Puerto Rico, 00912

<sup>1405</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1364

<sup>1406</sup> German Episcopal Conferencie *Catecismo Católico para Adultos, 3ª, IV, 3, 1* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1407</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 940 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1408</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 2º, 2ª, III. 98* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1409</sup> JOSÉ LUIS DE URRUTIA, S. I.: *Nuevo Diccionario*, 1 Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander . 1976

banquet to commemorate the Last Supper. We Christians gather to participate , with the proper dispositions, in the Eucharistic Banquet.

2. There are people who say that they do not go to Mass because they feel nothing. They are mistaken. Persons are not sentimental animals, but rational ones<sup>1410</sup>. Christianity is not a question of emotions but of values. Values are above emotions and can be dispensed with. A mother ignores the fact she does or does not feel like taking care of her child because that child for her is valuable. Those who know what a Mass is worth, ignore the fact whether they feel like going or not. Try not to lose a Mass and assist willingly.

For a Mass to be good for you, it is enough to attend willingly even though there are times when you do not feel like attending. One's will sometimes does not coincide with what one feels like doing. You voluntarily go to the dentist because you know it is necessary but you do not necessarily feel like going.

Some people say that they do not go to church because it does not mean anything to them. How is it going to mean anything if they have a sorrowful religious knowledge? You cannot convince anyone about something they do not know. Uncultured people are, for example, not interested in museums. But a precious stone does not lose its value just because there are people who do not appreciate it. One must discover the value of things to appreciate them.

Others say that they do not go to Mass because they do not feel like it and it is not worth going if one does not feel like going. If Mass were a pastime it would be logical to go only when one felt like it. But obligations must be carried out whether you feel like it or not. Not everybody goes to school or work because they feel like it. Sometimes we have to go even though we do not feel like it because it is an obligation. That you smoke or do not smoke is up to you, but where work is concerned, it is an obligation and you cannot please yourself. It is the same with Mass. I hope you attend Mass in a good mood, because that means that you understand how marvelous it is to show God that we love Him and we take part in the most sublime act of humanity which is the sacrifice of **Christ** through which He redeems the world. Apart from this, Sunday Mass is obligatory, because it is the act of public worship that the Church offers to God.

Mass is an act of worship of the faithful for God. Individual worship is not enough, we all form part of the community and of the kingdom of God and, therefore, we all have the obligation of taking part in the communal worship of God. Private worship is not enough<sup>1411</sup>.

Holy Mass is the Church's official act of communal worship. To fulfill one's obligations one cannot limit these to be fulfilled only when one feels like it. It is far better to carry out one's obligations in a cheerful and willing mood.

Christianity is a way of life, not only an external cult. The cult to God is necessary, but it is not sufficient to be a good Christian.

Attending Mass is above all, an act of love of a son or daughter that is going to visit their father: because of this, the motive of your attendance to Mass should be love.

Many Christians **do not realize** the incomparable value of the Holy Mass. I heard a priest say that if he was offered a thousand dollars for not celebrating Mass for one day, without any doubt he would refuse the money but not the Mass. I thought that undoubtedly I would do the same. Some days later during a lecture that I was giving, I thought that a thousand dollars was not sufficient and I said "not for ten, fifty, one hundred or one million dollars, or for all the money in the world would I forsake saying even one Mass". One, of course, has to know the value of a Mass to say that. Just one Mass glorifies God more than all the angels and saints can and that includes his Holy Mother<sup>1412</sup>,

<sup>1410</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA: *Hablemos de la Fe. IV, I.* Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1411</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2105

<sup>1412</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Perfección Cristiana, n° 235* Ed. BAC. Madrid



Our Lady, who glorifies Him for eternity in Heaven. The reason is that Our Lady and the Saints are limited creatures, but the Mass, as it is the sacrifice of Christ God, has infinite value.

Just one Mass, properly attended, **is worth far more** than a thousand Masses offered for us after our death

3. As the Holy Mass is a “bloodless reproduction of the sacrifice at Calvary, it has the same goals and produces the same effects of the sacrifice on the cross<sup>1413</sup>

A Holy Mass is offered for **four purposes**<sup>1414</sup>.

1.- To adore God with dignity. All of us are obliged to adore God because we are His creatures. And the best way to do this is by attending to the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

2.- To make amends for our sins and for the sins of those Christians alive and dead<sup>1415</sup>.

3.- To thank God for all the favors He grants us, those that we know about and those we do not.

4.- To ask for new favors for body and soul, spiritual and material, personal and social.

To worship God, to thank Him for His benefits, to ask Him to grant us new favors for our soul and body, to expiate our sins, to succor the souls in purgatory, etc. etc., **the best is to hear Mass.**<sup>1416</sup>

Therefore, our petitions, joined with the Holy Mass have a greater efficacy. But the application of the infinite value of the Mass depends on our prior disposition.

4. Mass is always offered **only to God**, as it is only He we are to adore, but sometimes a Mass is said in honor of the Virgin or some Saint, so as to ask for their intercession before God<sup>1417</sup>.

A single Mass, properly heard, is **worth more** than a thousand masses offered in our memory after we have died.

Many Christians have the custom of offering masses for their dead<sup>1418</sup>. This is a very good thing, a Mass helps the dead person much more than flowers on his grave.

When one arranges for a Mass to be said, normally one gives a small sum of money to the priest to help him or the church, as **St. Paul** said: “Do you not know those employed in the temple service get their food from the temple and those who serve at the altar share in the sacrificial offerings”<sup>1419</sup>. But under no circumstance must this money be regarded as the price of the Mass, because of the infinite value of the Mass there is not sufficient gold in the world to pay for it. What we give the priest is not the price of what we receive, what we do is to give him a donation to assist in his daily sustenance in reward for the spiritual assistance he offers us.

5. Liturgy is the public and official prayer of the Church.

The Second Vatican Council in the Constitution on the Sacred liturgy, has stressed the importance of the Liturgy in the formation of today’s Christians; the Liturgy is the summit to which the activity of the Church is trying to arrive, and at the same time the source from which all its strength emanates<sup>1420</sup>. But it first says: “The Sacred Liturgy does not exhaust the whole activity of the church<sup>1421</sup>, and then goes on to say: the participation in the Sacred Liturgy does not encompass the

<sup>1413</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, III, nº 100 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1414</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, III, nº 101 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1415</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 940 and 950 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1416</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 1414

<sup>1417</sup> Council of Trent; DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 942 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1418</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 1371

<sup>1419</sup> Corinthians, 9:13s

<sup>1420</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, nº 10

<sup>1421</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, nº 9

whole spiritual life<sup>1422</sup>. That is why, together with the Liturgy and with a just autonomy, other cultural expressions must be fomented or not, such as evangelization, the catechism, the apostolate, the ascetic exercises, charitable and social actions, and the life of testimony in the world.<sup>1423</sup>

Liturgy is not opposed, but quite the contrary, it strongly demands an intense tilling of spiritual life, even out of spiritual actions with all of the ascetic means known and practiced in the Christian tradition<sup>1424</sup>.

One must be careful that: “the display that communitarian liturgical celebrations are reaching, are not produced by stomping and expropriating the piety and private prayer. As in such a case, the growth of the liturgical celebrations is no longer in agreement with the text nor with the spirit of the Consular Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy<sup>1425</sup>. Today we suffer a hypertrophy of the community sense. Sometimes there is a preference that the common overshadow in such a way that the individual be drowned. But all the movements in the pendulum history of ideas have passed through an excessive maximum, have ended being reduced to their just dimensions<sup>1426</sup>. Man has an inalienable value in himself. Although he is saved in community, he is saved by his individual answer to the calling to participate in the life on this community<sup>1427</sup>”.

## 51. HOLY COMMUNION IS THE ACT OF RECEIVING THE BODY, BLOOD, SOUL AND DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST IN THE FORM OF BREAD AND WINE.

1. We have the obligation under the possibility of mortal sin to receive communion once a year<sup>1428</sup>, and in when in danger of death.

The Canonic Code Law stipulates: In the situation of being in the danger of death, whatever the cause may originate the situation, it calls upon the faithful to receive Holy Communion through viaticum<sup>1429</sup>.

This obligation used to be at Easter time, but the new version of Cannon Rule says: “All the faithful, after receiving their first Communion are obliged to go to Holy Communion, at least once a year. This obligation should be carried out at Easter time unless there is some serious reason for not doing it, and this is fulfilled during some other time of the year<sup>1430</sup>”. The space of time which one can carry out this obligation is from Maundy Thursday until Whitsunday<sup>1431</sup>.

For a Christian to go to communion once a year **is the minimum**. The Church wants its members to receive Communion frequently; this is expressed in the new Canon 898 “The faithful must render the maximum veneration of the Sacred Eucharist by taking an active part in the celebration of the glorious sacrifice, by receiving the sacrament frequently”.

Frequent Communion can be monthly, weekly or, even better, daily<sup>1432</sup>. The best devotion is receiving Communion during daily Mass<sup>1433</sup>.

<sup>1422</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, n° 12

<sup>1423</sup> Document of the Episcopal Committee on Liturgy, 1-XI-1987

<sup>1424</sup> Comisión Conciliar de la Sagrada Liturgia

<sup>1425</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1256 (14-VIII-65)4

<sup>1426</sup> LUIS CUBILLO. RELIGION Y CULTURA Magazine, n° 47 (/VII-1967)70

<sup>1427</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine n° 1376(3-II-68) Collective Pastoral of the American Bishops.

<sup>1428</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1417

<sup>1429</sup> Canonical Code Law, 921, 1

<sup>1430</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, III, 134, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1431</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1389

<sup>1432</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1389

Receiving Communion is **the most sublime act**, because it means receiving God in our hearts. **Jesus Christ**, because he is God, is infinitely wise and powerful. He could not have left us a better thing. Even though there is no comparison, one could say, that with only one Communion, we gain more than if we had won the lottery. This is no exaggeration, it is reality and if we doubt it, we have no faith.

If we receive communion frequently, we are accumulating a spiritual fortune for eternity. However our own laziness does not allow us to take advantage of the greatest and easiest thing that is present in our lives.

Above all, by going to Communion we are pleasing **Jesus Christ**. That is why He is present in the Eucharist. It was not sufficient for **Jesus Christ** to become man and die for us. He wanted to remain with us in the Holy Communion, to become bread to join us in the Sacred Communion. For love of Him, try to receive Communion frequently. **Christ** says that those who receive Communion will live eternally.

Besides, Holy Communion **is necessary** because it is the food of our soul<sup>1434</sup> that makes it strong so as to enable us to battle in the daily fight that is life<sup>1435</sup>. The souls of those that do not receive Communion are weak, and they easily fall into a state of sin. Those that receive Communion frequently strengthen their souls and find it easier to fight sinfulness.

Receiving Communion frequently is the best way to fight temptation, because it weakens our sinful inclinations, increases our state of grace and preserves us from mortal sin<sup>1436</sup>.

If sometime you are not able to take sacramental communion, because you are not properly prepared, at least make a spiritual communion<sup>1437</sup>.

2. Before receiving Holy Communion, we should **prepare ourselves**<sup>1438</sup> reverently keeping in mind that it is no less than Jesus Christ who is coming to us lowly sinners. God, who is infinitely powerful, Creator of the Universe, but who loves us so much, that He has wanted to remain with us in the tabernacle, so that we can receive Him.

When taking communion, we fill ourselves with **Christ**, as a sponge fills itself of water<sup>1439</sup>. What is more, when eating the **Body of Christ**, the spiritual food transforms us, and we do not transform the food as when we eat material food. This idea is from **Thomas**<sup>1440</sup>.

In the Eucharist, more than transforming **Christ** into our substance, it is He who transforms us into His<sup>1441</sup>.

It would be an error to deprive ourselves of receiving Communion because of an exaggerated feeling of being unworthy to receive Christ in Communion. To receive Communion worthily, it is enough to be in a state of grace. It is not necessary to be a saint, but by receiving Communion frequently, it means that we could become saintly.

The best way to go to Communion is during Mass, but if you cannot hear Mass, at least go to Communion.

Priests are obliged to give Communion to the faithful at any time, should they ask for it in a reasonable manner<sup>1442</sup>.

<sup>1433</sup> John, 8:54

<sup>1434</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 898 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1435</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 898 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1436</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1395

<sup>1437</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio para la Iglesia*, n° 88 I. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1438</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1385

<sup>1439</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, III, 137. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1440</sup> Saint Thomas, in 4 Sent. Dist. 12 q. 2. a. 1

<sup>1441</sup> HANS URS von BALTHASAR: *Puntos Centrales de la Fe*, 2ª, VIII, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1442</sup> Eucharistic Rite, n° 14 New Canonic Code, n° 918

When you go to Communion, you should receive the host in a respectful attitude, when the priest goes to give you the sacred host, he will say *"The body of Christ"* and you answer *"Amen"*. You lift up your head and tilt it slightly backwards, open your mouth and let your tongue rest on your lower lip so that Our Lord can be placed on it. It is very difficult to give Communion to people who incline their heads towards the priest with their mouths slightly open without sticking their tongues out; because the sacred host might fall on the floor.

You then go back to your seat. To swallow the Sacred Form easily, dampen it with your saliva. If it sticks to the roof of your mouth, remove it gently with your tongue.

You can also receive the Sacred Form in your hand. Making a cup with your left hand and taking the Sacred Form with your right hand.

After receiving Communion **we should give thanks** for such a wonderful benefit and ask God for all our needs. Talk to Him like you would to a friend, ask him to take care of your family, that they remain in good health and that they have work, that they remain good and faithful and that they achieve eternal life. Ask for your friends, your fellow workers, people you know, for your country, the Pope, the Church and for the terrible problems of the world today; then say any special prayers of thanksgiving after Communion that you may know.

When the Sacred Form has dissolved, **Jesus Christ** is no longer bodily with you<sup>1443</sup>, but the sanctifying grace that you have received stays in your soul and does not leave it unless you commit a grave sin. Grave sin destroys the state of grace.

## **52** TO RECEIVE HOLY COMMUNION, ONE MUST BE IN A STATE OF GRACE AND HAVE FASTED AS THE CHURCH ORDERS.

**1. Eucharistic fast**, nowadays is to fast only one hour<sup>1444</sup> before receiving Communion. This includes solid food and drink (including alcoholic drinks) this same time is to be observed in the case of mid-night communions. (Christmas Eve celebrations) The hour is understood to be approximate. If you are five or ten minutes short, it does not matter.

Water and medicines do not break fasting. It does not matter if you have taken them immediately before communion.

Eucharistic fast is suppressed for the ill, even though they are not bedridden, for old people and for people who take care of the ill, the old and the families of these, and also those who would like to receive Communion with their charges<sup>1445</sup>.

Communion can be given to ill people at any time of the day or night<sup>1446</sup>. And with the Bishops' permission, they can receive Holy Communion by drinking the wine only, should they have a problem swallowing..

Normally one receives Communion only once a day. But you can go to Communion again the same day as long as you attend the entire Mass<sup>1447</sup>. One can also receive Communion for a **second time** the same day if you are with a person who receives the viaticum<sup>1448</sup>.

You can also receive Holy Communion without having fasted in the following situations: danger of death, to avoid an irreverent act before the Holy Sacrament such as a fire or a flood or a religious persecution, etc. In those cases, if a priest is not available, Communion can be administered to other

<sup>1443</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1377

<sup>1444</sup> Canon Code Law, n° 919, 1

<sup>1445</sup> Canon Code Law, n° 919, 3

<sup>1446</sup> PAUL VI. *Eucharisticum Mysterium Encyclical*, 40

<sup>1447</sup> New Canon Code Law, n° 917; Apostolicae Sedis Act, 76(7-VIII-84) 746

<sup>1448</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1637(7-IV-73)421

people and to oneself by any layman or woman who is in a state of grace. If they are not in a state of grace, they must say an act of contrition.

2. Apart from fasting, one must be in a state of grace to receive Communion<sup>1449</sup>.

When we are unfortunate enough to commit mortal sin, we are no longer in a state of grace, so we cannot go to Communion<sup>1450</sup>, if we do, knowing we are in a state of mortal sin, we commit an even worse one which is called **sacrilege**. **Paul** says: Anyone who is unworthy of communion "swallows his own condemnation"<sup>1451</sup>. Even though by saying a perfect act of contrition as we will see later - our sins are forgiven, if we know we are in a state of mortal sin, we **cannot receive Communion** without first going to Confession unless we have a very serious reason for doing so. This is so ordered by the Church in the Canonic Code<sup>1452</sup>

A serious reason would be that moral need, which, if we are not careful could cause us very serious damage, e.g. when other people perceive that we are in a state of mortal sin. If we suddenly realize while we are approaching the altar to receive Communion that we are in a state of mortal sin, there is no need to return to your seat, receive Communion, say an act of contrition and promise to go to Confession straight away<sup>1453</sup>. If you have a doubt about being in a state of grace, you can take communion after making an act of contrition<sup>1454</sup>. You can make an act of contrition with these three words "God forgive me"

**Pope John Paul II** states that Confession is of the utmost importance for those who realize they have committed sin and who want to go to Communion. He said that the act of contrition that we say at the beginning of Mass is not sufficient for those that are in a state of mortal sin. It is not necessary to go to Confession every time we go to Communion, unless we have committed a mortal sin. Pope John Paul II said on the 30th January 1981: "The norm established by St. Paul and the Council of Trent is still and always). This also applies to midnight Mass-one hour of fasting before receiving Communion. If one is five or ten minutes short of the hour, it does not matter. Water and medicines do not break the fast, it does not matter even if you have to take them even a moment before Communion. The Communion fast is suppressed or will be in force, which means that to receive the Eucharist with dignity and respect signifies going to Confession when one realizes that one has committed a mortal sin". Those that believe they are in a state of grace can go to Communion without confessing beforehand. However, one is recommended to say an act of contrition before receiving Communion. You can make an act of contrition by saying "Dear God, forgive me"

**John Paul II** affirmed that confession is indispensable for who has a conscience of mortal sin and wants to take communion. The Pope said that the penitential preparation at the beginning of the Holy Mass is not sufficient for those that want to take communion in a state of mortal sin<sup>1455</sup>.

It is not necessary to confess each time that one takes communion, unless there is in your conscience a mortal sin. **Pope John Paul II** said in January 1981: "it is now and always is in force in the Church the norm, established by **Paul** and the very council of Trent<sup>1456</sup>, by

<sup>1449</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1385

<sup>1450</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1415

<sup>1451</sup> I Corinthians I:27ss

<sup>1452</sup> New Canonic Code, n° 918

<sup>1453</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, I, n° 421, 3º. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1454</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: Teología Moral para Seglares, 2º, 2ª, III, n° 151, 2º, Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1455</sup> YA Newspaper, 16-VI-83, pg. 21

<sup>1456</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 880, 893 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

which for the proper reception of the Eucharist, one must put beforehand the confession of sins, when one is conscious of a mortal sin<sup>1457</sup>. Those who believe themselves to be in a state of grace can approach communion without confessing. However, it is always recommendable to make an act of contrition before taking communion.

---

<sup>1457</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2018 (14-II-81)8

## **CONFESSION**

### **Sin**

**53. - THE GRACE OF GOD IS RECOVERED BY BEING SORRY FOR OUR SINS AND BY GOING TO CONFESSION.**

1. The Sacrament of Penance pardons all the sins committed after Baptism<sup>1458</sup>.and it obtains the reliving of the merits obtained by the good works done, which were lost when committing a mortal sin<sup>1459</sup>

The sacrament of confession is also called “of reconciliation and forgiveness”. Apart from the sense of being reconciled with God it also means reconciliation with the Church.<sup>1460</sup>

**54. TO CONFESS MEANS TELLING YOUR CONFESSOR REPENTANTLY ALL THE SINS YOU HAVE COMMITTED SINCE YOUR LAST CONFESSION.**

1. Confession is an external sign of being sorry for our sins and of our reconciliation with the Church<sup>1461</sup>.

For a Christian, the sacrament of penitence is the only ordinary way to obtain forgiveness for sins committed after baptism<sup>1462</sup>.

---

<sup>1458</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio para la Iglesia, n° 911* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1459</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio para la Iglesia, n°2193* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1460</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*. Dogmatic Constitution of the church. N° 11

<sup>1461</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n°. 911

<sup>1462</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 2193

## 55 -THE SACRAMENT OF CONFESSION WAS INSTITUTED BY JESUS CHRIST.

1. Perhaps you may have heard uninformed people say “Confession was invented by priests”. This is totally false.

We know who invented printing (**Gutenberg**), the telescope (**Galileo**), the mercury thermometer (**Fahrenheit**), the lightning rod (**Franklin**), the electric battery (**Volta**), the telephone (**Bell**), the gramophone (**Edison**), the radio (**Marconi**), the submarine (**Peral**), x-rays (**Roentgen**), the auto-gyro (**La Cierva**), penicillin (**Fleming**), etc. -fine, but which priest invented Confession. It cannot be known, as he has never existed. And if it had been invented by a man, he would not have invented it for free! Because it is inconceivable that a man invent such a disagreeable thing for a priest - who has to sit in a narrow space for hours on end listening to the same things over and over again, with a risk to his health, etc. and all this without receiving a penny in return. Because when you offer a service, normally you get paid for it.

Besides from everything else, who is to have the authority to oblige the Pope to go to Confession? Actually he has the obligation to go to Confession, and does as frequently as all good Catholics should, as well as cardinals, bishops and priests of the whole world. If Confession had been invented by one of them, surely they themselves would have a dispensation?

Some Protestants, in order to not admit the sacrament of Confession say that this was established in the Council of Lateran. But this view cannot be supported by any cultured person, even among the protestants; because as it has been historically demonstrated, that the IV Council of Lateran held in 1215, decreed the obligation of going to Confession once a year<sup>1463</sup>. Whether by malice or by ignorance of the History of the Church, confused the institution of the sacrament of Confession with the precept of going to Confession yearly. But going to Confession has been practiced since the beginning of Christianity, though with less frequency. Back in the 3rd century we are told about a priest who was in charge of forgiving people’s sins<sup>1464</sup>. **Hermas** recommends confession in “The Shepherd” (c. 150 A.D.)<sup>1465</sup>.

Private Confession, as we know it today, dates from VI century; it was introduced by Irish monks who reacted against the practice of terrible penance that was in vogue in those times. From the penance of not being able to receive the Eucharist for the rest of one’s life.

2. The sacrament of Confession was **instituted by Jesus Christ**<sup>1466</sup> when he appeared to the apostles who were gathered together in the cenacle where the last supper had been held; he gave them the power to forgive sins by saying: “*If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained*”<sup>1467</sup>. Through these words of **Christ** told the apostles and therefore their legitimate successors<sup>1468</sup> the power to pardon and retain sins<sup>1469</sup> **Christ** instituted the sacraments to be administered by the church to the end of times. As the apostles were to die soon, the power to pardon sins is transmitted to their legitimate successors, the priests. The person who has the competence of the sacrament of penance is the priest, who according to the Canon Laws, has the power to absolve sinners<sup>1470</sup>.

It is evident that if a priest has the power to forgive or retain sins with equanimity, justice and responsibility, one supposes that the sinner has to manifest his sins. Only the sinner can inform the priest what degree of consent there was in his sin.

<sup>1463</sup> Fourth Council of Lateran in 1215. Chap XXI. DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia N° 437* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1464</sup> Socrates *Ecclesiastical History*, 5, 19 MIGNE Patrologia Griega Vol. 67, Col. 613s

<sup>1465</sup> HERMAS: *The Shepherd*, IV,3,4.

<sup>1466</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 911. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1467</sup> John., 20:23

<sup>1468</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1441

<sup>1469</sup> Council of Trent. DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 894 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1470</sup> Rite of Penance n°, b. pg. 13, 1975



The confessor and the penitent must be present at the time of confession, therefore, it is not valid to confess by letter, telephone, radio, television or E-Mail<sup>1471</sup>, because of the fact that there is no physical presence, the sacramental secret is jeopardized.

Because it is a law of the Church, those that have committed a mortal sin, must confess at **least once a year**<sup>1472</sup>, or before going to Communion<sup>1473</sup>, or if they are in danger of death. But this is in extreme cases. If one sincerely wants to be saved, you should not be happy with this. It is far better to go to Confession more frequently. Whenever you feel it is necessary so as to avoid habitually living in a state of mortal sin. Never live in a state of mortal sin.

A good Christian normally confesses once a month. Confession gives back to you the state of grace if you have lost it, it increases it if you have not lost it; and it gives you special help to avoid new sins.

Priests must allow confession to all who ask for it in a reasonable manner<sup>1474</sup>

**56.- SIN IS ALL ACTION OR VOLUNTARY OMISSION AGAINST THE LAW OF GOD,** which is, to say<sup>1475</sup>, do, think or want something against the commandments of the law of God or his Church or not to fulfill one's own obligations.

1. In his judgment concerning moral values, man cannot proceed according to his free will. In the innermost part of his conscience, man discovers the existence of a law that he does not dictate unto himself, but that he must obey. He has a law written by God in his heart, in whose obedience human dignity is fraught and for which he will be personally judged<sup>1476</sup>

Sin is a mystery and has a deeply profound religious meaning... To know it, we need the light of divine Christian revelation... Sin escapes reasoning.. Neither anthropology, nor history, nor psychology, nor ethic, nor the social sciences can delve into its deepness<sup>1477</sup>.

Some say that God is not affected by sin. Sin does not affect the divine nature, which is immutable, but it does affect the "Heart of the Father", who sees Himself rejected by the son He loves so much<sup>1478</sup>.

If sin would not offend God, it would be because God does not love. If God loves us, it is logical that he be "hurt" by my lack of love. The same way He would appreciate my love, He would be displeased by my contempt; speaking in an anthropological sense. But it is necessary to do so in this fashion in order to understand us. If God were to be insensible to my love or to my scorn, it would be a sign that He does not love me, that I am indifferent to Him. I do not mind the scorn of someone I do not know, but I do if it comes from someone I love. It isn't that man damages God. But God is "hurt" by my lack of love. The slap of a baby does not hurt the mother, but it does give her grief. She would prefer a peck on the cheek. It is all a matter of love.

God's immutability does not mean indifference. The immutability refers to the ontological sphere, not to the affective sphere. God is not a rock pinnacle; it is a heart. The God of the Gospel is the Father. Philosophy cannot change the Revelation.

<sup>1471</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral Para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, iv, nº 193, Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1472</sup> New Canon Code Law nº 906

<sup>1473</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 918 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1474</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 1464

<sup>1475</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 1849

<sup>1476</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*. Constitution on the Church in the actual world. nº 16

<sup>1477</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la fe cristiana*. 3ª, II, 50. Ed. BAC. Madrid 1975

<sup>1478</sup> JOSÉ A. SAYÉS: *Pecado Original*, VI, I. JFR Pamphlet, nº 24. EDAPOR. Madrid. 1988

It is a mystery as to how man's sin could affect God. But the fact that sin does affect God is a Biblical fact<sup>1479</sup>

Sin is above all, an offense to God<sup>1480</sup>.

The Bible expresses the offense of sin to God, through the image of adultery<sup>1481</sup>.

The Church has condemned the idea that there can be a sin that is merely rational or philosophical, that it should not merit God's punishment<sup>1482</sup>.

Sin means **not accepting God's will** more than actually breaking His law. Because of this someone can sin without going beyond the bounds of that law by consciously saying NO to God,

Whereas one can break the law of God without sinning, if one does not say NO to God in a voluntary way.

Sin is not something that befalls us unexpectedly, as lightning in the middle of a field. Sin grows slowly, little by little, within ourselves<sup>1483</sup>.

Repeated infidelities towards God, consenting disorderly conduct, irresponsible carelessness when you should be cautious, are preparing the fall.

Morals do not consist in the **mechanical fulfillment** of a series of precepts, but in our cordial answer to God's calling, which translates into a fundamental attitude in God's service.

2. The **fundamental option** is the permanent orientation of the will towards a goal. This attitude "must be explained in the faithful fulfillment of the precepts, not in a routine manner, but vivified through the dynamism that the Holy Spirit imprints in our hearts. The fundamental option is not to liberate oneself of the compliance of certain norms or precepts, but quite the contrary, in seeking within the life of each Christian. The fundamental option for God consists in placing God in the center of life. To hold Him as the Supreme Value towards whom all tendencies are oriented and through whom the multiple elections of each day are categorized<sup>1484</sup>.

The fundamental option is a free decision, which flows from the central nucleus of the person's faith, a total election in favor or against God, which conditions the acts that follow, and is of such density that it encompasses the person as a whole, giving a sense and orientation to his complete life

It is evident that in man, the attitude has more value than the acts. There are acts that express the fringe of the being and not the being of the man. The truly worthwhile acts are those that come from the ingrained conscious attitudes. It can be clearly seen that, even though the attitude is what authentically defines the moral of the man, the acts also have their importance, because, we repeat, conscious and free, they are on the way of converting themselves into an attitude<sup>1485</sup>. We can even say that there are acts of such transcendence, that, if they are carried out in a responsible fashion and without any possible attenuation, they become the **exponent** of an internal attitude<sup>1486</sup>. It is not necessary for the act to be repeated for it to be considered serious<sup>1487</sup>. Take the following as an example: an adulterous affair or a crime planned in cold blood, with full warning of the responsibility

<sup>1479</sup> JOSÉ A. SAYÉS: *Jesucristo Nuestro Señor*, VII, 4, 2. Ed. EDAPOR. Madrid. 1985

<sup>1480</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1440

<sup>1481</sup> Isaiah; 57:8

<sup>1482</sup> JUAN M. IGARTUA, S. I.: REINO DE CRISTO Magazine, 342 (V-1990) 5

<sup>1483</sup> JOHN PAUL II: *Ejercicios Espirituales para jóvenes*, I<sup>a</sup>, IV. Ed. BAC.-POPULAR. Madrid 1982.

<sup>1484</sup> RAFAEL CANALES, S. I.: PROYUECCIÓN Magazine, 62(X-68) 281-8

<sup>1485</sup> LUIS ELLACURÍA, S. I.: Moral de Actos y Moral de Actitudes, *Estudios de Deusto*, Vol. XV, 30 (IV-67) 145ss

<sup>1486</sup> RONALD LAWLER, O.F.M.: *La Doctrina de Jesucristo*, XIX, 4, e. Ed. Galduria, Jodar. (Jaén)

<sup>1487</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: Statements on matters of Sexual Ethics n° 10 ECCLESIA Magazine, 1773 (17-I-76) 73

which is being engaged, seeking the way to overcome all difficulties, and without stopping at the consequences, so as to fulfill our wish. What doubt could there be that it compromises the moral attitude of man? The fundamental option can be radically modified by particular acts<sup>1488</sup>. A fundamental option for God is not sincere if afterwards it is not confirmed through concrete acts. The acts are the manifestation of our option.

What does seem certain, however, is that the attitude does **not change** overnight. Changes in man take place slowly. Mortal sin, that separates man from God, is the final consequence of a period of lax morals<sup>1489</sup>. That is why we say that venial sin gets you ready for mortal sin

3. Some people are of the opinion that at the end of life, God will give everyone the opportunity to ask forgiveness for their sins, but this final option **cannot be founded** on anything that is written in the Bible<sup>1490</sup>. Because of this, it is not accepted by theologians of international status such as **Ratzinger, Rahner, Pozo, Alfaro, Ruiz de la Peña**, etc.

4. They are also other **sins of omission**. The sins committed by those who do no evil, except those people who did no good when they had all the opportunities to do so. <sup>1491</sup> **Jesus Christ** banishes to hell people that did no good, "*what you did not do with these*"<sup>1492</sup>.

Often one has the obligation to do good and one does not carry out that obligation so, therefore, that is considered a sin of omission. The faithful who think that our temporary tasks can be neglected because we are not going to be here on earth permanently, do not realize that our own personal faith makes us fulfill these tasks far better because of our personal vocation. But no less serious is the error of those who think that we must devote ourselves to these temporary tasks entirely as if these were removed from our religious life, they think that by going to mass and obeying certain obligations it is more than enough. The great divorce between the faith and daily lives of many people must be considered as one of the greatest errors of our times<sup>1493</sup>.

Today it is very normal to hear people talking about social sins, but really sin in its true sense is always the act of one person. A society in itself is not a subject of moral acts. What is true is that each one's sin, does, in a way affect everyone else. But at the bottom of any sinful situation, we shall always find people who are sinners<sup>1494</sup>

Although it is true that generalized personal sins will build an atmosphere of sin, you cannot dilute the personal responsibility in anonymous collective guilt<sup>1495</sup>.

5. The principal things that tempt us and make us sin are: the world (lax criteria, corrupt habits, unhealthy environment and other attractions), the devil with his temptations and the flesh with its sinful inclinations<sup>1496</sup>.

The inclination towards sin is called concupiscence. This is concretely found in the seven **Capital sins** which are:

**Arrogance** - a disorderly appetite of ones own excellence.

**Greed** - an overbearing treasuring of material goods.

<sup>1488</sup> JOHN PAUL II: *Reconciliación y Penitencia*, n° 17

<sup>1489</sup> HEGGEN: *La Penitencia, acontecimiento de Salvación*, I, 2, Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca

<sup>1490</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYÉS: *Más allá de la muerte*, VI, 1. Ed. San Pablo. Madrid. 1996

<sup>1491</sup> ORTEGA Y GAISÁN: *Valores humanos*, 2°, VI, Vitoria.

<sup>1492</sup> Matthew, 25:42s

<sup>1493</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes. Constitution on the church in the current world*. n° 43

<sup>1494</sup> JOHN PAUL II *Reconciliation and Penance*, n°16 ECCLESIA Magazine, 2204 (5-I-85) 26

<sup>1495</sup> JOSÉ MARIA IRABURU: *El matrimonio católico (Separata) Apéndices*, III, 2. Ed. Gratis Date. Pamplona. 1989

<sup>1496</sup> OTTO ZIMMERMANN, S. I.: *Teología ascética*, n° 25, II, B. Seminario Metropolitano, Buenos Aires.

**Lust** - a disorderly attachment to sexual pleasures.

**Anger** - a desire of vengeance.

**Gluttony** - a disorderly appetite to eat or drink

**Envy** - sorrow for the others possession and happiness in his illness.

**Laziness** - the negligence in fulfilling your own obligations.

The Apostle **James** says: "Each one is tempted..... by his own concupiscence"<sup>1497</sup>, and **John** "Whosoever commits a sin, is a servant of sin"<sup>1498</sup>. "He who sins, becomes the son of Satan"<sup>1499</sup>

Sometimes, a bad surrounding can pervert many Catholics. As **Paul VI** said in a moving allocution, "Many Christians of today, instead of being missionaries, are receptive to other missions; instead of converting, are converted,; instead of communicating **Jesus Christ's** spirit, they are contaminated by the spirit of the world."

We cannot overcome temptation by ourselves; but we have God's help and grace, if we look for them by praying and frequenting the sacraments. **Paul** says that God does not let the devil tempt us beyond our fortitude<sup>1500</sup>

Many times the devil uses men themselves to make us sin. Sometimes with his bad example. Others, also with his words. It is necessary to know how to fight against bad surroundings, and not be dragged towards sin by human respect. The best means to do this is to run from bad company and join good friends.

It frequently occurs that, in a group, the most undesirables are the leaders and they dominate a collection of weak and vulgar individuals. Be very careful that no one attempts against the integrity and rectitude of your personality. And should you integrate yourself into one of these groups, have the sufficient courage to be independent and leave the group, even though the rupture will bring upon you some disagreeable setback. Do not let it bother you. It has less importance and it is good to confront it. The best way to defeat the **bad surroundings** is to take a decisive attitude from the start, a clear and unbreakable one. If they see that they cannot poison you, it is useless, they will leave you in peace. But if they see that you waver, they will come back time and time again, until they overcome you.

**6. Human respect** is doing wrong for being ashamed of doing right, because of the fear of being criticized by others.

And **Jesus Christ** said: "Whosoever will deny Me before men, I will deny to My Father"<sup>1501</sup>.

It is an indignant cowardice. It is shameful to be afraid of the malicious smile of a person who, through his conduct is undeserving of our esteem. On the other hand, whosoever complies with his duties above all, is rewarded with the esteem of all good people, together with the respect of all that are not, "say what they may, on the outside" on the inside have no other recourse but to recognize and admire the superiority of honesty and virtue.

In your behavior, you must be courageous when others try to take you towards what is bad.. But you must not **boast about** it. If shyness and cowardice cheapen virtue, boasting also impairs one's reputation making it disagreeable and obnoxious to everyone.. Your behavior should be that of an honest, upright person, who knows what it is to fulfill one's obligations but who does not demean others; on the contrary, you must be kind and thoughtful to everyone, so that they know that they can

---

<sup>1497</sup> James, 1:4

<sup>1498</sup> John, 3:8

<sup>1499</sup> 1 John, 3:8

<sup>1500</sup> I Corinthians, 10:13

<sup>1501</sup> Matthew, 10:33

depend on you for anything that is not harmful. If you are an honest and kind person, you will soon have many followers. There is nothing so attractive as virtue, when it is carried out in a kind and brave way. The majority of people are imitators; they will follow someone who is capable of setting a good example.

Remember that **your behavior influences** other people. Perhaps you do not realize it. But a good example influences people far more than a bad one. Many do not dare to be the first to demonstrate this but they will follow someone who does. We Christians must, by our exemplary life, give witness to **Christ's doctrine**<sup>1502</sup>.

Transmission of faith is done by testimony. A Christian bears witness in the way he gives his whole self to God's work. Normally, the Christian doctrine truth is known through a Christian person<sup>1503</sup>.

7. You must be saintly happy; the best apostolate is that of joy. Let the world know that those who follow **Christ** are the most happy and joyful of people. Goodness is not nonsense, what's more only the good are truly happy. The joy of sin is a lie and its pleasure soon becomes a torment. Happiness is a gift of God and it is impossible to achieve if you turn your back on Him. Very frequently, a sinner in his innermost self is a sad, tired and bored person, things annoy him and he has no illusion.

But after making a good confession, do you not feel relieved and consoled? During a spiritual retreat for blue-collar workers, one of them gave me a note in which he had written: "The sensation of happiness and joy I feel after going to confession is so strong that for me there is nothing in the world that can be compared to it. It is something out of this world. It has exalted me to such an extent that I cried out of joy and repentance. I am not worthy of such happiness". I have not changed a word of what that good man wrote to me, I still have this note. I also have another note that was given to me after another spiritual retreat that said: "Father, after confession I feel full of joy, Christ is in my soul. I have never felt so happy in all my life as I do now. You have helped me to obtain true happiness". The famous Mexican poet **Amado Nervo** confessed on his death bed, and immediately after told his friends "I have confessed and I feel completely happy"<sup>1504</sup>. Really the happiness of a **clean conscience** cannot be compared with the bitterness that is left behind after sin. Selfish pleasure before sampling it, attracts, but disillusion afterwards. And if in order to satisfy this pleasure one degrades oneself and sins, the emptiness that is left in the soul is nothing like the happiness I feel after doing some good work that needed a sacrifice on my part.

8. Sin is the **worst of the evils**<sup>1505</sup>. Worse even than death itself, which is only bad if it surprises us in a state of sin. Death in a state of grace is the step to eternal happiness. All other sorrows finish with this present life. Only sin torments in eternal life.

Many people who harden towards anything spiritual, live peacefully in sin. They will have the most terrible surprise in the next life. They will realize how **mistaken** they were about the most important thing in their lives - to save oneself for all eternity.

Above all, sin is an offense against a God who is infinitely good, a Father who loves me as nobody has ever loved me. That is why, sin is an evil that has no equal in this life.

Man cannot renounce, he cannot become a slave of the economic systems, of production and of its products<sup>1506</sup>. Man sometimes is overanxious to possess, enjoy, being independent; you can

<sup>1502</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*, Dogmatic constitution on the Church. N° 35

<sup>1503</sup> JUÁN MOUROUX: *Creo en ti. III* Ed. Flors. Barcelona

<sup>1504</sup> ROCA VIVA Magazine, 299 (IV-93) 177

<sup>1505</sup> OTTO ZIMMERMANN, S. I.: *Teología Ascética*, n°22 *Seminario Metropolitano*. Buenos Aires

<sup>1506</sup> JOHN PAUL II: Encyclical: *El Redentor del Hombre*, n° 16

also find in him the desire for money, or hypocrisy, injustice, egoism, pride, cowardness, lies, etc. All these vices affect society. They produce unrest, indignation, rebelliousness.

**Jesus** preached truth, He never had anything to do with sin and injustice. This attitude of betrayal and rejection led Him to His death.

**Jesus**, when He condemned sin, wanted to awaken the dignity of man. Man, because of sin, apart from rejecting God, becomes a slave of things that have far less value than he has<sup>1507</sup>.

**Saint John Chrisostomos** says:

When I see you live in a manner contrary to reason, how shall I call you? Man or beast.

When I see you abscond with things that belong to others, how shall I call you? Man or wolf.

When I see you cheat others, what shall I call you? Man or serpent.

When I see you act stubbornly, what shall I call you? Man or mule.

When I see you basking in lust, what shall I call you? Man or swine.

Worse even. For each beast has a single vice: the wolf is a thief, the serpent is a liar, the swine is dirty, but man can have the vices of all of the dimwitted<sup>1508</sup>.

9. There are people who have lost the **sense of sin** and reject the doctrine of the Church when it defines something as sin. They say: "I do not see that it can be a sin, besides that, everyone does it." This does not prove anything.

Things do not become good because they are frequent, drugs, terrorism, rape, etc. And also, the opinion of the majority does not change the reality observed by a scholar.

Moral cannot change with the fashion of every season. Today it is fashionable to allow abortion, but it will always be an injustice to condemn an innocent life to death. Democracy is now in vogue, but the good and bad do not depend on what the majority says. They are absolute values. And a minority of scholars are worth more than a majority that is not. If it is a case of health, the opinion of three doctors is much more valuable than the opinion of a majority group formed by a hairdresser, a carpenter, a language teacher, an architect, etc. The same goes as to piloting a plane, or of morals. Democracy is only valid when all of those whose opinion is cast know the subject, for example, in a doctor's consultation. But the opinion of the majority is not sufficient if they do not understand the subject.

Even though everyone in town says that the water of a certain fountain is drinkable, as they do not see any microbe in it, if the person in charge of public health, assisted by his microscope, says that the water is contaminated, that it is not to be drunk, even if : people cannot see anything wrong in it. The Church has a special assistance from God to take men to their salvation, in other words, to signal what is good or bad.

It is a very extended fallacy these days, which is demagogic and false, " democratic pluralism demands ethic relativism". As if the respect to everyone's liberty is founded on the fact that an objective truth does not exist nor does good on all things and also on human nature. This is an error. What can never be done is to use coercion and violence to impose my concept of truth and goodness. But if I do not defend what I consider that which in my mind is good and true, I would be unjust with the people who surround me. Democracy is not a means to define what is true or false., good or bad. To believe that popular vote is what determines malice or goodness, truth or falsehood, is an error. To convert democracy into a substitute of rational capacity for man to distinguish truth is fallacious. Democracy does not imply ethical relativism. Respect for freedom of conscience does not imply hiding the truth or the objective good of things. We have the right and the obligation of

<sup>1507</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *School Catechism*, 4° EGB, n° 9

<sup>1508</sup> SAINT JOHN CHRISOSTOMOS: MIGNE. *Patrologia Latina*, LV, 500

defending the good and the truth in a society to try to have truth and goodness reflected in the Laws<sup>1509</sup>.

Not everything that is democratically ordered has the guarantee of being fair<sup>1510</sup>

Each one of us is obligated to obey his conscience<sup>1511</sup>. But this conscience must be well formed, because man can fool himself considering as good what he likes or is convenient to him. This is why the Authority of the Church, which is objective and independent, signals what is good or bad. **Pope John Paul II** states in his encyclical *Veritatis Splendor*: There are objective norms of morality, valid for all men, of yesterday, today and tomorrow. We must mold our conscience to the teachings of **Christ** and of the Church. Education of the conscience is indispensable for the human beings who subject to negative influences and tempted by sin to prefer their own judgment and reject the authorized teachings<sup>1512</sup>. An erroneous conscience is not always exempt of guilt<sup>1513</sup>. Only the invincible ignorance is exempt from guilt<sup>1514</sup>. Only the erroneous conscience because of an involuntary error and unaware is free from guilt. But as soon as the error is discovered, rectification must be made. The conscience is not **well formed** if it does not follow the Magisterium of the Church, as **John Paul II** stated in the Second International Congress of Moral Theology<sup>1515</sup>

## 57 THERE ARE TWO KINDS OF SIN. MORTAL AND VENIAL<sup>1516</sup>

To sin is to offend God<sup>1517</sup>. Imperfection does not venial a venial sin. It is usually defined as “a deliberate omission of a better good. Being able to do a better good, you elect a lesser good<sup>1518</sup>

## 58 MORTAL SIN IS DIFFERENT FROM VENIAL SIN IN AS MUCH AS THE FIRST IS VERY SERIOUS AND THE SECOND IS LIGHT<sup>1519</sup>.

1. It is not the same to commit adultery --which is always serious--, as to say a white lie --which may not always be important--. Serious sin breaks our friendship with God, venial does not<sup>1520</sup>.

Some people draw distinctions between serious sin and mortal sin. But **Pope John Paul II** said, “Serious sin practically identifies itself in the doctrine and pastoral action of the Church with mortal sin. The triple distinction of sin as venial, serious and mortal could emphasize a scale in serious sins. But the main principle is firm about the essential and decisive difference between sin that destroys charity and sin that does not kill supernatural life. Between life and death there is no

<sup>1509</sup> BENIGNO BLANCO: MUNDO CRISTIANO Magazine, 396 (II-95) 47

<sup>1510</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Moral y sociedad democrática*, n° 36. EDICE. Madrid. 1996

<sup>1511</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Dignitatis Humanae*, Statement on Religious Freedom, n° 11.

<sup>1512</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1783

<sup>1513</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1801

<sup>1514</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1793

<sup>1515</sup> ECCLESIA Magazines, 2405-6 (7-I-89) 26

<sup>1516</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1854

<sup>1517</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1850

<sup>1518</sup> JOSÉ RIVERA-IRABURU. *Sintesis de la espiritualidad Católica*, XVI. 5 Gratis Date. Pamplona.

<sup>1519</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1855

<sup>1520</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1863

intermediate life<sup>1521</sup>". That is why the New Catechism of the Catholic Church makes no distinction between serious sins and mortal sins<sup>1522</sup>.

**59.-** The effects of mortal sin are: the loss of God's friendship, the destruction of the supernatural life of our soul and the danger of condemning ourselves to hell, if we die in a state of mortal sin<sup>1523</sup>

1. All of the above lines limited to our spiritual well-being, but in our human well-being how many terrible things happen to us through sins against God's law, illnesses, imprisonment, families ruined and disgraced.

If you notice that the dress you are wearing has a grease spot you would probably change it immediately, or if your face is dirty you would wash it straight away, as you would not dream of going out with a dirty dress or face. Aren't you ashamed that your soul is repulsive to God and Our Lady?. If you have a stone in your shoe you will not be happy until you have gotten rid of it, how can you have a quiet conscience if you have a mortal sin in you soul?

**60** The effects of venial sin are: putting in danger the supernatural life of our soul and predisposing us to more serious sins<sup>1524</sup>.

1.- Venial sin is the voluntary transgression of the Law of God, but in a slight way<sup>1525</sup>. If you have a slight cough but you do not care of it, it can lead you to the grave. A small hole in a tooth is nothing serious, but if you do not get it treated you could need to have it extracted.

It is not that venial sin **becomes serious**. Even a few venial sins do not necessarily become serious sins<sup>1526</sup>, but venial sin predisposes people to more serious sins because it weakens our self-will and it deprives us of the supernatural graces that help us to fight against serious sin. Venial sins do not deny us entry into God's kingdom<sup>1527</sup>.

We should have due diligence in avoiding venial sins, which are clearly indicated and voluntary. Avoiding the semi deliberate supposes a special Grace of God. The Holy Virgin Mary had this privilege<sup>1528</sup>.

2. A sin that **in itself** is slight, because the cause is slight, can become serious if:

a) the person who commits the sin believes, mistakenly, that the sin is serious, e.g. steal a 25 cent piece.

b) if someone sins with the idea of inciting another person into sinning, e.g. insulting the other person in such a way that the other ends up using blasphemous language.

<sup>1521</sup> JOHN PAUL II: *Reconciliación y Penitencia*. N° 17 ECCLESIA Magazine, 2204 (5-I-85)29s

<sup>1522</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1854

<sup>1523</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1874

<sup>1524</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1863

<sup>1525</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 1ª, III, n°54* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1526</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 1ª, III, n°55* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1527</sup> Rite of Penance, n°47. 1975

<sup>1528</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 1ª, III, n°57* Ed. BAC. Madrid



c) to hurt someone or to try and hurt someone or to be the cause of public scandal, e.g. young people whose behavior is not correct in public.

d) to run a risk of sinning seriously through, for example, entering a porno-show only through curiosity!

e) in some special cases where because of small thefts that have been carried out frequently, stolen objects accumulate.

3. There are people who like to ask where the limit between slight sin and serious sin is.

But that is as difficult to answer as to demonstrate where one color starts and another color finishes in a rainbow.

That is why, when in doubt many tell the confessor: I repent just as I am, in the presence of God.

## 61. SIN IS SERIOUS WHEN THE FOLLOWING THREE THINGS OCCUR TOGETHER

1) WHEN THE CAUSE IS VERY, VERY SERIOUS (in itself or in the circumstances) or that I believe it is serious even though in itself it is not.

2) WHEN DOING IT, I KNOW IT IS SERIOUS

3) THAT I WANT TO DO IT IN SPITE OF KNOWING THAT IT IS SERIOUS.

For a sin to be serious these **three things** must occur at the same time, If not, no serious sin has been committed<sup>1529</sup>, e.g.

1) I deliberately tell a lie, I say that I have been to London when I have not. This cannot be a serious sin because though I deliberately lie, there is no serious cause. I do not hurt anyone.

2) Someone does not know that becoming completely and utterly drunk is serious, and at a party they deliberately become totally drunk. Though the cause is serious and that person has voluntarily become drunk, he does not commit a serious sin because he **did not realize** that the cause was serious.

3) It is a Sunday, someone is working at sea as a member of a fishing fleet. He knows that it is Sunday but in the circumstances it is impossible to attend Mass. He does not commit a sin because though the cause is serious and he realizes that he has the obligation to attend Mass, he simply cannot go due to the circumstances. This absence from Mass is not therefore voluntary, and no sin is committed.

A **serious cause** is an important thing<sup>1530</sup>, it can be serious in itself, e.g. blasphemy-or in its circumstances- the telling of a lie which causes great harm to someone.

A **warning** of the seriousness of the cause must accompany or precede the action.

It is not enough to realize it was wrong after committing the sin<sup>1531</sup>, guilty ignorance (I did not know it was a sin) does not excuse the sin<sup>1532</sup>.

<sup>1529</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1857

<sup>1530</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1858

<sup>1531</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia, 2ª, V, n°136* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1532</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1859

The knowledge of sin should be taken into account. I must realize that by committing this sin I compromise my fundamental attitude of love and service to God and I am doing something that God has forbidden.

The **acquiescence** of one's will should be perfect.

This means that there should be freedom to do anything or not to do it.

Anyone who does not have this freedom to choose to do or not to do something does not use his will and therefore does not sin. Someone who is in prison does not sin if they do not let him go to Mass.

For sin to exist, **it is not necessary** to want to offend God directly, that would be diabolic. Anyone who voluntarily does what he know offends God, is sinning against God.<sup>1533</sup>

To go against God's Law, is offensive to God.

If someone steals your purse and tells you that he did not mean to offend you as he only wanted your money that would not make you very happy.

By attacking your rights he is offending you even though it is not his intention to do so.

"Man commits mortal sin not only when his behavior proceeds from his direct contempt of the love of God and his fellow men but also when he freely and deliberately chooses an object or purpose that is seriously irregular or lawless, be as it may be, the motive of this choice<sup>1534</sup>".

To sin it is sufficient to **freely do something** that I know is sinful, realizing it is sinful.

If, when I do something I do not realize it is sinful then I do not sin.

If any of these **three conditions** are lacking, then serious sin has not been committed.

What I mean is when the cause is not serious, or it is serious but I do not realize it, or I do realize it but I do it without meaning to or without realizing what I am doing.

In these cases there is not serious sin. As you can see anything done unintentionally (through ignorance, neglect or in a fit of rage) or anything that is done without someone's full consent or without full warning -is not a serious sin.

What is done through invincible ignorance or extrinsic violence, is never a sin<sup>1535</sup>.

2. Anything one does while dreaming is not a sin even though it would be if one was awake, as one is unconscious.

However it would be, if, while awake, you intentionally continue what has started while you were asleep.

For it to be a serious sin one must be completely awake, take pleasure in the forbidden deliberately and with one's full will. What you do half asleep and drowsy is only a venial sin.

It cannot lead to mortal sin if the situation lacks full knowledge and full consent.

<sup>1533</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *Razones para creer*, II,4. Ed. Paulinas, Madrid. 1992

<sup>1534</sup> PAUL VI: *Algunas cuestiones de ética sexual*, n° 10 (29-XII-75)

<sup>1535</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1862

Because of this in problems of chastity, even if awake, if an inevitable physiological event happens, ignore it and then no sin occurs.

3. As far as **doubtful sins** are concerned those sins in which you do not really know if there was full knowledge and full consent, you should perhaps ask your confessor but it is not obligatory.

The doubt can also be if the serious sin was committed or not, if it was confessed or not, if the matter of the sin was serious or venial.

In none of the three cases is there the obligation of confessing it; although it is better to do it, while manifesting the doubt to the confessor.

But if you have any doubts whether something is or is not a serious sin and you are to be in the same situation to commit it again, you have a serious obligation to ask about it before doing it -if there are serious reasons to suspect that it could be a mortal sin.

4. When you are in doubt whether an action is licit or not, you can apply what the theologians call "**probabilism**",

Any law that is doubtful for you does not put you under obligation as long as it deals with actions that do not harm anyone, materially or spiritually, e.g. you are going to Communion and you are not certain whether you have fasted for an hour, you think you have but you cannot remember exactly. In this case you can dismiss your doubt knowing that your action is licit because in these circumstances this law, now doubtful for you, puts you under no obligation.

But although the probability is licit, those people who have a sensitive conscience know that just because it is licit it does not mean that it is pleasing to God. For love of Him and for generosity one can overcome what is licit for what is pleasing to God.

5. It is most convenient to **instruct oneself clearly** about what is a sin and what is not a sin, because if I believe that something is a grave sin, even if it is not, but in spite of this I voluntarily commit that sin, then I commit a grave sin, e.g. I believe that stealing a penny is a grave sin, but in spite of everything I steal it, then I am committing a grave sin.

The education of the conscience is indispensable<sup>1536</sup>. A mistaken conscience is guilty if it is due to the lack of concern to know the truth and the good<sup>1537</sup>

6. Therefore a sinful action is not a sin if when I committed it I did not realize it was a sin.

A licit and permitted action will be a sin if, when I sinned I mistakenly thought it was a sin but even so I did it deliberately.

The sin will be serious, if when I committed it I mistakenly thought it was serious even though the cause was not serious.

A sin will be slight if I thought it was venial, even though I later find out that I sin again knowing that it is a serious sin, then it becomes a serious sin.

The reason for all this is that God judges our sins exactly **as we have then in our conscience**.

What God punishes is the bad disposition that we have when we do something, not our mistakes or involuntary errors. But we must try to have our conscience well formed.

Whoever doubts if he is in the truth, must call on the means to leave this situation<sup>1538</sup>

<sup>1536</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1783

<sup>1537</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1791

7. To sin, **it is sufficient to have the intention** of committing the sin even if afterwards you do not carry it out. I am guilty of sin at the moment that I have decided to commit it, e.g. I sin seriously when I have the intention of committing adultery, but due to difficulties or circumstances I cannot carry out that intention. Obviously a sin committed is more serious than an intended one but only the intention is already a sin.

You take an amount of money with the intention of stealing it but later you find out that that money is your own, you have committed a **formal sin** though there has been **no material sin**.

8. On 6th August 1993 **Pope John Paul II** published “Veritatis splendor”, a document which put an end to the moral subjectivism that was becoming widespread in the Church. Many people think they have the right to decide what is good and what is bad according to their conscience and forgetting God’s law. Good and bad are objective and do not depend on people’s opinions.

It is important to direct one’s life towards God, but even if there is no explicit rejection of God, mortal sin is the result of a voluntary transgression of moral law.

**Monsignor Yanes**, Chairman of the Spanish Episcopal conference, has said “Veritatis Splendor is a thorough presentation of some fundamental aspects of Christian moral, and is an invitation to reflection. It represents a sincere desire to seek find the truth. It demands that we take our lives and our vocation to God seriously<sup>1539</sup>.”

In Veritatis Splendor, the Pope says: No. 62; The conscience is not exempt from the possibility of error. No. 63; Sin committed through ignorance or by error of judgment may not be imputed to the person who commits it... but when the conscience is mistaken, because the person is not searching for the truth, he risks his dignity.

No. 34; Mankind has the obligation to search for the truth, and once he has found it, he must follow it. No. 70; A serious sin committed with full knowledge and deliberate consent, is a mortal sin. No. 68; By any deliberately committed mortal sin, man offends God who has given the law in spite of keeping his faith, he loses sanctifying grace. No. 67; The fundamental option is revoked when a person risks his freedom in conscious choices that oppose moral law. No. 64; The Church represents a great help for Christians in the formation of the conscience.. No. 40; The Church illumines the objective truth of natural law, the work of God. No. 61; The person who disconnects itself from the objective truth of natural law is mistaken..No.104; It is unacceptable to make one’s own weakness the criteria for truth in order to justify oneself. No. 60; The conscience is not an independent source for deciding what is right and wrong. No. 64; By the will of **Christ**, the Catholic Church is the teacher of the truth and its mission is to declare and confirm the principles of moral order that proceed from nature itself. No. 115; The Lord has entrusted **Peter** with strengthening his brothers.Nos. 64,110,116; The Church serves the conscience by helping it not to stray from the truth. No. 76; The faithful are obliged to recognize and respect the specific moral precepts declared and taught by the Church in the name of God. No. 28,95; The Church has authority not only in questions of faith but also in questions of morality. No. 83; Faith has a moral content, it provokes and demands a coherent obligation with one’s life. No. 88; Truth is not authentic unless it is acted upon and put into practice. No. 32; Liberty is not an absolute value. No. 34 Liberty must be subjected to truth. No. 96 There is no liberty outside of truth. No. 33; We would arrive to a relativistic of moral. No. 35; Revelation shows that the power of deciding between good and bad does not belong to man, but only to God. No. 113; Moral doctrine cannot depend of a democratic style deliberation. No 51; Natural law is universal in its precepts, and its authority encompasses all mankind. No. 97 & 101;

<sup>1538</sup> JESUS MARTINEZ GARCIA: *Hablemos DE La Fe. III, 7*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1539</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2653-54 (9-16, X, 93) 6

Citizens and public officers must uphold it. No. 116. The opinions of theologians do not constitute a teaching norm. No. 113; In the opposition, the teachings of the Pastors, one cannot recognize the legitimate expression of Christian freedom, nor the diversity of the gifts of the holy Spirit. Pastors have the obligation to demand that the rights of the faithful to receive the Christian doctrine be always respected, in its purity and in its integrity. No. 94 There are moral truths and values for which one is willing to give his life for. No. 120; No pleasing philosophical or theological doctrine can make man truly happy, only the cross and Glory of **Christ** resurrected can give peace to his conscience and salvation to his life.

## **Commandments**

### **62. THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF GOD.**

1. The commandments are rules of conduct dictated by God to Humanity. These rules are the way shown to man to help him achieve eternal happiness. **Jesus Christ** said: "If you would enter into life, keep the commandments"<sup>1540</sup>.

The division and numbering of the commandments has varied in the course of history. The current one is from **Saint Augustine**. The orthodox have a different division.

The commandments are precepts of the natural law<sup>1541</sup>, imprinted by God on the soul of each human being<sup>1542</sup>. They oblige every man and woman of every country and they are binding until the end of time, they constitute the fundamentals of all individual and social morals<sup>1543</sup>.

"The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul"<sup>1544</sup> is stated in the scriptures.

God has imprinted these commandments on the soul of each person in such a way that although they may consider themselves to be atheists and deny God's existence, they acknowledge these law imposed by God on men and they feel offended when they are called thieves or liars. Catholic moral not only obligates Catholics, it obligates all men. As it is based on the natural law<sup>1545</sup>. All men, Catholic and non Catholic, are obliged to not kill, nor steal, or exploit the brethren, injure, etc. This does not exclude that there are commandments that are exclusive for Catholics, such as going to mass, the sacraments, etc.

The commandments are the moral law that God gave to **Moses** in the Old Testament and that Christ perfected in the New Testament<sup>1546</sup>. They are based on the fact that God is our master and our father and he can command. But as he is so perfect whatever he commands is for our good. With the commandments, God protects our rights and those of our fellow beings.

Commandments are **not capricious prohibitions** to hinder man's liberty. It is the just and wise law with which God wants to govern us for our own good.

The commandments are for everybody; and to save oneself we must obey them. It is not sufficient to say: "I neither steal or kill". To save oneself we must obey **every commandment**. To condemn oneself it is only necessary to break one commandment. If you want to cross a bridge, it is important that none of its spans has collapsed, that the whole bridge be in good condition<sup>1547</sup>, otherwise you cannot cross it. St. James in his letters says: "For whoever keeps the whole law but fails in one point has become guilty of all of it"<sup>1548</sup>

2. God's commandments constitute the **most perfect and most complete** program that has ever been given to the world -so as to achieve. peace and tranquility for individuals, families, countries. In keeping the commandments is the secret of going through life in a dignified way. If you

---

<sup>1540</sup> Matthew, 19:17

<sup>1541</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1954-60

<sup>1542</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2070

<sup>1543</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2072

<sup>1544</sup> Psalm 19,7

<sup>1545</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1ª, III, n° 84*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1546</sup> Matthew, 5:17-48

<sup>1547</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2079

<sup>1548</sup> James, 2:10

want that the whole world respect you and hold you in high esteem, keep the commandments. Besides, I assure you that your life will be much happier than if you do not keep them.

Some of the greatest tragedies that we frequently see in this life occur because the commandments are not observed- That is why jails are full of unfortunates, the reason for the hunger of many children, the many quarrels in the families, so many tears and so much sorrow. If God's commandments, many of today's problems would disappear: delinquency, terrorism, rape, single mothers, adultery, out of wedlock children, abortions, homosexuality, drugs, AIDS, etc. If the whole world were to comply with the commandments, life on earth would be heavenly.

Because we do not observe the Commandments of the Law of God, then, as is said by **Hobbes**, "*man is wolf to man*"

We do not deny that an Atheist can be an honest man. But he is lacking a good motivation. His morals can crumble with ease, the same way as a house of cards. "A law from which one can easily withdraw oneself without risk, is not efficient. **Edmund Scherer** has said: Morality is nothing if it is not religious. Without God, without soul and without future life, moral is an idol that man destroys the day he realizes that it is his work<sup>1549</sup>. Each will act according to his own desires as is said by **Benezech**<sup>1550</sup>.

A society that does not accept authentic values is on its way to suicide. For many, today, the following have no value: family, matrimonial fidelity, children, the unborn, sexual morality, honesty, truth. Religion, moral,... Where are we going in this heading? What future awaits us? God says in the Bible :"*I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the people*"<sup>1551</sup>.

The recognition of God in no way opposes human dignity, but rather, is its foundation. When man organizes the world without God, he ends up organizing a society against man<sup>1552</sup>.

3. The fulfillment of the commandments sometimes is burdensome. We must refrain ourselves, resign. But the commandments will take us to heaven. They are like the wheels in a car, they may be heavy, but thanks to them, the car will go forward. A car without wheels, no one can move it. God, through his grace, makes his commands possible<sup>1553</sup>.

4. Catholic moral is not repressive, as some say. It does not take freedom away from man. It orients so that he can fully realize himself as a man. Just like the tracks of a railroad, who force it to go through a given way, but help it in advancing and arriving. They avoid it from falling down the embankment. Some consider God as an enemy of human freedom, and think that man will be totally free when he emancipates himself from God and religion. However, by being under God's law, we are fully developed human beings. As we are free of the slavery of our own disorderly instincts. Freedom is the capacity of being able to choose between two authentic values But to choose the bad or evil, foregoing the good, is not freedom but slavery. The fact that some choose to be slaves is truly lamentable. But jewels do not lose their values even though there are people that cannot appreciate it. Freedom with God is authentic. Freedom without God is a deceit. God does not take away liberty

<sup>1549</sup> H. PINARD DE LA BOULLAVE, S. I. ; *Jesús, luz del mundo*, 1, 2. Ed. Razón y Fe. Madrid.

<sup>1550</sup> A. BENEZECH: *Le critique religieuse*, I. 383

<sup>1551</sup> Isaiah, 51:4

<sup>1552</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Esta es nuestra fe*, 2ª, III, 2, 4, c. EDICE. Madrid

<sup>1553</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2082

for the good, but only for the bad. With this, He helps man. To choose the bad is an error. To remove freedom for the bad is good.

“There is no true liberty but in the service of good and of justice<sup>1554</sup>”. “The exercise of freedom does not imply the right to do or say anything”<sup>1555</sup>.

That is why a Christian feels free - not because he does what he wants but because he does what God wants. He freely obeys God, without coercion. “what makes us free, is not wanting to accept that which is superior to us, but to gladly revere that which is superior to us. (**Goethe**). “I am free when I elect what perfects me as a human being. If I only act in accordance with my temporary whims, I am a slave of my trend to take the agreeable as a supreme value. What is agreeable is a value, but it is found on the bottom of the scale of values.”<sup>1556</sup>

### **63. THE FIRST COMMANDMENT OF THE LAW OF GOD IS: THOU SHALL LOVE THY GOD ABOVE ALL THINGS.**

1. Loving God does not precisely mean to **have a loving feeling** towards Him as we do towards our parents, because we cannot see God and for those people who we cannot see it makes it rather difficult for us to love them. God does not force us do this, as it is not in our hands.

Although there are those that can get to feel it, with the grace of God... Loving God above everything else is to esteem him supremely, which means that one must be convinced that God is worth much more than anything else, and because of that one prefers Him above anything else in this world. You can have much more love for a painting that one of your children has done than for any painting that is exposed in any Museum in the world, although you know that the paintings in museums have much more artistic value. One's love for God is appreciative.

2. We must love God because he loved us first<sup>1557</sup> and we must correspond this love.

Love is manifested by action, not words. Actions speak louder than words. To love God is to obey Him, heed to His will. Do no harm to anyone<sup>1558</sup>. Do good unto all<sup>1559</sup>.

Proof of one's love for God above everything else is by obeying his commandments<sup>1560</sup> What I mean is that you are prepared to lose everything rather than offend him. This is the case of **Saint Pelagius of Cordoba**, and of **Antonio Molle** of **Santa Maria Goretti** and **Josefina Vilaseca**, who allowed themselves to be knifed and become martyrs rather than to commit a grave sin.

**Saint Pelagius** died a martyr in the year 925, because he rejected the dishonest propositions of the Califf **Abderraman III** of Cordoba.

**Antonio Molle**, a youngster from Jerez, who at age twenty was mutilated and made martyr in 1936 during the Spanish Civil War. He fell prisoner to the militia at the Peñafior (Seville) front, and as he was wearing a scapular, they wanted to make him blaspheme. He shouted his answer: Long live Christ the Lord! They cut his ears and poked his eyes out, and at the end, they riddled him with bullets.

<sup>1554</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1733

<sup>1555</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1740

<sup>1556</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS *El amor humano, I, 4*. EDIBESA, Madrid

<sup>1557</sup> I John, 4:19

<sup>1558</sup> Thessalonians, 5:15 & 22

<sup>1559</sup> Con vosotros está. 2º, XXXVII, 2. Madrid 1978.

<sup>1560</sup> John 5:3



So recounts **Raquel de las Heras**, an eye witness<sup>1561</sup>. His mutilated body now lays in rest at the Basilica of our Lady of Crowned Carmen in Jerez de la Frontera (Cadiz).

**Maria Goretti**, Italian, died a martyr, succumbing to fifteen stabs with a knife for refusing to surrender to the impure desires of her friend, who later converted and died a Franciscan Friar.

**Josefina Vilaseca** also died of stab wounds in December 1952, in Artés, diocese of Vich, when refusing to surrender her virginity. She was 12 years old.<sup>1562</sup>

**Jesus Christ** said: "He who has my commandments and keeps them, it is he who loves me<sup>1563</sup>. And **John** said, "The love of God means keeping his commandments<sup>1564</sup>".

The first commandment obliges us to believe in all of the truths of faith; to have hope in God, that he will give us the necessary grace to obtain eternal life<sup>1565</sup>; to only adore Him, to venerate Him as is His due, and worship Him with body and soul.

This commandment orders us to adore God<sup>1566</sup>.

This commandment especially forbids idolatry<sup>1567</sup>, which is to adores as God something or someone else<sup>1568</sup>

3. People who mistreat other people, places or things which are consecrated to God, sin against this commandment. This sin is called a **sacrilege**<sup>1569</sup>. One also commits a sacrilege when he administers or receives, in a state of mortal sin, any sacrament that requires a state of grace, this is very grave; e.g. if someone marries or goes to Communion in a state of mortal sin.

Another sin is committed against this commandment by those who distrust God's mercy<sup>1570</sup>, or is fearless of his mercy, remaining for a long time in mortal sin; or he that sins and sins, precisely because God is merciful and has promised us His forgiveness; who has faith in soothsayers, card readers and horoscopes<sup>1571</sup>, mediums and charlatans<sup>1572</sup>; who seriously believes superstitious things (lucky 13, chain letters, etc); who denies or voluntarily doubts of a truth in faith, or ignores, through his own fault what is necessary of religion.

Man is either religious or superstitious. Many who do not believe in the truths of the Religion, therefore believe in the lies and trickery of the soothsayers, mediums and diviners.

**Parapsychology** is not the same as superstition. Superstition is to attribute to things creative powers that belong only to God<sup>1573</sup>. Parapsychology deals with natural events although they are beyond psychology. They are paranormal phenomenon. On the other hand, superstition is to attribute results completely out of proportion to the causes employed.. Everything that exceeds the normal natural causes is of supernatural origin. Only God knows the free future and only He can reveal the future to is prophets<sup>1574</sup>.

<sup>1561</sup> ÁNGEL GARCÍA: *Un mártir de la boina roja*, 2ª, IV, 2, Apartado 31001, Barcelona

<sup>1562</sup> HOGAR DE LA MADRE Magazine, 71 (VII, VIII-1996) 22

<sup>1563</sup> John, 14:21

<sup>1564</sup> 1 John 5:3

<sup>1565</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1817

<sup>1566</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2096

<sup>1567</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2110

<sup>1568</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 1º, 2ª, I n° 360 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1569</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2120

<sup>1570</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2091

<sup>1571</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2116

<sup>1572</sup> OSCAR GONZÁLEZ DE QUEVEDO, S. I. : *Curanderismo: ¿un mal o un bien?*

<sup>1573</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2111

<sup>1574</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2115

4. Any doubt about a truth concerning religion has to be voluntary before becoming a sin<sup>1575</sup>. It is not a sin because one realizes how difficult a certain mystery is to understand, or that we are not capable of understanding, etc. But if in spite of this one confides in God's revelation and one believes, then not only are one's doubts not a sin but they are a merit!<sup>1576</sup>.

In the absolute divine veracity—the formal root of faith—there is no room for error or deceit<sup>1577</sup>.

What one can never do, in spite of the deep obscurity of the mystery in question, is to doubt whether it is a truth or not. This positive doubt, from the point of view that one accepts it as uncertain what God has revealed, is then a sin.

The sin against faith is in the negation or in the voluntary doubt of that which known to have been revealed by God<sup>1578</sup>. This is not opposed to the lack of clarity we may have about a truth of faith, nor of the desire to clarify it, within the possibility, knowing that there are mysteries which surpass all understanding.

The sin becomes a grave sin when a voluntary doubt is accepted, knowing that it concerns a truth that the church says that one must believe in. If the doubt is not voluntary but a mere occurrence of the difficulties that we may encounter in our understanding, then there is no sin, at the most only a venial sin; if one has been negligent in resisting the temptation. If, however, one has a doubt in any dogma of the church, then that is a grave sin against the faith. Faith must cover all the truths revealed by God and proposed as such by the church.

No one loses faith without being guilty of it<sup>1579</sup>. The Council of Trent said: "God does not abandon anyone, if He is not abandoned first<sup>1580</sup>."

A grave sin against faith is **apostasy**. It is the sin committed by a baptized person who rejects the truths of faith. Be it partial or total "Whosoever dies in this rebelliousness, is surely condemned<sup>1581</sup>."

5. No adult can be saved if he does not do an **act of faith**. God cannot give the responsible adult man the gift of His supernatural friendship, until man accepts Him previously and freely<sup>1582</sup>. If you have committed to memory the "Creed"; it is a magnificent act of faith. If you do not know it I have written below a very brief act of faith, but you must say it with great faith.

"I believe that God exists.

I believe that God will reward the good works done during our lives<sup>1583</sup> when we attain eternal life.

I believe there is only one God in three different people.

I believe that these three people are: Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

"I believe that God became man and died for us on the cross".

Or if you want it in two lines:

"I firmly believe in everything that the church tells us we should believe because of God's revelations<sup>1584</sup>".

<sup>1575</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2088

<sup>1576</sup> OTTO ZIMMERMANN, S. I.: *Teología Ascética*, n° 59 Seminario Metropolitano. Buenos Aires.

<sup>1577</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 1ª, VI, 47 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1578</sup> MIGUEL NICOLAU, S. I.: *Psicología y pedagogía de la fe*, XI, 1, Ed. FAX, Madrid. 1960

<sup>1579</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 1ª, VI, 79 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1580</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 804 1ª, X, n° 72. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1581</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 1ª, VI, 72

Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1582</sup> CÁNDIDO POZO, S. I. *La Fe VI*, EDAPOR, Madrid, 1986

<sup>1583</sup> Hebrews, 11:6

<sup>1584</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1842

To strengthen our faith we should say an act of faith every so often, but above all at the hour of our death.

Faith is like a sixth sense that allows us to have a far better knowledge of God. Who does not have faith cannot explain it. One cannot explain about music to a plant because it can never capture the essence.

6. Faith can never be **demonstrated with arguments**, it is a gift, not a science. But reasons for its credibility can be given. Faith exceeds reason but does not destroy it. The reasons for believing are not the philosophic-scientific revealed truths but by the authority of God, who has revealed.. These reasons help us to see that faith is reasonable, but they are not the principal motive of faith. We can know that God has spoken to us and therefore we have the obligation to believe in what he has told us<sup>1585</sup>.

We must value above anything else the gift of faith; we must try to conserve it by prayer and study; to let it be known and loved to and by others; defend it if attacked and ask God to let it be known by the incredulous and non-faithful.

At the same time, we must avoid everything and everyone that could put us in danger of losing it, e.g. those that neglect their religious instruction, those who willingly listen to people who attack the faith, or read books or journals against the faith, the arrogant and the impure; all these people put themselves in danger of losing this divine gift<sup>1586</sup>. To deny one's faith is not ever allowed but we are not always obliged to manifest it. However, sometimes there are circumstances in life which oblige us to show it, as when the glory of God demands it or when by keeping silent in certain circumstances means to renegade one's faith. It is never licit to deny the faith either by word or deed, behaving as if you are professing another non Catholic faith, not even in the danger of death<sup>1587</sup>.

7 If sometimes you come up against **a challenge concerning the Catholic Religion** and you have no idea how to solve it -do not let it worry you. It is impossible that you have at hand all necessary knowledge needed to solve these situations and to show that at times it is no more than a fallacy or deceitfulness or covering up the truth, etc. etc. But you must not let this affect you. Find someone who understands these problems that often crop up in religion and let them help you to solve them. You can be sure that all obstacles raised against religion have a solution, even though you do not know what it is. What is more: they have already been solved many times, because the enemies of the Church are always repeating the same things and they do not want to accept the solution that they have been given about these problems facing our religion; you must remember that although some people ask questions with a desire to learn something that will help them solve their questions have no answer, so that they have an excuse to shake off any doubts about Christianity that always seem to annoy them<sup>1588</sup>.

To get to **know one's religion** better, it is very convenient to assist to talks and to read books on religion.

We should all try to achieve a certain level of religious formation within our circle of work, family, culture, etc. Sometimes when a group of people **start a discussion** about religion, you will find that, generally, those people that dominate the discussion are precisely those that know least about the subject, but their very ignorance gives them audacity!

This type of person is very difficult to convince, as their self-esteem obliges them not to accept the more convincing arguments.

<sup>1585</sup> M. GONZÁLEZ GIL. S.I.: *Cristo, misterio de Dios, 4º, XXVI, 1*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1976

<sup>1586</sup> Catechism, National Text, Third Grade, 39, a. Madrid, 1962

<sup>1587</sup> New Canonic Code Law, nº 1325

<sup>1588</sup> JUAN LÓPEZ PEDRAZ, S. I.: *Cristianos en busca de respuestas, XIII, 18* Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander . Santander

Now, if in the group there are people who are willing to listen to you and think that you can help them, then give them your opinion calmly and with fore-sight.

It would help you to take the offensive so as to find out just how ignorant people are about religious matters.

Even so, you must not offend anyone if it is not necessary.

But you must be strong and if there is someone who attacks in bad faith and who is trying to do propagate evil, then you must put him right even if he is offended.

If someone ridicules religion, then you must take it to defend it. It is very important that you manage to get those people who are laughing on your side.

If you simply have not the strength to dominate the group, you must realize that it is much easier to do this with individuals when alone, they will probably be much reasonable than when they are in a group.

8. It is also a sin against this commandment to write, read or possess, lend or sell books that are against religion; to belong to any irreligious societies, e.g., masonry, spiritualism or any Marxist political party, as Marxism is essentially atheism<sup>1589</sup>. It is also a sin to tempt God<sup>1590</sup>, asking him to prove things by actions or doubting that he exists or trying to oblige him to intervene extraordinary in any event<sup>1591</sup>, e.g. "if it rains tomorrow, it means that God approves of my plan to revenge myself against Mr. X".

It is also a sin to put your life in serious danger when it is not at all necessary expecting God to save you.

Sinning against this commandment is he who decides to sin because God is merciful.

This is "a very grave sin against the Holy Spirit, as it suggests a grave disdain of God's grace"<sup>1592</sup>.

This commandment also includes the sin of presumption, when one expects the glory of having done something that really does not merit any glory whatsoever, or expecting to be forgiven without repenting or expecting eternal life when you have completely forgotten God.<sup>1593</sup> Those who sin of presumption, are those who expect to receive the salvation of the soul and the Glory without having done anything meritorious; the pardon without repentance; eternal salvation, while being on the wayside of the path of God.

9. Do not let a day go by without praying something, at least three Hail Mary's which are a pledge of eternal salvation.

Do an examination of conscience and then ask his forgiveness and help and promise to try and be a better Christian and say three Hail Mary's.

You could also do the following exam:

1.- What good deeds have I done? (THINK FOR A MINUTE)

Thank you Lord for you have helped me.

2. What faults have I committed? (THINK FOR A MINUTE)

a. With You: respect, prayer, forgotten by You

<sup>1589</sup> Apostolicae Sedis Act, 2-VII-49. pg. 334

<sup>1590</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2119

<sup>1591</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 1º, 2ª, I, n°369 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1592</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 1º, 2ª, I, n°317, 2º Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1593</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 1º, 2ª, I, n°316 Ed. BAC. Madrid

b. With others: egotistical, helpful, criticizer

c. With myself:

a') duty: obedience, work. Everything well done?

b') purity: glances, desires, words, works.

c') character: irate, smug

Forgive me Lord. I am heavy laden for having offended you. To repair my fault, I promise.....

3. What good deeds have I not done? (THINK FOR A MINUTE)

I promise you my Lord, to take every occasion to do good. Lord, in spite of everything, I love you and I promise to be better. Mother of God, help me! (Three Hail Mary's)

#### **64. THE SECOND COMMANDMENT IS: "THOU SHALL NOT TAKE GOD'S NAME IN VAIN".**

1. The second commandment prohibits the use of the name of God in an inconvenient way<sup>1594</sup>.

The one who swears, takes the name of God, as to swear is to make God a witness of the truth of what is being said.

So that the swearing be licit, it must comply with three conditions: that it be with the truth, that it be with justice and that there is real need<sup>1595</sup>

A person who takes an oath names God as a witness to what he says.

It is not licit to make an **oath if you are being doubtful about it**.

You must be morally certain.

Moral certainness excludes any reasonable doubt but does not, of course, exclude the fear of being mistaken.

Even so, when one takes an oath before a jury you must be sure about one thing: to know exactly the event happened because you experienced the happening or you heard about the happening from people who offer a guarantee of credibility.

In this case, you must make it very clear that you are under oath and that these people are to be believed.

When you are under oath and you deliberately tell a lie, it is a very grave sin. If he is aware that he is swearing and know he is lying<sup>1596</sup>. To place God as a witness of an untruth is to gravely insult Him<sup>1597</sup>.

To swear with a lie is to do something bad or that it is in detriment or harm of your brethren. The sin will be grave or light according to what is being sworn, if it is gravely or slightly illicit.

If what you have sworn is bad, it cannot (the oath) be carried out. As it would be two sins. One, to take an oath about something wrong should regret, two for not carrying out. Whosoever has sworn to do something bad, must be pained for having sworn and not comply.

To swear without need is to swear without a reasonable motive, as those who swear from habit. He who swears with the truth but without need, from habit, not realizing it, does not commit a grave sin; but he must correct his bad habit.

<sup>1594</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2146

<sup>1595</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2164

<sup>1596</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2163

<sup>1597</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2º, I, n° 401,2*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

For it to be a **true oath**, it is necessary that there be the intention of swearing and follow the swearing formula.

Who pretends to swear, using the formula without the intention of swearing, commits a sin, as this in insulting to God<sup>1598</sup>.

The true formula for swearing must include, implicitly or explicitly an invocation to God in testimony of the truth, v. gr.: "I swear by God that...". Expressions such as: "may lightning strike me if it is not true", "on my sainted mother's memory", etc., must be considered as swearing formulas that suppose to place God as a witness of the truth and that in case it is not true, He would be in charge of punishing the lie.

Phrases that are sometimes used in conversation, such as "swear it", "I swear", etc., must not always be considered as a true oath, as they have no intention of swearing.

This is a bad habit that must be corrected.

Many people swear for the sake of it. This is improper.

If you so wish, you can say "On my word"

This is not swearing; and it should suffice to accentuate your statement. Whoever is not satisfied with this, offends you.

2. People who say things against the religion and who **blaspheme**, sin against this commandment.

Blasphemy is any insulting expression to God, the Blessed Virgin, the Saints or holy things whether by word, signs, gestures, drawing, etc<sup>1599</sup>.

God punishes blasphemy greatly. Sometimes, even in this life.

Other sins are done due to weakness or for a gain, for example, to steal.

But he who blasphemes, gains nothing.

A blaspheme is a sin that goes directly against the majesty of God.

That is why it pains God so much and He punishes it with rigor.

Blasphemy is a diabolic sin.

If you believe in God, you must understand it is an absurdity to insult Him

And if you do not believe in Him, then who are you insulting?

The problem is that sometimes people blaspheme without quite realizing what they are doing. It is a bad habit.

<sup>1598</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, I, nº 401*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1599</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2162

What you must do is to very seriously try to drop this bad habit, because although the blasphemy that sometimes slips out of your mouth without realizing it, is not a grave sin –but it can become a grave sin if one does not try to correct oneself.

They are always a bad example.

If people hear you blaspheme, they can copy you, e.g. your children, your fellow workers, etc.

Then one must make the promise and have the decision to overcome this bad habit, because even though the blasphemy escapes your lips unconsciously, it is not a grave sin. But it can turn into one if you do not have the determination to do it.

To correct yourself, it can help you if you impose upon yourself a small punishment.

For example, to stop smoking for the number of days as many as the number of blasphemes you have done.

If you like tobacco, you will see how quickly you correct yourself.

If you do not dare to do so much, do not smoke the cigarette after lunch, or do any other small sacrifice; but do not leave the error without punishment.

If you do not smoke, quit something else that you like.

If you cannot think of anything else, you could give a few dollars for each fault.

To punish yourself, is the best way to correct a defect.

If at any time you hear a blasphemy and you are able to correct it, do it. And if you can't, say: "praise be to God", and if you say it out loud, so much the better. And if you do not dare, at best, say it in a low voice..

3. Blasphemies, which are insulting to God, to the Virgin, etc., must not be confused with other demeaning words, such as curse or cuss words. which we normally would call "bad" words.

The ill sounding words and cuss words are a sign of a low education, and must not be uttered, but they are not blasphemies, nor ordinarily a sin.

4. Another way of sinning against this commandment is by not complying with your **vows or pledges** made to God in order to reinforce your petitions and manifest your gratefulness.

A vow is a promise made to god, freely and deliberately, with the intention of obligating oneself, under the threat of sin, of a possible action or thing, good and better than the opposite<sup>1600</sup>.

You must fulfill your promise under the threat of a minor or major sin, in accordance with what you have said in your covenant.

However, a light matter can never force us to agree in a grave obligation.

We must not confuse the pledges and vows with the offerings that are made to God without the intention of fulfilling them under the penalty of sin.

Before making a pledge or a vow, you should consult with an experienced person, such as a priest.

And if you have not been able to do it before, do it afterwards, should he be able to dispense or commute it.

---

<sup>1600</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2102

5. **Grave sins** against this commandment are blasphemy, not fulfilling when able, the pledges and to swear falsely.

**65. THE THIRD COMMANDMENT OF THE LAW OF GOD IS: THOU SHALL KEEP HOLY THE SABBATH DAY.**

1. To keep holy Sundays and holidays of obligation, one must hear Mass and not work if it is not absolutely necessary<sup>1601</sup>.

The most wonderful day of the year is the Sunday of the Resurrection of Our Lord.

Every Sunday is a commemoration of this Easter Sunday.

In the Old Testament it was Saturday that was a holiday

But the apostles changed it to Sunday as that was the day Our Lord rose from the dead<sup>1602</sup>.

If you read the Acts of the Apostles in the New Testament they tell us how early Christians gathered together each Sunday to celebrate the Eucharist<sup>1603</sup>

And the *Didajé*, written between the years 80 and 90 of our era, affirms that Christians assisted to mass every Sunday<sup>1604</sup>.

It is an obligation to attend Mass on the **days prescribed** for all baptized and who have reached the age of seven and are in full use of reason<sup>1605</sup>. Those who deliberately omit this obligation commit a grave sin<sup>1606</sup>

Not attending Mass in a habitual way, without an excusing cause, supposes a disdain of the precept.

The precept of listening to Mass consists of the personal assistance to the Church.

Listening to Mass on television does not satisfy this precept.

Although listening to Mass on television will always be a laudable thing, it does not make up for the obligation of listening to it personally, unless there is a excusing cause.

Besides being physically present, it is necessary to also be there mentally, that is to say, paying attention.

Any voluntary distraction, if prolonged, can be a sin. Involuntary distractions are not a sin<sup>1607</sup>. If one misses a small part of the mass at the beginning or end is not a serious sin.

---

<sup>1601</sup> New Code of Canonic Law

<sup>1602</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2190s

<sup>1603</sup> Acts of the Apostles, 20:7

<sup>1604</sup> *Didajé*. XIV

<sup>1605</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, n° 418* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1606</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2181

<sup>1607</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, I, n° 419*. Ed. BAC. Madrid



It is much better to hear Mass from the time when the priest comes out onto the altar until he leaves it. The one who arrives after the Offertory has begun, is considered not to have attended Mass<sup>1608</sup>.

The obligation of Sunday Mass and holidays of **obligation can be fulfilled** by attending Mass in the evening of the day before<sup>1609</sup>.

If two days of obligation follow each other, one must go both days to Mass.

People who say that it is the same going to Mass on Monday that on Sunday is like saying that to go and see your father or mother on their birthdays or to go three days later is the same.

2. Some people are **excused** from the obligation of hearing Mass if they have an impediment<sup>1610</sup> such as: an illness, a journey that gives you no time to hear Mass, if you live a very long way from the nearest church, if your obligations leave you no time or opportunity to get to Mass (e.g. taking care of ill people who cannot be left alone, being on duty such as doctors, nurses, policemen, firemen, soldiers, etc.), and have no one to substitute for you.

To know when we have a reasonable motive which will excuse us from going to Mass, the best thing is to ask a priest.

If, however, you have no priest at hand and you want to satisfy your doubt urgently, the following norm will help you.

You can decide not to attend Mass if, in the circumstances you find yourself in, you would also not attend a business deal that is of certain importance for you. A business deal that would probably let you earn about 500 and that you have only this one occasion to earn this amount, you must ask yourself this question, would you lose this occasion to earn this amount of money?

A Mass is worth much more than even 1,000. It has an infinite value.

3. One must abstain from work on Sundays and other Holy days, if this impedes worshipping God.

Unless this work is necessary for Public Service, that cannot be postponed, due to unforeseen circumstances or because they are urgent<sup>1611</sup>.

4. To observe Sundays and other Holy days of obligation, first you must hear Mass and not work unless it is a necessity.

You must try to avoid anything that is offensive to God -particularly some types of parties that very often transform "the day of the Lord" into "the day of Satan".

These days are really to participate in family life, cultural activities, religious reading, resting or outings with good friends or family -sport activities but not for enjoying yourself by indulging in sinful entertainment<sup>1612</sup>.

<sup>1608</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA. *Hablemos de la Fe, IV, 6*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>1609</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2180

<sup>1610</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2185

<sup>1611</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, I, n°4206*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1612</sup> New Canonic Code n° 1247

You must try and find an enjoyable way to spend these Sundays and holy days of obligation but without offending God.

**Works of mercy** such as visiting the sick, the poor, etc. are a very good way of spending these feast days<sup>1613</sup>.

5. Reading good books is another way you can spend your time on Sundays and feast days. Books that help you to form your character, your culture and your religious formation. Try not to read too many novels, some can harm you and at the best they are a waste of time. A good book can do a lot of good.

But a bad book can do a lot of harm, they can present false arguments sometimes very realistically and they are a danger because they can destroy our faith and even our reasons for living.

“The faithful must be warned about the need of reading the Catholic press so as to obtain a Christian criterion about every day events<sup>1614</sup>”.

You must be very careful with books that pervert ideas and customs.

If, by any chance, one comes into your hands, you must destroy it before it hurts somebody. The best place for an evil book is the fireplace.

#### 6. The holy days of obligation are:

All Sundays of the year,  
Mary, Mother of God (1st January),  
Epiphany (6th January),  
Saint Joseph (March 19)  
Corpus Christi (date changes each year),  
Assumption of our Lady (15th August),  
All Saints (1st November),  
Immaculate Conception (December 8)  
Christmas Day (25th December).

These can be modified in different countries by the Bishop of the diocese.

## 66. THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT IS: HONOR THY FATHER AND THY MOTHER.

1. To honor thy father and mother, if you still live under their protection, is to obey their commands if what they command is not sinful, of course, as it is required to obey God before obeying man<sup>1615</sup>. Also to help them with their needs and to reverently love them. “Children, obey your parents in everything, for this pleases the Lord<sup>1616</sup>”

In some translations of the Bible there is a phrase that can be erroneously interpreted. **Jesus Christ** says: “Those who hate their parents are not worthy of me<sup>1617</sup>”. The word “hate” in Hebrew is not used in the same sense as in English, it really means not to over-estimate. So, really, this sentence means “Those who put their parents before me are not worthy of me”.

<sup>1613</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2186

<sup>1614</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Inter mirifica* Decree on the merits of social communication, n° 14

<sup>1615</sup> Acts, 5:29

<sup>1616</sup> Colossians, 3:20s

<sup>1617</sup> Luke, 14:26

2. **Disobedience** towards one's parents is much more serious when it is relative to the well-being of our souls<sup>1618</sup>: religious obligations, friendships, social activities, etc.

"Obedience to your parents ceases with the emancipation of the child, but not the respect which is owed to them, which remains forever<sup>1619</sup>."

Your parents are everything to you. Even if they are old and grumpy, you must respect and love them. You must never be ungrateful<sup>1620</sup>. All that you are and all that you have is because of them. "*How can you repay them for all that they have done for you?*<sup>1621</sup>". Think of the abandoned children that do not know who their father is or have never known the love of a mother.

It is not enough to love one's parents, you must show them your love. There is no love in this world so unselfish as that of our parents: it is not too much to ask of us that they should receive some show of love from their children; they will be so grateful for it.

These days, there is little talk about obeying one's parents. Some even think that by disobeying they are showing signs of independence and personality. That is to say that they consider disobedience as a value. This is a mistake. Those same young men who do not obey their parents who love them, will later obey friends, fashion or even their whims, which are their tyrants. They **change obedience**: the good ones for the bad. To be free is not doing what you want. That is being a slave to your capriciousness. He who is free is the one who willingly fulfills his duties. The freest person was **Jesus Christ**, who was God. He did however, obey the will of his Father.

It is so easy today for sons and daughters to become infected by the spirit of rebellion and uncontrolled freedom that is in the environment. **Fr. César Vaca, O.S.A.**, wrote in the YA newspaper of Madrid, "To criticize the false teacher, the bad educators, the non-understanding and selfish parents, is OK, but to reject family discipline as a whole, to be uncompassionate and underestimate those who carry out the heavy load of teaching and educating, by presenting as the best of schools the anarchy of an uncontrolled freedom, is to place oneself on the road to ruin"

The problems that are covered on the front page of the newspapers of the world, are a reflection of the lack of disposition of our youth to submit itself to a system of values should it be different to the system of their criteria. We are all witnesses of cases where adolescents are warned and given advice over and over again by experienced and responsible parents, but they prefer to "do their thing" in order to find out a bit too late, that their father had predicted it correctly. Unfortunately, there are many youngsters who do not want to listen to advice. Such hostility of young people towards paternal authority, assumes that they irrationally oppose the benefits of experience<sup>1622</sup>

The children **must help** in family life. In every family, collaboration of the children is needed. By sharing, a happy and pleasant family life can be had. In our society the number of people who reach old age is higher every year. The aged encounter problems that make their life harder, they are no longer able to work, some are sick, others, alone. All members of society must feel responsible in sharing the burden of taking care of the aged, especially their children.<sup>1623</sup>

3. This commandment also includes **the obligations of the parents** towards their children<sup>1624</sup>; these are, apart from loving them: feeding them, clothing them, and giving them religious instruction,

<sup>1618</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2º, III, nº 847*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1619</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2217

<sup>1620</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2215

<sup>1621</sup> Ecclesiastes, 7:30

<sup>1622</sup> EDMUND J. ELBERT: *Problemas actuales de psicología, XII, 1* Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>1623</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2218

<sup>1624</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2º, III, nº 837-847* Ed. BAC. Madrid

cultural education, watching over them, correcting them and setting a good example for them<sup>1625</sup>, as well as giving them a future proportionate to their status and social condition<sup>1626</sup>

In other words, educate them physically, morally and intellectually<sup>1627</sup> and protect them from the dangers that can attack their bodies and souls.

Parents have the right and obligation of educating their children<sup>1628</sup>

“Parents should be reminded that it is their duty to care that their children see shows, films or read books or magazines that do not attack or offend faith and that these things do not enter their homes and that their children do not see them elsewhere<sup>1629</sup>”.

We must collaborate with our parents towards the spiritual well-being of the family, letting them know about things that they must know, so that they can correct them.. Unless there is a more efficient way. But keeping from them the mistaken behavior of one’s brother and sister, may become responsible in front of God for the uncorrected mistakes. Parents have the obligation to correct, but to this end, they must be informed of what is going on. Do not exaggerate matters. But do not minimize what is important. Parents are the prime educators, and it is they who must decide and not the state, the type of education that is best for their children. The state must help all children of school age indiscriminately. It would be unfair if the parents needed aid to educate their children, and the State wanted to cooperate, if it would only help those who attend public schools, and did not help those from private schools.<sup>1630</sup>

Parents, primarily responsible for the education of their children, have the right to choose a school in accordance with their own convictions. This is a fundamental right. As soon as possible, parents have the obligation to select the schools that will serve them best in the responsibility and toil of Christian educators. Public officials have the obligation to guarantee this parental right and to assure the conditions required for it.<sup>1631</sup>

Education is of transcendental importance and of a great responsibility for parents. There are many people in this world today who suffer because their parents did not educate them properly. through omission and carelessness. In education, as in everything else, **one reaps what one sows**. Young children, must, gradually, in the measure of their capabilities absorb, the need for cleanliness,, order, obedience, sacrifice, loyalty, servitude, honesty, resignation, etc. etc. Let them be used to behaving in all places, to practice what is good, even if it is painful, and to push away from harm even if it may be seducing, spontaneously and on their own account, even if no one is watching ready to dole out punishment<sup>1632</sup>. It will be very difficult to acquire virtues as an adult that were not bred in us as children.

Children, for their correct development, need tenderness from the first moment. Studies have been made of children who were carefully taken care of in their vital needs, in specialized centers, but who were not lovingly nurtured which show characteristic abnormalities.

But children cannot be **pampered and spoiled**. The spoiled and pampered child becomes bratty and unsociable. This will bring him acceptance problems from his school mates later on. This will retard his psychological maturity. It has been proven that the child who is well accepted by his school mates, because of his personal qualities, has a better possibility of a good psychological maturity in the future.

<sup>1625</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2223

<sup>1626</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2º, III, n° 837* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1627</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2221

<sup>1628</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 2207 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1629</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Inter mirifica: Decree on the Social communication means*, n° 10.

<sup>1630</sup> ANTONIO TAPIES: *Nuestra Salvación, 1º, I, 23*. Ed. Claret. Barcelona, 1987

<sup>1631</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2229

<sup>1632</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2º, III, n° 842*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

One must not spoil children or punish them without reason. **Punishment is inevitable**, as it is morally impossible for your children not to behave badly and so not deserve punishment. **Foerster**<sup>1633</sup> says: “without punishment no education is possible”. But so that punishment must be correct and educative it must always be<sup>1634</sup>: a) timely, do not punish when angry; b) just, never overdo the punishment, c) prudent, never be carried away by your anger, d) loving, so that the child will understand that it is for his own good. We are never effectively punished unless it is by those who love us and whom we also love<sup>1635</sup>.

Physical punishment has its problems; it can cause obstinacy, rancor and weakening of the sentiment of honor. Highly strung children should not be physically punished as there is the risk of increasing their nervousness. In girls, the corporal punishment will weaken their feeling of being corporally untouchable, so precious for the demureness of future life.

The punishment must aid the child in the road of honesty, obedience, etc., to build him up to be a moral man. The punishment, more than to expiate the guilt, must serve as a corrective measure. For this to happen, the child must recognize the fault, and the fairness of the punishment. The punishment has so much more value when the child accepts it voluntarily, imposes it upon himself. After the punishment is applied, peace must be had with the child as soon as possible<sup>1636</sup>.

There must be tact in order to correct efficiently. Little is gained by simple verbal or physical abuse and humiliation. One must encourage. Awaken self esteem in the individual. A proper correction must always leave open a door to the hope of self improvement<sup>1637</sup>. Letting him do whatever he desires, will be interpreted one day in the future as a lack of interest in his well being. On the other hand to confront him, showing him that this is being done for love and interest in him, will end up by gaining his heart. To say. “ I love you too much to allow this”, or a moment of tenderness after a punishment, will reestablish harmony. Love must be above all mischief. A mother once told her child, after punishing him: “I am not mad at you, I am mad at your mischief”. And the child was grateful for the punishment.

It is very important to know how to dole out punishment in pursuit of a good education, but it is no less important to know how to use an award; for example, praise. The pedagogical reward may take many forms: a look of approval, a kind and warm gesture, a tender word, the granting of a desired permit, a gift, etc. But one must also not be overly generous in his praise and gifts, as they will lose efficacy, and then run the risk of making the child selfish, whose behavior will only be good when looking forward to a prize or reward.

Stimuli is much more effective than repression. Sometimes this will be inevitable, but its efficacy will be greater if the child is accustomed to having his good deeds recognized, and his effort duly acknowledged, as those efforts are not always crowned with success. Everyone will be grateful to whoever is sincere in his praise. A proper praise, just and opportune stimulates and educates towards the good. The art of educating consists of knowing how to smile and say NO to children at the right time and in the right way<sup>1638</sup>

Once of the worst things that parents can do for their children is spoil them and to let them become **capricious and stubborn**. It is of utmost importance that when educating children they form their own will. One's own will becomes stronger by teaching oneself to renounce things. This should be started at an early age. The child should start to learn to give up small things, e.g. to share sweets between his brothers and sisters or friends, to get up from the chair to throw away the candy

<sup>1633</sup> FOERSTER: *Temas Capitales de Educación, XIV, 1*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1634</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2º, III, nº 840, 3º, 1*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1635</sup> J. HOFFER, S. M.: *Pedagogía Marianista, 2, III, 4*. Ed. S. M. Madrid.

<sup>1636</sup> SCHNEIDER: *Educación Católica de la Familia* Ed. Labor. Barcelona

<sup>1637</sup> FOERSTER: *Temas capitales de educación, XIII, 2*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1638</sup> Dr. ALFONSO ALVAREZ VILLAR: *YA Newspaper*, 20-IV-66

wrapper, to give one's seat to an older person, to stop making noise when it upsets an older member of the family, to tidy his room after playing, etc.

There are a multitude of resignations and wants that have a high formative power.. The smile a child give its parents so much pleasure that it makes it hard to go against the child. On the other hand, there are weak hearted parents that cannot bear to hear their child crying. However, they must know that by not wanting to confront them today, and acceding to their whims, they really are preparing them for great disappointments in life, as things will not always will turn out according to their will. It is a great mistake to say "Let it be, poor darling. He will suffer later on" Quite the contrary. The spoiled child will suffer twice as much as the one who has been accustomed to renouncing naturally. In life, one must renounce so many times, and forcefully!

It is necessary to accustom the child, from the beginning, to behave properly everywhere, spontaneously and on his own initiative, even though no one is watching him and will not punish him. One must know how to separate them from evil or harm and guide them towards good, so that they can, by themselves appreciate virtue and duty, and embracing it voluntarily. It is very important in the education of children to know how to cheerfully offer them licit pleasures, and so that they may learn to renounce the illicit without anguish. It is impossible for children to always get what they want. Children must be accustomed to accept these frustrations good naturedly, as life is full of them.

The youngster who is accustomed from early childhood to do his own will is useless in life. As life is a tapestry of unpleasant duties, and if not accustomed to comply with them in a strict fashion, but rather following impulsive tastes, whims and passions, he becomes a victim of his own will when reaching maturity<sup>1639</sup>.

**Stuart Mill**, the great educator, says: "He who has never deprived himself of something that is allowed, will not know how to deprive himself of what is not allowed"<sup>1640</sup>. The will is the power that the human being has through which the individual does that which he has set out to do without being distracted by what he likes or dislikes. It is very important to be a person with character. That makes a man "more of a man". In order to be able to control one's will, it is necessary to train oneself, just as you do in sports. One must acquire a habit through the repetition of those acts done with the desire of a personal improvement. This training must start with relatively simple things.

A spoiled child is not one for whom too much is done. One can never do too much for a child. A spoiled child is one to whom nothing ever has been denied, who has not been shown to give back in proportion to what he has received. To condescend to the whims of a child will lead to making him a small tyrant.

There is no better way to forge the misfortune of a child than to give in to his every whim<sup>1641</sup>.

To educate and form a child is to make him obey, help him to overcome difficulties, teach him to love, to love when he does not want to or when he finds it difficult. If one leaves a child to his own whims and self-will, he will become a slave to his instincts. The intervention of the educator's strong will, will free him. This tiny bit of humanity which makes all of us feel so loving and protective towards him, is in reality selfish and greedy. He must be guided, molded, and made more humane. There is no moral rectitude in life, if one does not obey the basic principles in spite of all temptations and caprices that come our way.

You must also consider that there is no true joy, even for the child, in those things that are effortlessly attainable. In all paths of life, one must endure many hours of arduous climbing in order to have the pleasure of a beautiful panorama. To overcome resistance will produce joy. The child must be given the experience and pleasure of these rugged and deep feelings of joy that rise from the difficulty that is overcome.<sup>1642</sup>

<sup>1639</sup> ÁNGEL AYALA, S. I.: *Formación de Selectos*, VIII, 6 Ed. Atenas. Madrid.

<sup>1640</sup> ALEJANDRO ROLDAN, S. I.: *El Carácter*, VI,2, #, a. Ed. Fe Católica, Madrid, 1975

<sup>1641</sup> DR. BERNABÉ TIERNNO, *Psycho pedagogue- El Semanal Magazine*, 420, (12-XI-95) 120

<sup>1642</sup> P.J. HOFFER, S.M.: *Pedagogía marianista*, 2ª, II, 2, 4. Ed. S. M. Madrid.

Of course, the parents must never permit an act of disobedience. Before giving an order, think if it is convenient. Do not give many orders together and these should never be contradictory. Both parents must always be in agreement as to orders and punishment. Orders or commands must be clear, so that the child may understand them. And well described as to their details; time frame in which they are to be done, result that is to be obtained, etc. Try not to order difficult things, but once given, that order must be carried out in spite of everything. As an example: “pick up your room after you have had your bath” Explain that this is to be done after his bath, not at midnight; everything clean; it is not enough to pick up your dirty clothes, etc.

Do not order too many things. Nor forbid simple things. This was said by the psycho-pedagogue **Dr. Luis Riesgo** at a conference in Cadiz in November 1995: “Do not make mountains out of molehills. Be tolerant in small things. In the entire family pedagogy, it is better to win an important battle than to win one hundred unimportant skirmishes.”

One must always permit the children a field of autonomy. Lest we forget that the child needs self-affirmation.

Try not to order very difficult things. But once the order is given, it should be above all else and is to be executed. If the child manages to get his own way just once, he will never forget it and will keep on trying to do it again, he must learn that there are times when a crying and screaming tantrum will get him nowhere<sup>1643</sup>.

Parents must fulfill their promise of a reward or punishment, if not, this can disorient the child; those parents who order, threaten and promise many things but afterwards nothing bears fruit, are acting without reason. If you say you are going to punish or reward a child you must not suppress it without just cause<sup>1644</sup>.

But we must be careful that the punishment is not caused by our bad humor, but to the gravity of the fault and to the child's responsibility. It is important that the child realizes that he has done wrong and that he understands why he is being punished. But it is also a good thing in his education to diminish the punishment if there is a promise of betterment.

Teaching a child means accepting that he has his own way of being, and letting him be himself.

Teaching a child means strengthening all the virtues he has in him, firmly and with authority, but gently and without violence.

To educate is to instill the values that we intend to have, through example<sup>1645</sup>.

This **correction of the child** must start when he is small, it is much easier to show them the straight and narrow way while their characters are still pliable.

Make sure you do not let anyone, praise evil and mock the good in front of small children. You must also not tolerate that they be taught to say obscenities. That is why you should be careful that small children are not present at a time when anything “bad” can entice them. Children are great imitators, one must be very careful of everything that is done or said in their presence. You must also be careful that there are no indecent pictures or calendars, nor books or magazines in the home. Worry about instilling in them, from the very beginning, love of purity, of truth, honesty, help to brethren, respect to authority, etc. Nothing persuades you to practice goodness as a good example does. One does not teach what is known, nor what is said, but what is done (**Jaurés**). Words move, but examples pull. It is the deed that counts, not the words. Words are counterproductive when they are contradicted by acts. Examples educate more than words do. The child needs clear role models

<sup>1643</sup> ISAMBERT: *Tu hijo crece*, n° 56. Ed. Daimón. Barcelona.

<sup>1644</sup> ISAMBERT: *Tu hijo crece*, n° 57. Ed. Daimón. Barcelona

<sup>1645</sup> DR. BERNABÉ TIERNÓ, EL SEMANAL Magazine. 10-XII-95, pg. 110

of behavior, strong and permanent. If the models are defective, spineless and weak, he will not know what to do at a given moment.

But besides giving them a good example, one must make them act accordingly. The secret in learning is doing. To demand from children that they do whatever is necessary to do, of what they must and can do in accordance with their age, without allowing concessions.... is to love them and educate them for life. Having everything, not having to work for it.... Is a tremendous disgrace<sup>1646</sup>

What really teaches is the example of a coherent life, and authority supported by reason. Not the unrelenting authoritarian. The incidence of the paternal image has been studied by **Alinear Glueck** comparing five hundred juvenile delinquents with five hundred who are not. The investigation showed that the majority of the juvenile delinquents received their education from parents with extremely severe attitudes or permissiveness; while the youngsters who showed a normal conduct belonged, in the majority of cases, to parents who knew how to apply a firm but serene and understanding hand<sup>1647</sup>. For children, a harsh and stern authority is just as bad as a lack of authority. To let children do whatever they want is very comfortable for the parents, but ill-fated for the children. The child needs an authority to free him from his feeling of insecurity. The adolescent needs guidance. There is even the case of the youngster who adopts a provocative attitude towards his father, and said attitude deep down has no further reason than to force him –unconsciously, of course- to take the role of family head. He seeks the authority which he needs so badly, and which is the foundation of his feeling of security<sup>1648</sup>.

Discipline is the training of the child. Studies carried out on the disorders of the conduct of youth have demonstrated that a child who is educated without discipline cannot control himself as an adult. **Charles Manson**, killer of multiple families, always did whatever he pleased as a child. With the passage of time, we have seen the consequences<sup>1649</sup>.

There was a time in which authoritarianism was abused in educating a child, with the old saying: "spare the rod and spoil the child". But today, with a pendulum movement, it is now the inhibition of educators to let the children be "good" spontaneously and let them find the truth by themselves, which is really utopia. Long ago, memorizing was the way to learn, just remember the names of the American Presidents, while today memory is eliminated from education, which is really unfortunate, as memory is a human potential necessary in life. The child needs to be told what is right and what is wrong, and to be led to the right path.

Taking into account that the young child cannot understand irony. He understands things literally, just as they are spoken. An innocent practical joke for an adult can harm a child. Parents who sneer at what a child takes seriously, may, in their error, lose the child's trust.

One of the worst errors parents can incur in is to make comparisons. You will only make your child abhor the one he is being compared to, and he will blame you for it<sup>1650</sup>

**Maria Montessori**, the world famous Italian doctor, said: "A child must be respected and not used as a toy to amuse us with his funny gestures, baby talk, provoking him to do something repeatedly in an abusive fashion, and some times in an abrupt way, looking for our own satisfaction. A child must be treated with respect and not used as something to amuse an adult"<sup>1651</sup>.

It is very important to know how to listen to children about their small problems, by doing this we are preparing the way for when they will discuss with us their more important problems.

<sup>1646</sup> Dr. BERNABÉ TIERNO: EL SEMANAL Magazine, 13-III-94. Pg. 74

<sup>1647</sup> Dr. BERNABÉ TIERNO: familia cristiana Magazine, nº 9 (IX, 19992) pg. 15

<sup>1648</sup> Dr. LUIS RIESGO. HOY Daily, Badajoz. 29-IV-77

<sup>1649</sup> MARABEL MORGAN: *La Mujer Total*, XII, 7. Ed. Plaza. Barcelona. 1976

<sup>1650</sup> MARABEL MORGAN: *La Mujer Total*, XII, 2. Ed. Plaza. Barcelona. 1976

<sup>1651</sup> ISAMBERT: *Tu hijo crece*, I<sup>a</sup>, III, 1. Ed. Daimón. Barcelona



4. You should be very concerned that your children **do not learn** about the facts of life from their street-wise friends. Evidently, they will try to find out, and if parents do nothing about this, when curiosity gets the better of them, they will go to their friends who know more about this -in other words, the more undesirable friends. Can you imagine the kind of information they will get from these friends? If your answer to the question that a child may ask about this matter is evasive, he will realize that he has discovered something mysterious, and will keep quiet; but his curiosity will arise and he will go and ask questions to the person or persons in which he has more trust.

As far as sex is concerned, a child needs to know and therefore there is the obligation to tell him about it. But it is not convenient that this information be given by their pals, in an unorthodox manner, deformed, degrading sexuality and debasing the mystery of life. One must do it healthily, clearly, correctly, adequately and properly.

It is of utmost importance **that you tell him the facts** using tact, discretion and prudence. Children must be “broached, according to their age, with a positive and prudent sexual education”<sup>1652</sup>. There is a small booklet on this matter called “*Initiation of children in life*”<sup>1653</sup>. This book will give you exact norms and even, the talk to be given to different ages and sexes. There are some that suggest that it is better to wait until the child asks. But, what if the child is embarrassed to ask the parents? And what if the child were to ask first on the streets? Also, in many cases the street is eager to inform the child before he even thinks of asking. One of the dangerous ages of a child is between 9 and 11 years, and they must be guided. lest you forget that it is better to be a month early than a day late<sup>1654</sup>.

It is important for a child **to feel superior** to his friends -precisely because he is well informed and because he knows that all his questions will be answered. I know a child, who, when his friends began to talk in a dirty manner about sexual matters told them “I know all about this because my father has explained everything about it” and off he went.. His father was proud because he had prepared his son so well.

There are three attitudes that can be taken when a child asks about the facts of life.

a) Silence and evasive answers: this means that generally the child will go away somewhere else to ask his questions, the same way as he would go elsewhere to get a piece of bread if we do not satiate his hunger. A mother, when her daughter asked her where babies came from, answered her by slapping her in the face and said “nice girls do not ask about these things”. Very pitiful behavior!

Silence on the part of parents on sexual matters will cause the children to believe that sex is something bad<sup>1655</sup>.

b) Telling lies: which will make him lose trust in you when he finds out the truth. This attitude means that when the child has found out from another source and realizes that his parents have lied to him, he will start to lose confidence in them and will start forming the idea that sexual life is something to be ashamed of, he will also be made fun of by his friends for believing that babies come from Paris, or that the stork brings them, etc.

c) Answer truthfully: answer the child’s questions briefly, clearly and naturally -and truthfully, do it gradually, depending on the circumstances and maturity of the child<sup>1656</sup>.

When you explain the facts of life to a child, it must be in uplifting terms, with candidness and delicateness<sup>1657</sup>. Release the information in a gradual way, in response to the child's questions, but

<sup>1652</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gravissimum educationis*: Declaration on the Christian education of youth, n° 1.

<sup>1653</sup> ANGEL DEL HOGAR:| *Iniciación de los niños en la vida*. Ed. Descleé. Bilbao. 1970

<sup>1654</sup> VANDE – ODEN: *Psiquiatría y catolicismo, XXIII*. Ed. Caralt. Barcelona.

<sup>1655</sup> EDMUNDO ELBERT: *Problemas actuales de psicología, 2ª, XI*, Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>1656</sup> PILAR CRESPO DE ARILLO: *De donde vienen los niños?* Booklet PPC n° 197.

<sup>1657</sup> Holy Vatican Congregation for Catholic Education. Document on sexual education, n° 87 ; ECCLESIA Magazine, 2155 (24-XII-83)32

always satisfying his curiosity. If the child does not respond with questions try tactfully to provoke questions so that he will hear the answers in his home and not in the street. The first questions may come as early as four or five years of age. Before the child is nine or ten years of age, they must know that the baby starts to grow inside the mother because of father's love<sup>1658</sup>.

I will give you an example of a possible conversation of a dialogue of a child with the mother, with the answers to the more compromising questions the children may ask. I have found them in several books which I have read on this subject. Evidently, it is not wise to give these answers ad verbatim. They are only an orientation in the answers you may need, and modify them according to the age, sex and maturity, etc, of the asking child.

- Where has my brother come from?
- God has sent him to mother and father because they love each other so much.
- Then Aunt Mary and uncle John don't love each other because God has not sent them a child.
- This is because children are a gift from God, and this gift, God does not give to everyone.
- And how do they come?
- God has put in mother's stomach a very warm and protective nest. And the baby is there for nine months, because in the beginning he is very small and could be stepped on like an ant. I have also carried you for nine months below my heart and have fed you with my blood. That is why I love you so much, because you are blood of my blood. When I had you inside me, I thought of you often, I prepared your crib, your diapers, your clothes and many more other things; and I prayed to God for you. And when you were a little bit bigger, then I gave birth to you. That made me have very strong pains, and I had to rest in bed. But such pains were transformed into joy when I had you in my arms, and I could hold and kiss you.
- And why did I make you suffer?
- Because when you came out of my body, you were quite large, and I had a hard time.
- Where did I come out from?
- Through a door that God has put in the body of women, which we always have covered, and as adults are never to show it.
- And where is that door?
- Between the legs. Close to where you urinate from. The door will stretch as if it were made of rubber so that the child can come out. First, the head comes out, then the shoulders, the arms, and finally, the legs. You were born in this manner. Can you imagine the joy I felt when I could hold you in my arms?
- And why am I also my father's child?
- Because it is the father who places the seed of life inside the mother's body.
- And how is that done?
- God has made man's body different from the body of the woman, so that when they are married, they can join so that the father can leave the seed of life inside the body of the mother. The door from where the baby comes out, was, nine months before, the door through which the seed of life entered, as donated by the father<sup>1659</sup>.
- Well, I have a friend who does not have a father
- Because he has died or has left.
- His mother is single.
- That means that his father did wrong, and did not want to marry his mother; but all children are born of the union of a father and a mother.

<sup>1658</sup> Dr. RIESGO: *Hablando en familia, III*, 4.EAPSA. Madrid. 1973

<sup>1659</sup> -If the age and maturity of the child allows it, you can say it this way: "Fertilization occurs through the union of the genital organs of the husband and his wife. The man's (which is called penis) enters into the woman's (which is called vagina) and deposits in its interior a liquid (which is called semen) in which the microscopic spermatozoa, which will fertilize the female ovum (which the woman places in her uterus once a month) , giving origin to a new being: a baby.

- And why do single women not have children?
- They should not have them, as they do not have a husband. They can have them if they give their body to a man. But this is a sin in a single woman. Sometimes this happens without guilt on their part, through violence or treachery by perverse men.
- That is why in school they talked about someone who had had a child with a single girl.
- Of course. That is a great sin. But do not talk about these things in school. Everything you want to know, I will tell you. We will talk about all of this any time you want. But you should not talk with your friends about these things. Maybe there is someone whose parents have told him the story about the stork, thinking that he could not understand the things that I have already told you, and it is not convenient that you expose his parents. And if someone wants to talk to you about these things, just tell him that I have already told you about them. And you ask me anything you want, and I will explain it better than anyone else, as I am your mother.

Frequently, it will be easy to satisfy the child's curiosity about the other sex. This can be done by showing it a boy or girl, who is still an infant, and being naked. It is preferable to avoid the exhibition of nude adults. Our society does not admit it, and it can offend the child<sup>1660</sup>

It is convenient for a mother talk to the child about the significance and normality of the monthly menstruation by the time that the child is ten years old<sup>1661</sup>, so, that if it were to start at an early age, the psychological impact would not be so great, and not damage the child. The way of doing so could be like this: "The greatest thing that a woman can do is to have a child. This happens when the woman gets married. But from the time she is a child, God is preparing the woman's body, and every month, a nest is formed for the possible child. When a child is not formed, the nest is unmade and a bit of blood comes out, but it does not hurt".

The same must be done with boys as related to nocturnal emissions, so that they know that it is perfectly normal, foreseen by God so that the body may eliminate the surplus secretions that are not needed for its strengthening.

If parents explain to their adolescent children about the nocturnal emissions of semen and the facts of menstruation, respectively, before this is to happen, when the moment arrives, the children will accept it naturally.

Sexual information is not the same as **sexual education**. Sexual information is easier but it is not sufficient. It has been proven that when there is more sexual information, there are more teenage pregnancies, venereal illnesses, etc<sup>1662</sup>.

Sexual education must procure the affective maturity of the child, helping him become himself, and to use sex in a correct fashion<sup>1663</sup>. Education carries man to do good. "Virtue is not only a matter of teaching. Many times we can assert that the problem, is not the lack of knowledge of what has to be done, but what is missing is the effort to do it. Virtues are obtained through continuous personal effort, but it is fundamental that said effort be accompanied by an intellectual conviction<sup>1664</sup>. It is not sufficient for man to know what is true and what is good, he also needs a motivation to live it. And this is what education is all about. Daily life teaches that it is not enough for man to know good to practice it. **Ovidius**<sup>1665</sup> said it two thousand years ago. "I know good and I approve of it, but I practice the bad".

Experience has shown us that insistent sexual information, such as what we have today, has negative effects, as it turns into sexual excitement.

<sup>1660</sup> GAUDEFRY: *Estudios de sexología, IX, 1, B, 3*, Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1661</sup> SER PADRES Magazine, nº2 og. 111

<sup>1662</sup> MUNDO CRISTIANO Magazine, 375s (VI-VIII,93) 9

<sup>1663</sup> Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education: *Pautas de Educación Sexual*, nº 70

<sup>1664</sup> ALFONSO AGUILÓ: *Interrogantes en torno a la fe. Presentación*. Ed. Palabra. Madrid.

<sup>1665</sup> *Metamorphosis*, VII, 20

Teaching is never a complete education. It must be supplemented by personal effort, by struggle. This is specially true as it relates to sexual education. The Christian use of sexuality does not come easily, there has to be an effort, and this effort sometimes has to be heroic. This is basically valid for youth, where the strength of sexual tendencies and the lack of maturity of the youngsters personality, will end in a deeper struggle. But on the other hand, youth is also the best time to understand life as a time to scorn comforts. To strengthen conscience in youth that human life is only obtained through struggle, is to place one of the strongest foundations for education, in the sexual aspect.

In this struggle one must have human resources and supernatural ones, as in this field also, the natural and supernatural are mutually affected.

Prayer and Sacraments are like the two directions on the road that joins man with God. Prayer, is fundamentally a request, man's road to God; Sacraments are the pathways through which God sends us His Grace, God's pathway towards man. Prayer and sacraments are at the base of sexual education.

As to the Virgin, She is full of Grace, she is the protagonist of the purest and deepest love that any creature may have or has had. She is our Mother and is before God to talk well about us, to intercede for us<sup>1666</sup>.

The failings in sexual matters are due to more than to the lack of information; to the weakness of the will, which is exposed to all kinds of temptations which can only be overcome by human effort with the help of God's Grace.

**Fr. Martin Descalzo** has said that the recent condom campaign is an acknowledgement of the failure of sexual education. As young people have not been taught to control their sexual instincts, they are given condoms to please them. Just like giving a baby a pacifier when he throws a tantrum<sup>1667</sup>.

Sexual education, well carried out, --initiation and education--, is necessary, and it is a right and obligation of the parents, who in all logic, must be prepared and insist on it. It would be a mistake to leave this education to unwarranted agents that the child will find, who will, inevitably carry out their pseudo education. No one can curtail the parents of this labor, and no one will take over properly so long as they, the parents, do it properly. In any case, it must be made clear, very clear, that, sexual education is a part of the whole education of a person, experiments towards the integrity and personal equilibrium of the person, be it on a personal basis, or confronting others, are not licit. It is also proper to remind parents, above all to those who give an initiation, albeit premature, to tell their children that this matter should not be talked about with others. Should there be success in this, the conversations on sexual matters would be less frequent, nor would parents be surprised by unexpected revelations.

Information that is given progressively about sexual reality at a cultural and religious level is very important when a child begins to become aware and starts seeing the world around him; but information alone is not enough. You need, above all, to educate a person in purity and chastity - virtues that will help the person dominate sexuality – through ideal means. This is achieved by a) an exemplary family atmosphere, b) learning and talking about love as taught through the gospels, c) self-control, and above all by prayer and sacraments.

For these reasons, **the State and Local Governments should collaborate** towards the well-being of the community. This means that they should not try to take over completely, but should respect the competence of the parents and the rights of the Christian community. In a realistic State program of collaboration in this matter, many problems would have to be taken into account, such as: the protection of the family, education, work conditions, housing, multiform pornography and

<sup>1666</sup> VÍCTOR GARCÍA DE LA HOZ: *Estudios sobre sexualidad*, XI, 5, 11, 13. Toledo, 1979

<sup>1667</sup> JOSÉ LUIS MARTÍN DESCALZO: *Razones desde la otra orilla. XXXIV*. Ed. Atenas. Madrid. 1991

eroticism, the so called “cultural aperture” of the media and others, some of which are truly pernicious realities etc., truly unjust aggressors – with beautiful poetic names—of the rights of the weak persons who, on their own account cannot defend themselves. Public power is equally responsible, together with the citizens, for the defense of their values, and in our case, it is not just that pansexualism holds such a high level monopoly in sexual education.

**Schools**, and now we are talking about Catholic schools, may help tremendously in giving the child a good sexual education. As a subsidiary reality it must act with the consent and cooperation of the family, giving the child an integral education and assisting him to be properly integrated into the age of sexuality.

. The school must also educate the child about this matter in other more specific ways -by teaching the scientific aspect on a biological and psychological level, without however, omitting the moral aspect. The school must always work hand in glove with the parents and must try to avoid any new and grave problems arising before solving the already existing ones. This last situation can arise and is a high responsibility.

It can happen that a school, particularly if it is not a truly religious one, can upset this education due to the imprudence of a teacher, sometimes due to pressure by the pupils, or an outside influence or even a morbid interest about the matter. When this happens, what should be a serious educational matter, becomes a class of silly horse-play, an erotic den and might even reach the state of pornography. So one must insist on an atmosphere of extreme delicacy and respectfulness towards the students of both sexes when this matter is being taught.

We would like to tell educators to not allow whimsical initiatives, without the parent’s consent; it is not fair that they sometimes find themselves, burdened by the conferences, short courses and projections of sexual themes in Catholic schools that have not taken into account the Church’s Doctrine<sup>1668</sup>.

The Permanent Commission of the Spanish Episcopate has protested the distribution of some pamphlets by the socialist entities of the Spanish Public Administration, which pretend to be of sexual education, but what they really do is to incite libertine sexuality, encouraging the exercise of sexuality for the only purpose of self gratification, indifferent if it is derived from the solitary vice, or with another person of the same or different sex, without any relationship to morals or to sexual integration in the maturing of the person, turning sexual life into a game and pastime, something trivial and lacking human sense. Amongst other things it says:

Orientations relative to sexual conduct are opposed to the fundamental values and good of human sexuality and to the moral teachings of the Church... We feel the need to denounce that such orientations degrade and pervert the consciences of young people. This diffusion of immorality in the sexual field is frequently associated with attacks on Christian faith<sup>1669</sup>.

When civil authorities, of any rank, promote the distribution of the aforementioned pamphlets in school areas, they are committing an absolute abuse of authority. Public powers are clearly violating the rights of the citizens which through the aforesaid pedagogical initiatives of through powerful communications media, try to establish in society as a whole, a predetermined concept of sexual conduct, which implies a defined form of understanding man and his destiny. It does not belong to the State, nor even to the political parties to try to establish in society a determined conception of man and of morals through means that presuppose an undue pressure on citizens which is contrary to its moral and religious convictions.

It is of the competence of the state organizations, to tutor the citizens against moral disorders and of any form of sexual aggression, especially in the abuse of minors and, in general, against the degradation of customs and limitless permissiveness. Taking into account the plurality of modern society, and the rightful religious freedom, it is the state’s responsibility to help all families so that they can give their children in all schools an education in accordance with the moral and religious

<sup>1668</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine (4-X-75) 19ss

<sup>1669</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2346(21-XI-87)8

principles professed by their parents, such as is prescribed in the Spanish Constitution. The Constitution itself establishes the norms of protection of the morality towards children and youngsters.

The common welfare of society is at stake; a community that does not hold a sufficient degree of adhesion to fundamental moral values, such as, in this case, those relative to sexuality and to family, are destroyed.<sup>1670</sup>

The Archbishop of Valladolid, **José Delicado Baeza**, in a pastoral letter, laments the frivolity with which in some sites sexual education is conveyed, stimulating sex more than educating it, and he adds, "Chastity is not the only one, not even the main one of the Christian virtues, but it is a necessary virtue to life in grace"<sup>1671</sup>

Sometime ago, sexual education had some mistakes. But today, some people call sexual education that which is pure pornography. They have forgotten, that man, besides body, has a spirit, and that the sexual behavior of man cannot be the same as that of an animal. The sexual instinct of man must be directed by reason and will. In this manner, it elevates itself, it dignifies and spiritualizes itself. Libertine sexuality has worse problems than sexual repression. Sexual aberrations are spreading like wildfire. Because man requires an ethic, a moral norm. His conduct is not regulated by instinct such as in animals, who never eat if they do not need to, nor do they procreate outside the times of when the female of the species is in heat<sup>1672</sup>

5.- It is, above all, important that parents **worry about** the religious instruction of their offspring. If they do not know or cannot do it, they must find someone who can foster this obligation, be it in school, or at the catechism class of the parish. The New Code of Canonic Law: "it is the obligation of the parents, in first place, to carry out the Christian education of the children"<sup>1673</sup>. The young child must be obligated to do certain things, (cleanliness, hygiene, etc.) even if he does not understand their value. In time he will understand their meaning, and when he grows up, he will do them on his own. The same must be done with religious education.

Take them out on Sunday to the park or to the countryside, and when returning home, pay a visit to some church and show them, little as they may be, where the Lord is, so that they become accustomed to praying and asking Him things and to talking with Him. It is convenient from their first years to instill in them a life of piety. This cannot be substituted. You must have the habit of praying together: blessing the food, praying in the automobile when going on an outing, etc. A family that prays together, stays together<sup>1674</sup>.

6.- Children **are the charm** of a home, and the joy of the parents. Carriers of the name, perpetuating the surname, a stimulus for their work, a consolation to their suffering and the hope of their old age.

Children strengthen the love of their parents. International statistics show that there are less marriage breakups when the couple have children. Children enrich conjugal love. They cause egotism to be overcome. The love of the father towards the mother can have an egotistical hue because of the physical pleasures that she gives him and the help she gives. The offspring will make his sacrifices increase, and nonetheless, he is loved. The same in her, maternity awakens enormously the capacity of sacrificing love.

A home where children abound, is a happy home.

<sup>1670</sup> YA Newspaper, 13-XI-87. pg. 25

<sup>1671</sup> CADIZ Daily Newspaper, 5-VI-92, pg. 40

<sup>1672</sup> CESAR VACA, O.S.A.: YA Newspaper 6-VI-75

<sup>1673</sup> New Code of Canonic Law. N°226

<sup>1674</sup> JESUS URTEAGA: *Dios y los hijos*, III. 6. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. .

Children are noisy, how sad is one's old-age without children. Children are the strongest link between couples. They fill their lives with illusion, I know that sometimes they are the cause of annoyance and displeasure, but they do make their parents happy.

The future of the human race is forged in the family. Therefore, it is essential and urgent for everybody to make an effort to keep and promote the values and demands of the family<sup>1675</sup>.

The family is a community such that from the very beginning, from its infancy, moral values can be learned, beginning by praising God and using freedom properly<sup>1676</sup>.

“The problems that a married couple and the family face in our days are well known. That is why it is essential to present the ideal of the Christian family based on marital unity and faithfulness, open to fertility and guided by love. And why not express a vivid support to the pronouncements of the Spanish Episcopate in favor of life and to the illicitness of abortion? I exhort everyone to not waive in their defense of all form of human life, in the strength of marriage, in the fidelity of conjugal love, in the education of the children and youngsters following the Christian principles and confronting blind ideologies who deny transcendence, and whom recent history has disqualified by making them show their true face”, so spoke **John Paul II** in June 1993 at the homily in the mass of canonization of **Saint Enrique de Ossó** in Madrid

**The family is the basis of society**, which is what **Pope Pius XII** said on may 9, 1957. “Society is for the family, and not the family for society”. The family is the naturally established institution, universal in time and space. That is where human life originates, the repository of education and the link towards the transmission of ethics. But for this transmission to be effectual, the religious and moral norms must be established with conviction, with motivation and with example. There must not be any contradiction between what is said and what is done.

You educate more by example than by talking. In the family, everything educates or sets a bad example.

The family has an **irreplaceable value** for the children. A child without a family is traumatized. Statistics of juvenile delinquents and psychic abnormalities speak for themselves. According to **Katherin Kasun**, President of Family Campaign Foundation of Sweden, a country in which the state substitutes the family in a large way, for the education of the children, one out of every four kids needs a psychiatrist, and the number of suicides of those under 16 has reached 130 a year, and is increasing<sup>1677</sup>

A society that destroys the family **commits suicide**. The greatest treasure of a nation are the children. The future depends more on the children than on roads and other infrastructure. Children need a home. A day care center cannot take the place of a home. Psychiatrists talk about the psychic traumas of the children that have not known the love and care and warmth of a home<sup>1678</sup>.

Family crisis is basically due to lack of Christianity. With **Christ** the family would be better. But the crucifix has been removed from the head of the bed to make place for a painting of a landscape. The family praying of the rosary has been substituted by watching television, religious books have been changed for magazines, either scandalous ones or those of gossip; Catholic moral has been put into a corner in order to live the hedonism broadcast by television, etc. That is why the family croaks, without **Christ** it teeters.

Today, in Spain, the family is in crisis. We have the lowest birth rate in the world<sup>1679</sup>. One of every three marriages breaks up. The equivalency of matrimony to the “couples”, which allow

<sup>1675</sup> JOHN PAUL II: *Familiaris Consortio Encyclical*, no°86

<sup>1676</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2207

<sup>1677</sup> YA Newspaper, 5-X-88, pg. 11

<sup>1678</sup> Dr. C. GÓMEZ LAVÍN: *Salvemos la familia*. YA Newspaper 20-IX-87, pg. 20

<sup>1679</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid. 17-IV-97, pg. 8

homosexuals to adopt children, is an insult to legitimate marriages and normal families. And an insult to those children which will result in psychological decay when they realize that their fathers are not normal.

The future of humanity is through the family.

Some time ago, this story came across my desk:

A painter wanted to create his masterpiece, but he did not find inspiration.

He thought it convenient to ask others what they considered of greatest importance.

He asked a priest. He answered: FAITH

He asked a bride leaving a wedding. She answered: LOVE

He asked a soldier coming in from war. He answered: PEACE

When returning home, he saw in his mother, FAITH, in his wife, LOVE and in his children PEACE. He had the inspiration required. He painted HIS FAMILY.

7.- The most difficult age for the education of your children **is adolescence**. The adolescent begins to discover his own personality and feels the need to affirm it. So he becomes rebellious towards everything. Education, character or virtue can dominate this rebellious spirit.

This should not come as a surprise to us, what we should do is find out how to educate him. It is a difficult time. Older people are still inclined to treat the adolescent as a baby and that makes him rebel. They feel grown-up and need to feel respected. Treating them irrespectively or ironically can be counter-productive.. Without losing parental authority, parents should try to become friends with their adolescent child so that he can see that they are trying to treat him with consideration. The brashness of the adolescent is only a façade. On the inside he is insecure. He needs advice. But it must be given without his being belittled, as then he will not accept it. The adolescent needs to affirm his personality, his independence, he wants to be himself, let it be he who decides, let it be him responsible for self. He is starting on the road towards adulthood., and only if he is accepted will he reincorporate himself emotionally into family life. Parents must assist in maturing the child on his road to adulthood. Parents must help their offspring to mature into adulthood. They should not be authoritative in their prohibitions, but guided by reason and for the good of their child, making sure in a loving way that they understand. It is not about slowing up their maturing, but to help him in his self-development. The adolescent will balk at anything that seems to be an imposition which would endanger his nascent personality. He will not accept being treated as a child.

Adolescents are insecure, as they lack internal unity, they lack the sense of security, the basis of a harmonious development.

They acquire the feeling of security when they have a home life of love and authority, love, particularly from their mother and authority from their father. This does not imply that the mother may not apply authority and that the father cannot be loving.

**Maternal love** is of vital importance for the physical and psychic health of the child. A disturbed adult is often a victim of lack of love during his infancy and adolescence. Criminologists have proven over and over again that many junior delinquents have been deprived of family love. A mother must be the centre of the family and responsible for keeping the flame of love alight.

Unfortunately, these days many women prefer to be **equal to men**, forgetting their role of home-maker and neglecting the education of their children and often forgetting that the children need her.

There is another danger, overprotecting a child and spoiling him. This can cause a child to forego the necessary emancipation from his parents. An over-protected child will not know how to react later on when confronted with the difficulties of life, they will not be capable of doing anything without the help of someone else. A child must be educated for his own well being, to develop his own personality not just to satisfy the selfishness and egoism of his parents.



A father is indispensable in the education of a child, because the child needs his authority and guidance. Many fathers do not understand this. They arrive home at night, tired and very often pay no attention to their children.

One must find time to be with them, talk to them, inspire their trust, their confidence, listen to them and comprehend their problems with sympathy. But a father must be careful not to overprotect or spoil the children because this can cause them to become pusillanimous, afraid of life, and fearful of responsibility.

**A father's authority** is of vital importance to his child's emotional development. We often hear of people talking about the effects of a lack of maternal love; a lack of fatherly authority is just as bad.

Educate your children with love, comprehension and firmness. Maternal love and paternal authority are the two great columns on which the education of children and adolescents rest<sup>1680</sup>.

**Willpower** is very important in life. It is obtained with perseverance, and training like in a sport. To obtain it, there must be a great dosage of animation. The prize: stimulus, attention and frequent praise. Life is hard, and only with courage you can reach the summit of the strong.

These days one frequently hears what **Enrique Rojas** calls the "whatever" philosophy<sup>1681</sup> I do whatever I want because I like to. I don't do whatever I dislike, because I don't want to. They are slaves of what the body needs. They are as voluble as a wind vane in changing winds. Incapable of concrete objectives. On the other hand, a person who has an educated will, will achieve what he wants, if he is constant in his endeavor. To have a will, one must start by having self control. To not do what I want, but what is best. I may like the best, but this doesn't always happen. To educate your will, there is a gradual learning process, which is obtained with the repetition of acts where one battles the wants, until one achieves a "positive habit". This will bring peace, glee and happiness. It would be very convenient to teach him to start making small sacrifices; to say no to sweets, to delay quenching his thirst, to not watch so much television, to eat what he doesn't like, letting others speak, to not spend money on unnecessary items, etc. This will educate his will, which will be very useful down the road. **Aristotle**, maintained that the authentic manifestation of will power is measured in self control: "To go by the way of less resistance does not lead to maturity".

One must not only encourage the child to make an effort to reach goals, but also to praise continuously the small or big thing he has attained.

A child, when young has no criteria. Good and bad are learned from his elders.

Before someone inculcates bad things to him, it is necessary to give him a solid moral base, to form his conscience, imbue a sense of duty, correct what is defective and to clearly establish where he can find virtue.

It is convenient to clearly indicate what is bad and what is good. It is important to create good habits. Accustom him to do things properly and later on, they will, by themselves, attest that what they learned is something good.

What you do is what you learn. So when you put an individual into action, and help him ponder on it, it is the only or the most important way of traversing with realism in the field of values<sup>1682</sup>.

We must educate in values. There must be a system of values which can be a benchmark in our lives. Values the conduct guides. The scale of values establishes the conduct of each individual. The same way that children learn to walk, read and write, they learn conduct and moral behavioral norms. If we do not teach them to distinguish good from bad, if we do not correct them, nor teach them norms so that they know their boundaries, they will never learn to behave as adults, nor will they give sense to their lives. But values are lived, are suggested, are shared, they are not imposed. The child has an enormous capacity to imitate. He learns to be a man by taking on as his the values

<sup>1680</sup> MANUEL VIERA: *Vida sexual y psicología moderna, II*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>1681</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid 22-IX-94. pg. 42

<sup>1682</sup> PADRES Y MAESTROS Magazine: Clarification of values

and examples he sees in others. They seek role models to imitate. Example is the best way to educate<sup>1683</sup>

**Self-discipline** is vital for the formation of the human being. Some parents, frightened they may cause a complex in their children, let them do whatever they like and forsake their parental authority. These children will never be upright men and women. They will become a burden on society and their families: misfits. They have not been trained to face the inevitable difficulties of life. This phobia toward complexes will engender deeper complexes which are graver.

Disciplinary rules must be uniform and coherent. Both parents must be of the same mind, one must never undermine the authority of the other.

Parents should never discuss in front of the children. If there is a disagreement about the other's point of view -they must discuss it in private, and reach harmony. But they must always support each other in front of the children. In some marriages, it suffices for one of the parents to say something so the other will countermand him, unreasonably, just because it was said by the other. It is a way of bickering that damages the child.

Children need stability and constancy as well as firmness in their parent's attitude.

What educates a child is that which he understands affectively.

Children must be educated with love, comprehension and firmness. Children are never the same, every child needs to be treated differently. A shy child needs to be given self confidence, a high-strung child needs to be treated with patience, calmly but firmly. Authority and obedience are not to be imposed by shouting, this only increases their rebelliousness.

I suppose that there is no family living that however well educated or however Christian it may be, has never experienced the crisis of independence which provoked a conflict between parents and children<sup>1684</sup>. These conflicts should never be allowed to become deep and long lasting. Parents should be patient with their adolescent child and they should wait to correct him to be calm and with serene. Never do this in front of strangers, always try to see the reason the child has for his behavior. You must allow him the right to something secret (e.g. his drawer with his key), a prudent use of his independence, so long as his use of such liberty is known. If his parents respect his space, it will be easier for the adolescent to be more sincere with them, he will probably tell you some secrets, ask for advice, etc. But an unwarranted search, especially if against his will, will diminish the trust he has given the parents and will increase the distancing from them<sup>1685</sup>

Adolescents must be helped so that they can harmoniously develop their physical, intellectual and moral conditions, so that they will gradually acquire a more perfect sense of responsibility in the continuous and straightforward development of life itself and in pursuing true freedom<sup>1686</sup>

It is also very necessary for parents to get them interested in some sort of hobby, particularly any sport, handcrafts, a musical instrument, etc.

The adolescent is extremely insecure particularly in himself, which is why he asserts himself so aggressively. He needs a support and he tries to find one. At the same time, he is too proud to accept help unless it comes from a peer to peer environment, just as he would like.

First, he needs intellectual help. A child asks when he does not understand. But an adolescent, if he lacks knowledge, starts by affirming. Even though you may think the contrary, it is progress, or even better, a possibility of progress. The peremptory answers of his parents are not enough for him. He needs personal answers. He shifts from passivity to activity, from complete dependence in his infancy to virile self-dependence. His judgments are absolute, never mind how he

<sup>1683</sup> BERNABÉ TIerno: EL SEMANAL Magazine, 8-V-94. pg. 70

<sup>1684</sup> P. ARMENTA. S. M. Adolescentes. Ed. S. M. Madrid

<sup>1685</sup> SCHNEIDER: *Educación Católica de la familia. XIV*. Ed. Labor. Barcelona

<sup>1686</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gravissimum educationis*. Statement on the Christian education of youth n°1.

found them, on the T.V. or by reading or listening to a friend, and so he states this to all the world in general. It is no good trying to contradict him, he will become angry or he will shut himself away. Never laugh at him. He is obstinate, will probably never talk to you again and could try to find comfort elsewhere.

What is there to do? Help him. Start by not quarrelling with him. Do not get upset, you probably feel like calling him an idiot and telling him that what he is saying is so stupid that it is not worth discussing. Do not do it, swallow your indignation, calm down and listen to him. Learn to talk to him on an even level, do not talk down to him. But on the other hand, he needs you to maintain your influence over him!

The adolescent only listens to those that treat him as if he were a serious, intelligent adult, more so if he does not deserve to be treated as such. It is the only way to help him to become a serious, intelligent adult. Talk to him about how you felt at his age and how you managed to overcome the difficulties. Sort out all the statements he makes and you will probably find a truth that is acceptable.

Children do not like authority to be imposed upon them in an arbitrary way, nor to be treated as not being able to reason. They want to be given orders as adults. Mothers and fathers should have in mind the teaching maxim: "An infant is ordered, a child is to be suggested to, and an adolescent is included in the decision"<sup>1687</sup>. Values are suggested, they are not imposed with coercion, even though there may be the moral obligation of acceptance. Each one chooses the values he desires. That is why one must motivate them. It is not sufficient to voice phrases such as this: "This is the way that things are done around here, and that is it!"; "you have no idea about this".

*Children need to be heard, they want us to listen to their opinions, understand their problems and to treat them as adults.*

During adolescence, which starts with **puberty**, many important transformations take place, both intellectually and psychologically; it is the first step to maturity. There is physical growth, sexual maturity and, above all, a very deep psychological transformation; that gives the adolescent his own personality. He feels new things happening deep inside him. He becomes introverted and reflexive and discovers "himself", he wants to know more about this "self". This new awareness he has about himself, takes him to contemplate his ego, to be with himself. He wants to know himself, to understand himself.

It is narcissism, **Narcissus** a mythological creature, who enjoyed looking at his image in the still waters. Fell into the lake in rapture of his own image. The Gods transformed him into the flower that bears his name.

The adolescent falls in love with his own image, he admires himself secretly. Externally, he is very worried about his image, his hair, skin, physique, etc. He is always looking at himself in the mirror, he normally keeps a diary. It is also a time of self eroticism

At this age, they despise everything that is conventional. They want to stand out, by the way they talk, dress, dance, etc., everything points to their desire of extravagance This auto contemplation and aggressiveness help the adolescent in affirming himself but if allowed to go on too long it can have very serious consequences, inasmuch as he will have difficulty adapting to society. There are adults that never overcame this stage, they are the eternal rebels against everyone and everything, incapable of adapting to the reality of life. Adolescents feel the seduction of that which is great. It is necessary to channel this impulse to a noble ideal. Religious instincts start to awaken between 13 and 14 years of age and reach their completion at 16.

The adolescent is a natural **introvert**. This attitude has a repercussion on his conduct, making him love to be alone and in silent prayer. He senses the values and wants to form an ideal. It is in puberty where the religious problem is elucidated. Generally a difficult problem, as it lies between the

---

<sup>1687</sup> Libro básico del creyente hoy, XXXIII, 1. Ed. PPC. Madrid, 1970

infantile mind and the critical spirit of the adult, between the feeling of security and the violent bargaining in of instinctive life, between submission and the affirmation of the ego.

An adolescent's religious evolution depends on many factors, his own reactions, the surrounding environment, and the example of the adults he lives with. Some abandon the faith because it has been presented to them as a yoke and not as something that can help them to fulfill themselves. The sexual instinct brings difficulties in the religious and moral life of the young person. Violent conflicts arise between the moral and religious values on one hand and sexual tendencies on the other: between the spirit and the flesh.

If these tendencies are overcome and if natural values are harmonized with the demands of religion, the young person will find great strength to succeed.

Young people without religion fall into depravity much more easily, their sexual instinct without religion can drop to the level of an animal in heat.

There are people who say that **morality is old fashioned**, that it only serves to create complexes, that anything that holds back natural instinct must be anti-natural; but morality is formed by objective principles and not by personal opinions. The essential obligations of moral law are based on the essence and nature of man, on his fundamental relations and they prevail wherever man is found. We have already said that self control is indispensable in the formation of the human being. Psychologists tell us, based on experience, that many psychic illnesses have as their origin, the disorder that comes from not abiding a moral law.

To educate a man is to make him capable of distinguishing and categorizing values. A value is something for which a thing or act is appreciated. Everything has some value. Discretion is what is capable of discovering in each thing the type of value and counter value that it contains. There are values that must be sacrificed for superior values: money for man, sex for love, etc. The different categorization of values is what gives the individual his moral status<sup>1688</sup>

**Paul Chauchard** says "Moral precepts are necessary for psychological equilibrium<sup>1689</sup>". Moral must be presented in a positive manner, inculcating virtue and imitating **Jesus Christ**. The sacrifice and control that following the Lord implies, must be freely chosen with love<sup>1690</sup>.

In nearly all social circles and levels necessity comes before capacity. One needs to be treated as an adult before being capable of being one, precisely because it is the only way of becoming one. Your child wants to start thinking for himself even though he does not know how to do it. If you despise him or get cross with him because he does not know how to do these things, where do you think he will learn, reading the newspaper? Among his friends? In the cinema? You, his parents must and should teach him to think, but in order to do this do it with him slowly and with patience. You will be rewarded the day you hear him defend your ideas, the ideals that have prevailed in the home and now it appears that your child defends them better than you could.

Speak with your children about everything and create an atmosphere of dialogue in which parents and children can talk without reserve. The adolescent needs his points of view to be listened to and appraised, and above all, that he be valued and that he sees that his parents are concerned about him.

The Decalogue of the adolescent:

- 1.- Allow me to choose my clothes
- 2.- Treat me as an adult and I will become one
- 3.- Let me build my own convictions.
- 4.- Respect my privacy
- 5.- Help me in my ideals of faith and succoring my brethren

<sup>1688</sup> BERNABÉ TIerno: *Valores humanos, 1ª, III*. Ed. Taller de Editores. Madrid. 1993

<sup>1689</sup> PAUL CHAUCHARD: *Biología y Moral*, pg. 171.

<sup>1690</sup> MANUEL VIERA: *Vida sexual y psicología moderna, I, 1, b*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

- 6.- Help me in appreciating my capacities and limitations.
- 7.- Nurture me with your experience and help me to have mine
- 8.- Help me to clarify my problems and find solutions.
- 9.- Help me learn the proper use of money
- 10.- Show me how to prepare myself for marriage<sup>1691</sup>

After 45 years of mixed education, sociologists and teachers have realized that it is better for boys and girls to be educated separately. This has been stated by the Swedish Minister of Education, **Beatriz Ask**.<sup>1692</sup>

“Youth, divine treasure”, says a poet and he is right. Youth is the most wonderful stage of life and the least difficult. It is the most wonderful because during youth one’s heart encloses myriads of illusions and hopes that have not yet been destroyed by the fate of life, one’s mind creates marvelous dreams and ideals that may one day become reality. But it is also the most difficult stage because it is the crossroads of thousands of paths, and one’s life long happiness depends on which path you choose. Among these thousands of wonderful possibilities, is the agonizing urgency of selecting one path and rejecting the others.

Perhaps the most important psychological characteristic of youth is the awareness of being able to think, work and subsist by themselves. The sensation of independence that awakens us from our infancy; when we depended on someone for everything. This development and anxiety of freedom which are very good, necessary and praiseworthy can lead a young person to rebel unjustly against everything, against society, against family, against teachers. They think they are superior to everyone else in their way of living, that all adults are old-fashioned, that they do not know anything, that “I” am the only one who knows, the one who can choose my course of life, who knows what it is all about, ignoring and refusing all help and advice from others.

This is a very mistaken attitude, because we all need help from someone in this life, and the young person although he does not believe it or does not want to believe it, is precisely the person who needs most help and advice because it is he who is at the cross-roads of life. The best help that a young person can obtain is that of his parents, it is always the most unselfish, honest help ever given<sup>1693</sup>.

The problems that are headlined in newspapers around the world, are a reflection of the lack of disposition that our youth has to be subjected to a series of values that are not those of their pragmatic, uncertain and ephemeral criteria. We are all witnesses of cases where the adolescent is warned and counseled over and over again by his parents, experienced and responsible, but they, the youngsters, prefer to “go on it by themselves”, just to discover when it is too late, that father was right. Unfortunately, there are many youngsters who do not want to heed advice. Such hostility to paternal authority deprives them of the experience of their elders, for wanting to do things by themselves<sup>1694</sup>.

#### 8. Ways of converting children into delinquents.

- 1.- Give them everything that they ask for from babyhood: They will grow up convinced that the world owes them everything.
2. Laugh even though what they are saying is absolute rubbish:  
They will grow up convinced they are funny..
3. Do not give them any religious formation: They will choose it when they become older. They surely will not have one.

<sup>1691</sup> From a report from the Seattle, WA. Police department.

<sup>1692</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid 29-VIII-94. Pg. 17 & 84s

<sup>1693</sup> Dr. DOMÍNGUEZ.: *Felicidad Sexual, VII, 1.* Ed. Plus Ultra. New York. 1971

<sup>1694</sup> EDMUNDO ELBERT: *Problemas actuales de psicología, 2ª, XII.* .Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

4. Never say “what you are doing is wrong”. They might develop a guilt complex and later on, for example, when they are caught stealing a car, they will be convinced that it is society who is wrong and is persecuting them without motive.

5. When they throw something on the floor, you should pick it up, they will then believe that everybody should wait on them.

6. Let them read everything: make sure, of course, that the dishes and clothes they use are scrupulously clean, never mind about their spiritual well-being.

7. Parents should quarrel in front of them: they will be so used to it that when the family eventually breaks up, they will not even notice.

8. Give them all the money they ask for: God forbid that they should ever suspect that one has to work for it.

9. Spoil them, let them drink, eat, have fun, everything they desire must be given into; if not they will be frustrated.

10. Make sure that they know they are always right: it is the other people who are always wrong, their teachers, the law, society, etc, they victimize them.

And when your child is a total disaster, you will be able to say that you could never do anything with him<sup>1695</sup>.

Famous American pediatrician **Dr. Benjamin Spock**, who all his life was in favor of letting children have their own way, in the winter of his life, during a lecture he gave at the University of Pennsylvania, admitted that he had been wrong and was probably responsible for spoiling a whole generation of children. He stated that education must be guided by definite rules of conduct.

Spoilt children, to whom everything is given, that are refused nothing, will become traumatized. Suggest concrete objectives that are possible, and not too hard. Study the plan of action to obtain the proposed objective. Give him a time frame for the future stages. Practice with him so that he will allow small things to slip by.

In educating adolescents, the following ten bits of advise can help the parents:

- 1.- Listen more than talking to him
- 2.- Demand only important things
- 3.- Reason what is ordered
- 4.- Don't label him in a depreciatory manner, instead of calling him a “liar”, tell him “you have told a lie”
- 5.- Make him reason his ideas.
- 6.- Do not laugh at his ideas. Show him his errors.
- 7.- Give clear, concise orders. Demand they be carried out.
- 8.- Do not threaten uselessly. Demand the punishment doled out. Do not lift the punishment, unless it is with a just cause.
- 9.- That the punishment is proportional to the fault.
- 10.- Do not let him be disrespectful, but you should also not shout. Speak to him calmly.

**Dr. Bernabe Tierno**, a psycho-pedagogue, gives this advise to educate adolescents<sup>1696</sup>:

- 1.- Respect him as a person. Treat him as if he already had the qualities that you would want him to have.
- 2.- Be an example of the virtues that you want in him
- 3.- Admit your errors and he will learn to admit his.
- 4.- Exercise your self-control. Do not lose your nerves, even if he is out of place.
- 5.- Value his virtues, his efforts, his progress
- 6.- Reason your orders. The “do as I say” will put him on the defensive.

<sup>1695</sup> Taken from a document published by the Police Dept. of Seattle (Washington)

<sup>1696</sup> BERNABÉ TIERNO: FAMILIA HOY Magazine, 2 (V-95) 68

- 7.- Put yourself in his shoes. Treat him as you would like to be treated, if you were him.
- 8.- Promote his self-discipline: to not do what he would like, but what is convenient.
- 9.- Help him think towards maturity, Difficulties are not to abate yourself, but to affront them.
- 10.- Make him see that he can and should be happy. Happiness is within oneself. It does not depend on external circumstances.

Steps to be effective:

- 1.- Be clear as to what I want to attain.
- 2.- That this objective is within my reach. I should not try to grab the moon with one hand.
- 3.- Choose the adequate means to the goal.
- 4.- Do not give up too quickly. Be resolute and constant in your endeavor
- 5.- Correct the errors made, and do not blame others or the circumstances
- 6.- Take care of all details, and do not wait for others or chance to correct them
- 7.- Do not belittle anyone. That person may be of use to us tomorrow.
- 8.- Pray that God's help be present in all of the aforementioned points.

**Mental health** is one of the most important things in life. For mental hygiene to be able to make possible the psychic maturity and the balance of the person, the end result of all education, it is necessary to:

**a) Self-esteem.**-or accept oneself as one is. Recognize your qualities and defects. Do not overestimate yourself, considering yourself able in what is not possible. But at the same time, one should not consider oneself as a useless person. To know what one is capable of, and rejoice in that.

**b) Self-control.**- Do what is necessary, convenient and proper, even though it disagrees with us and is costly. Who ever rules his life by his wants, does not own himself nor does he own his acts. He is at the mercy of the circumstances and of the people who are around him.

That is why **Emerson** said that: "the education of the will is the goal of our existence", as from this goal, everything else becomes easy and gratifying. But to educate the character and will in some noble principles demands perseverance in doing good and this, almost always, makes you swim upstream. Against that stream that today is sweeping so many to run away from everything that supposes tenacity, sacrifice and effort<sup>1697</sup>.

The will is strengthened by performing strenuous acts. Their frequency conduces to habit. By repeating strenuous acts, by doing something that does not appeal to me because it is obligatory, necessary or convenient, I dominate my character in order to profile my personality<sup>1698</sup>.

**c) Capacity to confront** bad times without losing peace, nor hope, nor illusion.

**d) Live rejoicing** in the present, without and anguish from the past, nor fears of the future. Make of service to your brethren a means to overcome selfishness and the ideal of life.

All of this is not inherited. It is the fruit of labor and it is learned in a good education<sup>1699</sup>

9.-When the moment arrives for them to choose their **marital status**, you can give them advice but you can never impose on their freedom of choice. Parents will sin if they take away their freedom of choice. But they must advise what seems to be reasonable on the matter. If you do not like the relationship, be careful not to say or do things that could be an obstacle for the family relationship when eventually your son or daughter, in spite of your disagreement about it, marries the person of his or her choice<sup>1700</sup>.

<sup>1697</sup> BERNABÉ TIerno: EL SEMANAL Magazine, 27-VIII-1995, pg. 54

<sup>1698</sup> ENRIQUE ROJAS: *Remedios para el desamor*, X, 11. Ed. Temas de Hoy. Madrid. 1991

<sup>1699</sup> Dr. BERNABÉ TIerno, Psychologist, EL SEMANAL Magazine, 472 (10-XI-96) 100

<sup>1700</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2230

“Parents should be pleased and give thanks if one of their children is called by the Lord to remain a virgin in a life that is consecrated, or in the ministry of priesthood”<sup>1701</sup>.

10. Relations between foreman and worker, director and staff etc. are also covered by this fourth commandment.

The organization of a society demands that there be people who give orders and people who obey orders. Because of this the power of authority comes from God and this authority must be used according to God’s law. People who are in charge and give orders must do so with justice and delicacy and those who have to obey must do so with respect, fidelity and submission.

This means that just as those who have the duty to obey, those in authority have the duty to command within the moral law; this means that they must try to achieve the well-being of their workers and not their own well being, be vigilant that justice prevails, e.g. giving positions of responsibility to those that deserve them; spending and investing money wisely.

11.-The **social question** has become aggravated in our time, mainly due to the fact that no attention has been paid to the social doctrine of the church<sup>1702</sup>.

The solution is in the fact that we convince ourselves that we are all brothers, and because of this we must help each other<sup>1703</sup>. Those that have more, must give to those that have less, because every human being should enjoy -moderately- of the bounty of this world. A rich Christian should not rejoice of his wealth because he knows that his wealth creates obligations, he should love his brothers not his wealth and because of his wealth he sees that he is able to help the less fortunate<sup>1704</sup>.

The problem is that many call themselves Christians and by their actions show that they are not. They do not obey what the church mandates. **Pius XI** said very bitterly: “It is truly lamentable that there have been and still are at this moment, people who call themselves Catholic, who barely remember the sublime laws of justice and charity, by which we receive the mandate not only to give to each what is theirs, but also to succor our brothers in need, such as **Christ** did. They, and this is the gravest, are not afraid to exploit their workers for their own profit. There are those who abuse their religion and cover themselves with its cloak while unjustly extorting in order to defend themselves of the very just demands of the workers. We shall never cease to condemn such a lowly conduct; these men are the reason why the church, unwarrantedly, has had the appearance and the accusation of siding with the rich, and to be not moved by the needs and hardships of those who find themselves destitute of their share of welfare in this life”<sup>1705</sup>.

**Jesus Christ** did not present himself as a new **Spartacus**, brandishing a sword and proclaiming the freedom of the slaves. **Jesus Christ** terminated slavery, but not with the force of weapons, but with the force of doctrine. Injustices are not beaten with hatred, but by making men better. Hatred changes one injustice for another. The only thing that makes a man better is the love of brethren. To improve humanity, there is no other doctrine that can surpass that of **Jesus Christ**: “do unto others as you would want then to do unto you”<sup>1706</sup>, “love each other as I have loved you”<sup>1707</sup>.

<sup>1701</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2233

<sup>1702</sup> PEDRO VILLACREUS, S. I.: *Orientaciones sociales*. Ed. Fax. Madrid

<sup>1703</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1941

<sup>1704</sup> LECRECQ: *El cristianismo ante el dinero*, VII. 3. Ed. Casal i Vall. Andorra

<sup>1705</sup> PIO XI: *Quadragesimo anno*, n° 50

<sup>1706</sup> Matthew, 7:12

<sup>1707</sup> John, 13:34



We should convince ourselves that while all of those “upstairs” and those “downstairs” do not obey the Holy Mother Church, the world will not fix itself. Hate and egotism cannot sustain true peace.

The social doctrine of the Church is not dynamite that destroys, but yeast that slowly transforms.

12.- **Pius XII** told Austrian Catholics: “The class struggle will never be able to be the object of the Catholic social doctrine<sup>1708</sup> .

“Those that think the worker’s interests are best served by the old methods of class distinction are very mistaken”. Pius XII in his message to the Italian workers, 1st May 1953. All classes must collaborate and this collaboration should be based on trust and mutual fulfillment of social obligations.

**Salvador de Madariaga**, a well known Republican intellectual, said: “ for Marxists, the class struggle is not a means, but an end: in the situation where there is wellbeing and social peace, they try to end it and create a class struggle<sup>1709</sup>

**John Paul II** said in Brazil: “Christian liberation uses evangelical means and does not use any sort of violence, nor the dialectic of class struggle or to the praxis or Marxist analysis<sup>1710</sup>. Class struggle is not conducive to social order, as it runs the risk of inverting the positions of the antagonists, creating new situations of injustice. To reject the class struggle is to decidedly opt for a noble struggle in favor of social justice. The common good of society is being threatened from within. This does not mean that the necessary transformations to carry out a better justice must be realized with violence, revolution or shedding of blood, as violence only prepares a violent society, and we Christians do not admit it. But there are social transformations, sometimes deep ones, which must be carried out, constantly, progressively, efficiently and with realism, thru peaceful reforms<sup>1711</sup>

The church, during its 20 centuries of existence, has had to live in the midst of diverse social structures. It has always, in every atmosphere, fought for the implantation of social justice. Not through a bloody revolution but through its doctrine and influx. Just as it abolished slavery and founded the guilds, which so greatly helped to distribute wealth and affirm social equilibrium<sup>1712</sup>, today it will continue to abolish social injustice, consequence of liberal capitalism and will impose the Christian brotherhood to harmonize relationships between men. The peer dignity of human beings demands the effort to reduce the excessive social and financial inequalities, and thrusts forward the disappearance of the iniquitous imbalances<sup>1713</sup> .

The fulfillment of the **social doctrine of the church**, if carried out by everyone, will mean that employers and workers would live in perfect harmony and well-being. This collaboration by both parties towards the implantation of the doctrine of the church would then solve the social problem. The church directs but she alone cannot do everything<sup>1714</sup>, She needs the collaboration of everyone. She provides the doctrine but the realization of this doctrine depends on man<sup>1715</sup>.

Modern industry is very different from that of the 19th century. It has advanced a lot but it has still not reached the point that the church would like. We all have to collaborate so that it continues evolving to the point where the human element of work achieves the dignity it deserves. The

<sup>1708</sup> Pius XII Radio message in Vienna on 14-XI-52

<sup>1709</sup> SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA. *Dios Y los españoles*, 2º, 4. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona. 1975

<sup>1710</sup> YA Newspaper 7-XI-80. pg. 28

<sup>1711</sup> YA Newspaper 28-XI-80, pg. 28

<sup>1712</sup> PEDRO VILLACREUS: S.I. *Orientaciones Sociales*, nº46 & 536-541 Ed. FAX Madrid.

<sup>1713</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 1947

<sup>1714</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2423

<sup>1715</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2442

recognition of the dignity of the person, subject to unalienable rights, is found in the fundamentals of the social teachings of the church<sup>1716</sup>.

13.-Economic enterprises are communities of people, this means, they are free and self-governing men, created in the image and likeness of God. Because of this, and taking into account the different functions of each one; owners, administrators, technicians, workers, etc., and separating the necessary unity in the direction of the company, one must try to promote the full and pro-active participation of everyone within the activities of the firm. But, as in many cases, it is very rarely within the company levels that economical and social decisions are taken, they are usually taken at high institutional levels, where these decisions involve the future of the workers and their children, and because of this the workers must participate in said decisions, either by themselves or by their freely elected unions.

Among the fundamental rights of a human being should be the right to freely **form worker's associations** that properly represent the worker and help to collaborate in economical matters, and to give the workers the right to belong to said associations without fear of retaliation. This organized participation which is linked to the economic and social progress in their sense of responsibility, will further grow in the development of the sense of responsibility among workers and they will feel they are active subjects, within their own means and aptitudes, in the great task of developing the economic and social well-being of the world.

When there are **economic-social conflicts**, one must try by all means to find peaceful solutions. First, there must be a dialogue between both sides, but in the present situation, **strikes** are necessary although an extreme necessity, to defend the rights and achieve the just aspirations of the workers. One must try and find ways to negotiate and renew conciliatory talks<sup>1717</sup>.

"Striking is a method recognized by the Catholic social doctrine as legitimate within the limits of obligations and justice. The workers must have the right to strike without suffering personal sanctions because of their participation in the strike. Although it is officially allowed, striking continues to be an extreme measure. One must not abuse it, one must especially not abuse it for politically motivated reasons.. We must never forget that in the case of strikes, essential services that are of importance to everyday life must be assured, even through legal measures if need be. Strikes cannot abuse by paralyzing everyday social-economic life, as this is contrary to the demands of the well-being of society"<sup>1718</sup>.

The acceptance of striking does not legitimize the use of unjust methods of striking power, such as calumny, lies, threats against persons sabotage, and in general, all of those methods considered of direct action. It is also a responsibility that the strike does not cross the boundary of what is considered to be necessary in order to obtain the repair of the injustice or the concession of the justly sought betterment. A strike is morally unacceptable when it is accompanied by violence, or also when it is carried out with objectives not related to the working conditions demands, or contractual wellbeing. The benefit to be obtained must correlate directly in proportion the harms it may cause<sup>1719</sup>.

No one is obliged in good conscience to tolerate any injustice committed against him. People who defend their rights, while respecting others, are righteous. When confronting injustice, a legitimate opposition is valid. This action against an established injustice is something that the local authority and citizens must do. The State maintains the just order, basically with the Laws, the public

<sup>1716</sup> VON GESTELL, O.P.: *La Doctrina Social de la Iglesia*, VI, 9, Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1717</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*, Constitution of the Church in the current world. N° 68

<sup>1718</sup> JOHN PAUL II, Encyclical *Laborem Exercens* No. 20

<sup>1719</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2435

force and the action of the courts. The citizenry has two extraordinary measures to oppose social injustice, striking and in extreme cases, revolution<sup>1720</sup>.

14. Much more extreme than a strike, because of the complexity of the implications of all kinds that it carries within itself is a **revolution** as a resource for opposition to injustice, not limited to the economic field, but inserted in the political life. The traditional Catholic doctrine has always recognized its legitimacy, when certain conditions are met, as an instrument to free oneself from the injustice suffered by the people, and it must always have a lesser consequence than the disastrous consequences to be had by the provocation of the unjust regime established in society<sup>1721</sup>. And that all other roads have extinguished and that there is true hope based on success, and that it is impossible to foresee a reasonably better solution.<sup>1722</sup>

**Paul VI** in his encyclical *Populorum Progressio* (nº 30 & 31) said “There are unjust situations that will call out the name of God. When whole populations of cities, towns, villages, etc. lack the basic necessities and live in such a state of dependence that this prevents all initiative and responsibility, all possibility of cultural promotion and participation in political and social life, the temptation to repel through violence all such terrible insults against human dignity, is great. However, as is well known, a revolutionary uprising, except in the case of prolonged tyranny that attacks the fundamental right of a person and puts the welfare of the country in danger, creates new injustices, introduces new unbalances, disturbances and confusion. You cannot fight true evil at the price of a bigger evil”.

**Paul VI**, during his traditional New Year’s day audience with the Diplomatic core at the Holy See, in 1967, talking about social justice, said: “The Church cannot approve those who pretend to reach this noble and legitimate objective through the violent subversion of the law and social order. The Church has conscience, and this is true, to adopt with its Doctrine, a revolution, if with this title it is understood that it is a change of mentality, a deep modification of the scale of values. It also does not ignore the strong attraction that the idea of revolution, understood as a brusque and violent change, is continually exerting in some spirits which are avid of the absolute, of a solution that is quick, energetic and efficient, as they think, of the social problem, and they would gladly see in it an only way that will lead to justice. In reality, the revolutionary action ordinarily begets a series of injustices and sufferings, as unbridled violence is difficult to control and it acts against people as well as against structures. It is not, therefore, in the eyes of the Church, an adequate solution to remedy the pains of society<sup>1723</sup>”.

Here is another fundamental criteria that will orient the Catholics in society: the Church does not forbid, but recommends its faithful that they should collaborate with all men of goodwill in the construction of a more just society<sup>1724</sup>. It is not up to the shepherds of the Church to directly intervene in the political activity, and in the organization of life in society.. This activity forms part of the vocation of the laity<sup>1725</sup>.

The diversity of political regimes is legitimate so long as they promote the well being of the community<sup>1726</sup>. Authority is only legitimately exercised if it seeks the well being of the group in question, and, if, in order to reach it, it employs means that are morally licit. If those in power should issue measures that are contrary to moral order, these dispositions cannot consciously oblige<sup>1727</sup>.

<sup>1720</sup> Libro básico del creyente de hoy XXXVI, 3s, Ed. PPC. Madrid. 1970

<sup>1721</sup> Libro básico del Creyente de hoy. XXXVI, 4. Ed. PPC. Madrid. 1970

<sup>1722</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2243

<sup>1723</sup> YA Newspaper, 8-I-67

<sup>1724</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Apostolicam Actuositatem*. Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, nº 14

<sup>1725</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2442

<sup>1726</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 1922

<sup>1727</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 1903

Common welfare comprises three essential elements: respect and promotion of the fundamental rights of the person; prosperity or the development of the spiritual and temporary goods of the society; and the peace and security of the group and its members<sup>1728</sup>.

All men enjoy one same dignity<sup>1729</sup>.

Atheists attack Christianity as an alienation that atrophies the initiative and labor of man<sup>1730</sup>. They believe that the religious phenomenon is alienating, as they believe that the affirmation of the existence of God estranges the believer from the effort of realization of the world and man, as they trick him with the utopia of a future paradise. But this is not so! God's plan and the Gospel say that: "man is responsible for his development as well as for his salvation"<sup>1731</sup>. Christianity teaches: "the importance of earthly works is not diminished by the hope of the other world"<sup>1732</sup>. On the contrary, "it forces men even more to carry out these activities"<sup>1733</sup>.

"The redeeming work of **Jesus Christ**, which within itself refers to the salvation of men, proposes also to restore all temporary order"<sup>1734</sup>.

The responsibility of issuing a moral judgment on those things that affect the political order when the fundamental rights of the person or the salvation of the soul so demands, belongs to the church.<sup>1735</sup>

It is evident that the Church, as such, does not have the function of **building the temporal world**<sup>1736</sup>. But there are Christians who are wrong when they consider that they can neglect temporal duties, being unaware that faith is a reason that demands the perfect fulfillment of all of them, in accordance with the vocation of each<sup>1737</sup>, God's plan for the world is that men instill the temporal order with a spirit of concord and that they perfect it unceasingly<sup>1738</sup>. The Christian who fails in his temporal obligations, fails in his obligations to his brethren, and also fails above all with his obligations towards God, and puts his eternal salvation in jeopardy<sup>1739</sup>. The secular cannot limit themselves to work for the edification of the People of God, or for the salvation of their souls for all eternity, but must endeavor themselves in Christian restoring of the temporal order. Because of their situation in the world, the secular are those directly responsible for the efficient presence of the Church as it refers to the organization of society in conformity with the spirit of the Gospel.

When Public Authority, overstepping their boundaries, oppress the citizenry, they must not avoid the objective demands of the common good; it is licit that they defend their rights and those of their fellow citizens against the abuse of such authority, maintaining the limits which are established in the natural and evangelical laws.<sup>1740</sup>

Denunciation for the sake of denunciation is not valid, and even less valid is the denunciation for the journalistic style of sensationalism. Denunciation is valid for the correction of evil. Prudence recommends whether it is convenient or inconvenient. There have been times in which the ecclesiastical hierarchy wanted to publicly denounce situations of oppression or injustice, especially

<sup>1728</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1925

<sup>1729</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1934

<sup>1730</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et spes* Constitution of the Church in the current world. N°43

<sup>1731</sup> PAUL VI : Encyclical: *Populorum Progresio*.

<sup>1732</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et spes* Constitution of the Church in the current world. N° 20

<sup>1733</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et spes* Constitution of the Church in the current world. N° 34

<sup>1734</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Apostolicam Actuositatem*: Decree on the apostolate of laity, n° 5.

<sup>1735</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2246

<sup>1736</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2245

<sup>1737</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et spes* Constitution of the Church in the current world. N° 43

<sup>1738</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Apostolicam Actuositatem*: Decree on the apostolate of laity, n° 7

<sup>1739</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et spes* Constitution of the Church in the current world. N° 43

<sup>1740</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et spes* Constitution of the Church in the current world. N° 74

in communist countries, and Christians in these countries requested that it not be done, as there would be reprisals that would make the situation worse.

A well known historical case was the Hitlerian persecution of the Jews; many wanted the Pope to publicly protest. But it was much more effective to work in delegations and commissions, obtaining the liberty of many Jews. This fact was publicly and gratefully recognized by them.

There is an attitude of prudence. Many times we call cowardice, prudence; this is bad. But aggressive temerity can take the name of courage, and this is also bad.

Should we want the denunciation to be effective, we must believe in it and do it firstly with the whole truth, that is to say, that what we are denouncing is true and that we are sure of it. In second place, with the truth motivating us, so that in other words, we are doing it for love of brethren.

The Social Catholic Doctrine has **heavily influenced** social realizations throughout history. Just to cite some of the modern ones, we can point out the following: the first law on Sunday the day of rest, approved by the French Parliament, was proposed by Catholic representatives. The first committee or Board of Directors in a company was instituted in 1885 by the French Catholic entrepreneur **Leon Harmel**, in his factory Val-des-Bois. The first Family Welfare Compensation Savings Union was established by the French Catholic businessman **Romanet** in 1900. The establishment of the obligatory Medical Health Insurance was proposed in 1900 in France by the Priest **Lemir**. It is not true therefore, that we Catholics always arrive late<sup>1741</sup>

Christian restoration of society, as one of the objectives of the church's mission in the world, does not mean that only Christians or Catholics are the only ones capable of respecting human civil rights, of defending the freedom of countries or installing just regime. There are men, even non-believers that aspire to achieve these objectives. The Church does not oppose them, on the contrary, it contributes its own efforts to the struggle of these men of good-will, and Catholics share their enthusiasm and their projects so as to construct a freer and more just secular society, more humane and more habitable for people, so that in this way everybody does contribute to God's plan for the world<sup>1742</sup>. Vatican Council II, then affirms: "The Council deeply respects and appreciates the efforts of various institutions already founded that are good and just and that are incessantly founded precisely to help mankind. We wish to state that the Church wants to help and encourage all these institutions that depend on the Church and can therefore reconcile their mission with that of the Church. No one desires so much as to freely develop, for the good of all, under any and all political regimes that recognize the fundamental rights of the person and of the family and the imperatives of human well-being"<sup>1743</sup>.

**Let us make better men if we want a better world.** To change the world it is not sufficient to change the structures. "It is true that an unjust world makes it very hard to change the person. But it would be an alibi to assign all of the bad to some impersonal structures that would be the scapegoats of all of our personal mistakes. **Jesus** places as primary and fundamental, the theme of personal responsibility of each man in that necessary change<sup>1744</sup>. On December 30, 1987, **John Paul II** published the seventh of his encyclicals entitled *Sollicitudo rei Socialis*, which means "Worry over social matters" These following paragraphs are from it:

"The objective of peace, so desired by everyone, will only be reached through the realization of social and international justice, including the practice of the virtues that favor the living together which teaches us to live united in order to jointly build, giving and receiving, a new society and a better world". (nº39) The Church does not have technical solutions to offer the problem of underdevelopment as such, it does not propose economic or political programs or systems, nor does

<sup>1741</sup> FERNANDO GUERRERO: *La Doctrina Social de la Iglesia*, SILLAR Magazine, 13 (III-84) 75

<sup>1742</sup> Libro Básico del creyente hoy, XVI, 2. Ed. PPC. Madrid 1970

<sup>1743</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Inter Minifica*. Decree on the Social Communications Means, nº 42.

<sup>1744</sup> JOSÉ LUIS MARTÍN DESCALZO: *Vida y misterio de Jesús de Nazaret*, 2º. VI, 3, d. Ed. Siguiente. Salamanca

it manifest a preference for one or the other, so long as the dignity of man is respected and promoted, and that it enjoys the necessary space to exercise its ministry in the world”(n°14). “The social doctrine of the Church is not: “a third rail between liberal capitalism and Marxist collectivism” it is a doctrine that must guide the conduct of the people” (n° 41). A development that is purely economical is not able to liberate man, on the contrary, it enslaves him even more. A development that does not encompass the cultural and religious dimension of man and society, would contribute even less towards the true liberation”(n°6). “We all have a calling, even more, obligated, to this great challenge.... Each one is called to occupy his own place in this non aggressive quest, which must be carried out in a peaceful manner to obtain the development of peace (n°47).”I want to address all men and women without exception, so that when convinced of the gravity of the present moment, and of their respective individual responsibility let us set forth as our endeavor—with the personal and familiar style of life, with the use of earthly goods, with our participation as citizens, with the collaboration in the economic and political decisions, and with the performance on a national and international level – the measures inspired in the solidarity and in the preferential love for the poor” (n°47).

The materialistic man has raised an altar to the idols of money, sex and power. In his adoration, he chases happiness without reaching it. Like the Greyhounds who chase the mechanical rabbit, never being able to catch it. Or like the one who chases his own shadow!

When sweeping God from life, the family will be crushed, the marriage will fail, youth becomes enslaved in lust and many businesses become a den of thieves.

Only God can provide an efficient motivation towards virtue and honesty. Honesty without God is exceptional.

Catechism is better than police in order to moralize life.

After the First World War, one of the most celebrated Italian writers, **Papini**, who had been an atheist, anarchist and anti-Catholic, converted to Catholicism, and in his *Story of Jesus Christ describes the modern world idolizing money, egoism and immorality*. Without **Christ** men turn into beasts that devour each other. At the end of his book he includes a touching prayer to **Christ**:

**Christ**, come again, as we need you,  
Whosoever is hungry, needs You, Bread of eternal life.  
Whosoever is thirsty, needs You, who gives water of eternal life  
Whosoever seeks the beautiful, seeks You, Eternal beauty  
Whosoever seeks the truth, seeks You, Eternal truth  
Whosoever seeks the peace, seeks You, the only one who gives True peace.  
Everyone clamors for you, **Christ!** Come Lord **Jesus!** We need you!

Many are surrounded by Christianity, but it has not entered into their hearts of stone, as the part of the wheel that is submerged in the creek, which if cut, you will find that it is dry inside, as the water has not entered. There is the tale of some shipwreck survivors that were dying of thirst on their life raft. The ocean currents had taken their boat to the delta of the Amazon river. The boat was surrounded by fresh water from the immense flow of the river, but the survivors were dying of thirst.

15.- All men have the **right and obligation** to work. Many men would like to work but they can't. One of the more serious current problems are strikes or the lack of job openings<sup>1745</sup>.

The right to work is owned by all humanity and it must be shared. It is necessary for we Christians to set forth an effort to make sure that all men in society have a job to perform with just

---

<sup>1745</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2433

retribution. That this job, whatever it maybe, is not humiliating to anyone, and that each man finds, whenever possible, the job closer to his capacities and vocation<sup>1746</sup>.

Many, who exalt their liberty as a supreme value, will later complain when their rights are demolished by another in the name of his own freedom, they will not respect him<sup>1747</sup>

16.- Here is what the doctrine says on **salaries** of different Holy Fathers: “It cannot be said that social justice has been served if workers do not earn a salary sufficient to assure their and their families sustenance, if they are not allowed to save a modest sum for the future, therefore avoiding the plague of universal pauperism; if no measures are taken that will let them have private or State insurance for old age, illness or unemployment. In one word, to repeat what we said in our encyclical “*Quadragesimo Anno*”. The social economy will be solidly constituted and will reach its objectives only when every man can benefit from the wealth and natural subsidies and the techniques and social constitution the economy can produce. These goods must be sufficiently abundant so as to satisfy the needs and honest comforts, and raise man to a happier state of life, so that prudently administered, will not only not impede virtue but will favor it in a very big way<sup>1748</sup>”.

**Pius XII**, in his address to 20,000 Italian workers gathered in the Vatican in June 1943, told them what their full salary should be. “A salary that will guarantee the existence of your family, and that will make it possible for the parents to comply with the natural duty of raising a brood healthily fed and properly clothed, a dignified roof over their heads, the possibility of giving the children a good education; to be able to foresee and adopt measures for the lean times, ailments and senility.”

**John XXIII**, in his encyclical *Mater et magistra*, says: “A deep sadness embodies our spirit when facing the extremely sad spectacle of innumerable workers who are given a salary that subjects them and their families to an inhuman form of living<sup>1749</sup>”.

Second Vatican Council, taking as its own the words of **JOHN XXIII** in his encyclical *Mater et Magistra* says: “The remuneration for work must be sufficient to allow a man and his family to live a dignified life in the material, social, cultural and spiritual plane, taking into account the job position, and the productivity of each, as well as the conditions of the enterprise and the common good<sup>1750</sup>”.

As can be easily comprehended, it is not easy to determine the limits of a just and equitable salary. The criteria of a legal wage, set forth by the state, is not sufficient, and the employers must supplement it with their sense of justice. What can never be forgotten, is that the worker and his family has a greater right to their wage than the capitalist has to his benefit of dividends; and that all benefit obtained through the unjust retribution of work must be considered as exploitation and unjust richness. Restitution will weigh heavily on the owners and their heirs<sup>1751</sup>.

**Cardinal Bueno Monreal** has said during the XXV Social Week in Spain: “Assets created have a universal destiny for the use of the human gender. As a consequence, they must reach all in a just form and in a spirit of charity. Not all men are equal as to physical capacity and intellectual and moral qualities, but there is a fundamental quality as to nature, origin, vocation and destiny. Any form of discrimination in the fundamental rights of the person is contrary to the divine plan and must be eliminated<sup>1752</sup>. Even though there may be just differences among men. However, the equal dignity of the person demands that a more just social situation is reached. It is scandalous that the excessive social and economic inequalities appear between the members of the people of the

<sup>1746</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Esta es nuestra fe. 2ª, III, 7, 2, 2, d.* EDICE. Madrid. 1986

<sup>1747</sup> STANLEY JAKI: *Ciencia, Fe, Cultura, VII, 5, pg 181.*

<sup>1748</sup> PIUS XI Encyclical *Divinis Redemptoris*, n° 52

<sup>1749</sup> JOHN XXIII: Encyclical *Mater et Magistra*, n° 68

<sup>1750</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes: Constitution on the church in the current world*, n° 67

<sup>1751</sup> Libro básico del creyente hoy, XXXVI, 5. Ed. PPC. Madrid. 1970

<sup>1752</sup> Cardinal BUENO MONREAL – YA Newspaper 23-III-66

human race. They are contrary to social justice, to equality, to the dignity of the person and to social and international peace<sup>1753</sup>.

**John Paul II** in his encyclical *Laborem exercens* says: "A just retribution for the work performed by an adult person, who has a responsibility for a household, is that which is sufficient to found and support a family in a dignified way, and to be able to assure its future.

"Said remuneration, can be paid through the so-called family salary, in other words, a salary which is paid to the head of the household for his labors should be sufficient for the needs of the family, without the need of making the wife look for work outside the household; either through family subsidies or assistance to the mother who dedicates herself exclusively to the home, aids which must correspond to the effective needs, that is to say, the number of persons in her charge during the time in which she is not in condition to assume in a dignified way the responsibility of life itself.

On the Centenary of the *Rerum Novarum* of Pope Leon XIII, May 1, 1991, **Pope John Paul II**, signed an encyclical. The *Rerum Novarum* had a notable influence on the numerous reforms introduced in the last years of the nineteenth century and in the beginning of the twentieth in the areas of social welfare, medical and accident insurance, pensions, etc. Even though the Pope recognizes that the success in obtaining these benefits was not only because of the church's efforts.

Even **Leon XIII** in the *Rerum Novarum* after accusing the social injustices of his time, saw that socialism was harming those that it was pretending to help. (Nº12) The experience of the following years has confirmed it with the sinking of Marxism in the Eastern European countries, where mobs of people were exploited and oppressed by totalitarian communism. (nº 19)

It started in Poland and continued through central and eastern Europe. (1989 – 1990)

The economic failure has been spectacular. The USSR after seventy years of communism has not attained an economic level for its people as has been attained in Western Europe.

In those countries where there is an economic freedom, denied by communism. A prosperous material result has been attained, and in some cases, overwhelming; a wide sector of a prosperous middle class has been opened; the average middle class "per capita" has been raised; and there have even been occasions in which assistance has been given to less developed countries.

The European Confederation of Unions (CES) in their VII Congress which took place in Luxemburg from May 13 to 17, 1992, **Pope John Paul II** has said in his encyclical *Centesimus annus*: "The CES attests that the fundamental values and the ideals of the European union movement are reunited in the new encyclical.

Here are some ideas of said encyclical:

The cause of failure of Marxism, is found in its atheism, which today is still present in "true socialism". It excludes the transcendence of man, religion (numbers 12 & 13). Marxism had promised to remove God from the need of the human heart, but results have demonstrated that this is not possible...The spiritual emptiness provoked by atheism has left the new generations disoriented. (Nº24) In the recent past, many believers have sought an impossible compromise between Marxism and Christianity. (nº26) After atheist communism's defeat in the European east, the solution is not materialistic capitalism, who does not deny God but ignores it. There is these days a "Savage capitalism" which "reduces man to the economic sphere and to the satisfaction of the material needs, excluding the spiritual values (nº 19) After the fall of true socialism (in eastern Europe) western countries are in danger of seeing in that fall the unilateral victory of the economic system, and thus would not worry to introduce the needed changes (nº 56). The Marxist solution has failed but there are still in the world remainders of the poverty and exploitation phenomena, against which, the voice of the church is firmly raised (nº 42). After the fall of totalitarian communism, we today gather round the dominance of the democratic ideal. But it is necessary to give democracy an authentic and solid foundation through the recognition of the right of life of the child once it has been conceived, the

---

<sup>1753</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*: Constitution on the church in the current world, nº 29



right to live in a moral environment, the right to live in the truth of the proper faith, etc. (n° 47) Class struggle is unacceptable when what is sought is not justice and the well-being of society, but the interest of one part and the destruction of the other (n°14). Violence and rancor must be defeated with justice (n° 17). Peace is not the result of military victory, but the overcoming of the causes of war(n° 18).We want a society in which “men, who because of their work can build a better future for themselves and for their family (n°19). Production of assets must not be the center of social life, ignoring the ethical and religious dimension of man (n°39). One must “remember the duty of charity, that is, to help with one’s own superfluous means and sometimes with the necessary in order to give to the poor the indispensable with which to live” (n°36) A man who only worries, and is incapable of dominating his instincts and his passions, and to subordinate them, through obedience to the truth, cannot be free.. Obedience to God’s truth and to man’s, is the first condition of freedom, which allows him to sort his own needs, his wishes and the ways to satisfy them in accordance with a just hierarchy of values, so that the possession of things becomes a means of growth(n° 41). The obligation of earning the bread with the sweat of the brow, means, at the same time, a right. A society in which this right is systematically denied, and the measures of economic policy do not allow workers to reach satisfactory levels of occupation, cannot attain their ethical legitimacy, nor the just social peace(n° 43). A company cannot be considered as a “society of capital”, it is at the same time “a society of people” (n° 43). The regulation of the relationship within the company must be established in such a way so that the worker receives a just remuneration, has a healthy and moral work environment in accordance with his health and dignity, and receives the deference of one who works within the institution. The Church cannot abandon man. It is this and only this, that inspires the social doctrine of the Church. (n°54). The Church understands the sense of man because of the divine revelation.. To know the complete man, one must know God. The Church, when it announces the salvation of God to man contributes to the enrichment of man’s dignity. The Church can never abandon this transcendental religious mission in favor of man. (n° 55). Should there not be a transcendental Truth (God), with whose obedience man conquers his own identity, there is also no other secure principle that will guarantee the just relationship between men. The power of strength will win, and each will tend to use to the extreme, all means at his beck and call to impose his own interest or opinion, without respecting the rights of the rest (n° 44). The state, or maybe the party,, who raises itself above all values, cannot tolerate that an objective criteria of good and bad be upheld over the will of the governors. This explains why totalitarianism tries to destroy the Church or at least subdue it.(n° 45)<sup>1754</sup>.

17.- In his encyclical *Laborem exercens*, **John Paul II** says: “Experience has confirmed that an effort must be made towards the **social revalorization** of maternal functions, of the tiredness associated to them and of the need that the children have of their care, love and affection in order to develop as responsible persons, moral and religiously mature and psychologically balanced. It would be an honor for society to make it possible for the mother, without restricting her freedom, without practical or psychological discrimination, without leaving her as an inferior to her peers, to dedicate herself to the care and education of the children, according to the needs of their age. The forced abandonment of such chores for an earning outside the home, is incorrect from the point of view of the good of society and the family, when it contradicts or makes it hard to comply with these primary obligations of the maternal mission.

**Pope John Paul II**, in his speech to the Pontifical Council of the Family, has proposed to politicians and entrepreneurs alike, that they must study the best way that the housewife can receive

---

<sup>1754</sup> **JOHN PAUL II** Encyclical *Centesimus annus*, n° 15,

a salary so that she can better attend her work of education and of mother without having to resort to work outside the home<sup>1755</sup>.

It is a fact that in many societies women work in almost all sectors of life.

But it is convenient that they be able to fully develop their functions according to their own class, without discriminations and not excluding them from the employment for which they are prepared, but at the same time not damaging their family aspirations and the specific role that is theirs to contribute to the good of society together with the man.

The true promotion of women demands that the work be structured in such a way that she should not be liable for her promotion through the abandonment of her specific character and in putting her family in jeopardy, in which she has a non substitutable role<sup>1756</sup>.

18.- The revenue policy, besides the purely technical aspects, also comprises other profoundly human problems which suppose the orientation of a productive activity that is in service to humankind, and, besides, an intelligent and demanding action in favor of the social categories which are less fortunate, so that they can also have an access to a participation of the revenue, each time more just, in conformity with the aspirations based on dignity and the vocation of the human being<sup>1757</sup>.

**Thomas** says; “In any well organized society there must be an abundance of material goods which are necessary for the practice of virtue<sup>1758</sup>”.

Under this vision, the numerous proposals made by the experts of the Catholic Social Doctrine as well as the Supreme Magisterium of the Church acquire a new significance. They are proposals that refer to the co-ownership of the means of work, to the participation of the workers, and the benefits of the company in the so called “common stock” of work and other equivalents<sup>1759</sup>.

19. The Church **demands from owners** that, by virtue of the social function that economic goods give – in accordance with their possibilities – to share with those who do not have sufficient earnings to live honestly. But it also demands that the laborer work with nobility and enthusiasm, so that an increase in production and in a growing economy make it possible to have a material and cultural increase of the economically weak classes.

This is the constant hope of the Church

**Pope Pius XII** said over and over again that it is necessary to implant a more just distribution of wealth.

He called this problem the fundamental point of social matters and asked Christians that, even at the cost of a sacrifice, they make an effort towards a more just distribution of the riches, move towards the social practice of the of the Church<sup>1760</sup>.

The access for all to the necessary goods for a good life, personal and family, worthy of this name must be considered as a primary demand of social justice<sup>1761</sup>.

<sup>1755</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 26-III-94. Pg. 77

<sup>1756</sup> **JOHN PAUL II:** *Laborem exercens encyclical*, n° 19

<sup>1757</sup> **PAUL IV:** *Addressing the XXV Social Week of Spain, in Zaragoza, 1966*

<sup>1758</sup> Saint Thomas of Aquino: *De regimine exercensm* n° 14

<sup>1759</sup> **JOHN PAUL II:** *Laborem exercens encyclical*, n° 14

<sup>1760</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2403

<sup>1761</sup> Sacred Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Instruction on Christian Liberty and Freedom, n° 88.

**Private property**, or a certain dominion over material goods, assure each one an absolutely necessary zone for their personal and family autonomy, and must be considered as a prolongation of human liberty<sup>1762</sup>.

**Pope Paul VI** said in his encyclical *Populorum Progressio*: “ Private property does not constitute for anyone an unconditional and absolute right. There is no reason to reserve for one’s exclusive right, that which surpasses your need, when others need the basics<sup>1763</sup>.”

The goods created must reach all in a just and equitable form, according to the inseparable rule of just charity. All other rights, including that of property are subordinated to this.<sup>1764</sup>.

**Pope John Paul II**, in his encyclical *Laborem exercens*, establishes the position that the Christians have in relation to the so called “capitalist system” and the “Collectivist system”.

The “rigid capitalism” that considers that property and possession of material goods as an absolute right of the person, without limitations, must be subjected continuously to a review from the perspective of the rights of man in theory and practice.

The collective system considers that only the state has the exclusive right of ownership of the means of production, of the individuals and of society. This system attempts against the realization of the freedom of individuals, of the families, social groups and weakens the creative capacity of man.

For the Christian, therefore, the right to possess’ economic goods is a guarantee for his freedom, to organize himself as a person. And as with all rights, it demands the right to recognize it to all men in an efficient manner, distributing wealth among all<sup>1765</sup>.

For all men to have the possibility to develop as a person, it is necessary for all persons to be able to dispose of the material goods in a sufficient degree according to the economic level of each nation. That is why the just distribution of wealth is necessary<sup>1766</sup>.

God has destined the earth and all that is therein for the use of all mankind.

Consequently, the good created must reach in an equal manner, directed by justice and accompanied by charity- Therefore man must not have external things which he may legitimately own as exclusively his, but also as common, in the sense that they not only benefit him, but also everyone else<sup>1767</sup>.

**Pope Pius XII** says: “God does not want that a few have exaggerated richness, and others are so destitute, that they are lacking the necessities of life<sup>1768</sup>.”

In other words, God does not want the ignominious contrast between lavishness and poverty.

God does not want poverty to exist.

God has created the goods on this earth for all men, and wants that all partake in that which He has created with His hands<sup>1769</sup>.

Therefore, there must be no one in the world, that if he, does his part, should not enjoy the indispensable goods to sustain his life in a dignified way.

<sup>1762</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes: Constitution of the Church in the actual world.* ° 71

<sup>1763</sup> PAUL VI: *Populorum Progressio* encyclical, n° 23

<sup>1764</sup> PAUL VI: *Populorum Progressio* encyclical, n° 22

<sup>1765</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2404

<sup>1766</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Scholastic Catechism 7º EGB*, XI, 5. Madrid 1984

<sup>1767</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes: Constitution of the Church in the actual world.* n° 69

<sup>1768</sup> Pius XII *Sertum Laetitiae* Encyclical, no 14, A, A, S. 31(1939)149

<sup>1769</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes: Constitution of the Church in the actual world.* n° 69

The problem of hunger in the world, is a distribution problem.

There are some 5,000 million people on earth

And, according to a report of the Association of Agro-Chemical Producers of Germany, if all the arable land of the world were to be properly exploited with current technology, food could be had to feed, on a European basis, 50 billion human beings. In other words, about ten times the current population<sup>1770</sup>.

20.- **Jesus Christ** has in His Gospel very harsh words against the rich who do not comply with their social obligations.

*Get away from Me, ye damned, to the eternal fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. Because I hungered and you did not feed me. I was naked and you did not dress me.*

*When did we see You Lord?*

*What you did with the most insignificant of My brothers, you did with Me.*<sup>1771</sup>

**Jesus Christ** identifies himself with the destitute. He wants that the rich treat the needy as He would treat him personally.

As you can see, the obligations of the rich are grave..

And although, thanks be to God, there are good rich persons who listen to the word of **Jesus Christ**, and consider other men as their brothers, but, unfortunately, there are other rich men who are bad, who cherish their money, but live as if they did not know the Gospel..

That is why **Jesus Christ** says that it is extremely difficult for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of Heaven.

21.- **Workers** also have very grave obligations: to work with determination, diligence and loyalty, not waste materials or energy, take care of the work instruments and to properly employ the wages earned.

Sometimes you hear a worker **complain** that he does not earn enough.

And many times he is right!

But he should ask himself more than once: "Do you think that the effort you put into work merits a higher wage?"

It is certain that you should receive a just wage.

But it is also true that in order for you to keep a wage, it is necessary that you have merited it.

Sometimes work is done with such negligence and disdain, that it is difficult to justify aspiring to a higher wage

Do what is up to you as part of your obligation, and then you can justifiably demand what is rightfully yours.

The one upstairs sins if he does not pay a just wage; but the one downstairs also sins if he does not work.

This in no **manner is to justify** insufficient wages, but to bring out into the open the fact that work must be done with enthusiasm and diligence, if you want to receive a good wage.

It is true that many workers do perform with nobility, but it is also true that there are those who just do what they consider as enough. And these latter ones cause a grave damage to themselves and to their co-workers.

In order to raise the lifestyle of the worker, it is necessary that there be economic prosperity.

And in order to have economic prosperity, it is necessary that the work to wage ratio be efficient.

---

<sup>1770</sup> ABC Newspaper 24-IV-94 Pg. 78

<sup>1771</sup> Matthew, 25, 41-46

Workers who do not produce what is required have their share of guilt in the economic crises. And in economic crises, all workers end up losing.

Much has been done lately in Spain to elevate the standard of living of the worker; but it is necessary to recognize that it has not reached the ideal that the Church desires. To reach this ideal, it is necessary that all Spaniards do what is expected of us.

On the one hand, to increase production, and on the other, to justly distribute the benefits of said production.

These two factors are what are to give us economic wellbeing .

And those who are to blame that we cannot reach this economic wellbeing, are guilty of a grave sin against social justice.

22.- In some places, work is timed, and, sometimes, badly established, so that the worker cannot earn a sufficient wage, or in order to earn a good wage, extraordinary and superhuman efforts are to be made. Those responsible for this situation will also settle accounts with God.

But there are workers who will voluntarily increase the work time unnecessarily, and make them more expensive deliberately. Each one will give accounts to God of the injustices that he was responsible for.

23.- All of this as relates to the obligation of working with diligence.

But, also, it is **necessary to employ** the money earned in a reasonable way.

It is not right that a man does not make enough money to live.

But there is also no right that a man spend the money on vices, entertainment, whims and superfluous items when he needs it to feed his family.

One must not create superfluous needs.

First things first, and the first thing is to eat rather than to have enjoyment.

Not that having a good time discreetly be reprehensible, after having taken care of the substantial. But to spend on entertainment what is needed to feed the family is absurd and criminal.

Besides, for enjoyment, any amount seems small. Money leaves by itself. There is never enough. And this way, you never earn enough. That is why there is that anxiousness of earning more and more.

To make an effort to earn enough for a dignified way of life and a decorous amount of entertainment is just; but wanting to earn more in order to squander it, is another matter.

The desire for the necessary is legitimate; and to work for it is an obligation. **Paul** says: "*he who does not want to work, should not eat*"<sup>1772</sup>. But the acquisition of temporary goods may conduct one to covet, to the desire to have more and more, and to the temptation to increase one's power.

The greed of the persons, families, and nations can take over from the destitute to the wealthy, and provoke in either a suffocating materialism.

For nations, as for people, greed is the most evident form of a moral underdevelopment<sup>1773</sup>.

**Avarice** is a worm that burrows, in the heart of the rich as well as in that of the poor, and while men only think of becoming richer and richer, above all, as if this life were definitive, they will hinder their eternal salvation.

God wants man to have the necessary to live, but He does not want for man to be too attached to worldly goods, which will be in the way of his eternal salvation

That is why **Jesus Christ** tells us: "*Do not desire to accumulate wealth for yourself here on earth*"<sup>1774</sup>. Don't ever forget that what is principal, what is first, is to save yourself, although, as is

<sup>1772</sup> II Thessalonians, 3:10

<sup>1773</sup> PAUL VI: *Populorum Progressio* Encyclical n° 18s

<sup>1774</sup> Matthew 6:19

natural, you must also worry about solving your life here on earth. But not forgetting that eternal life is first.

24.- Occupying an important place for all men in general, and for the Christian in particular, included in the demands of social justice are the **tributary obligations**. Just taxes must be paid<sup>1775</sup>.

Second Vatican Council, in the Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes*, enunciates the doctrine in this way: "Among the civil duties of each one is that of contributing to public life with the material and personal goods required by the common good"<sup>1776</sup>.

The moral nature and foundation of the tributary duty is relative to man's sociability.

To live with dignity, to progress and satisfy your own needs, each time more numerous with the advance of civilization, the isolated man does not satisfy himself.

Therefore, society takes on a proportionate relevance.

But the social obligation of replacing the singular impotence of man or of the lesser human groups, corresponds to the right to demand the needed means to comply with it.

But on the other hand, if in man, there is a spontaneous and natural right to be helped by society, the contra part which is necessary, also naturally, will be that of contributing in the measure of their capacity to the social needs and expenses.

Therefore, the fiscal rights and obligations are naturally rooted, and thus linking the consciences, both from the society in general as well as that of man.

The Gospel of **Matthew**<sup>1777</sup>, and also that of the letters to the Romans<sup>1778</sup> confirms this. But of course, the obligation and tributary rights, internally linking the consciences of men, only comes from just taxes.

"Justice or injustice emanates from four sources of a particular tax, or that of a concrete tributary system: it must establish a law, duly approved, that will comply with the need required by the common good, not tax the income or riches that are below the vital minimum, and regulate itself in a progressive scale.

If they are respected unconditionally, the tax or fiscal system is just in itself or "objective".

But it can be that a just tax, when imposed on a certain person, can result to be too heavy, taking into consideration the individual circumstances, therefore becoming "subjectively" unjust.

The detailed analysis of the conditioners that determine the tributary justice exceed, by their extension, this place<sup>1779</sup>.

The new "Ritual of Penance" in the second of the three formulas that contributes in assisting the examination of conscience, under no. 5, queries:

"Have I complied with my civic duties?"

Have I paid my taxes?

Thus recognizing implicitly that it is a matter of conscience. And it is inferred: Have I paid my just taxes?

Deceit in the payment of taxes renders the nation unable to attend to the general need of the population, and to resolve the urgent needs of those socially depressed.

A couple of words on the badly called "**religious tax**". I say it is badly called because it is not an additional tax, but of what necessarily has to be paid to the tax collector, take five out of every thousand for the charity of the Church.

It is worthwhile to put the cross in the proper place, because if one does not put the cross there, then that 0.05% goes to the government.

<sup>1775</sup> Matthew 6:33

<sup>1776</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 2256 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1777</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*, Constitution of the Church in the current world. N°

<sup>1778</sup> Matthew, 22:16-22

<sup>1779</sup> GONZALO HIGUERA, S.I.: *Ética Fiscal, IV*, Ed. BAC. Madrid 1982

25.- **A grave sin** against this commandment are those children who disobey their parents in a grave matter, and that they can order; those who give them grave displeasure; who gravely harm and scorn, who insult, strike or raise their hand deliberately and threaten; those who desire a grave illness; those who do not succor in their grave needs, both corporal and spiritual, as for example, if they do not administer the Holy sacraments to them at the time of death.

A grave sin is also committed by the parents who gibe their children a bad example (blasphemy, etc.), curse them, wish them harm, or abandon their scholastic and religious education.

Employers also sin gravely, if, being able to, do not give their workers a just wage. But they also have the obligation of not imposing upon their workers jobs that exceed their strength, protect them, whenever possible, of the dangers of the workplace, and respect their dignity of man and Christian, treating them with kindness and avoiding the danger of sin.

Workers gravely sin, if they do grave damage to their employer, either by wasting materials or power, be it by purposely damaging work instruments. If they voluntarily work or produce less than they are able to, they can also reach a grave sin.

## 67. THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT IS “THOU SHALL NOT KILL”.

1. This commandment orders us not to damage our own lives nor those of others with words, deeds, or desires (hatred). This means to love everyone and forgive our enemies.

**To desire death** for oneself or someone else is a very serious sin if it is done because of hate<sup>1780</sup> or desperate rebellion<sup>1781</sup>. Hatred is incapable of liberating anyone. Hatred is only good to brew more hatred, and in human history, no one has been able to free himself through hate. Hate is never justifiable for a Christian<sup>1782</sup>

**Quarrels**, insults, injustices, can sometimes, become a serious sin if one seriously wishes harm to the other, if one seriously lacks charity and if one demonstrates hate. Normally of course, quarrels etc do not become so important because people try not to make them that important.

When two people quarrel, each one is half wrong and half right, each one only sees that he is right and that the other one is wrong, that is why they rarely come to an agreement. These quarrels usually start over little things, but sometimes they can lead to deep enmity and sometimes to crimes.

The best thing is to cut these quarrels short from the start before they grow out of proportion, and if one is in a really bad mood -count to 10 before answering. By using one's common sense and by remaining calm many of these silly quarrels can be avoided, if you do not do this, you will probably say more than you should and then you will regret it. You will never regret having kept quiet but how many times have you regretted words spoken in haste, these can never be recovered.

A sincere dialog is always difficult; one has to learn to converse properly. You have to try to see the other person's point of view; you must try to find a happy medium by recapping the best each side has to offer.

2. **Personal revenge** is never allowed under any circumstance. **Christ** himself forbade it<sup>1783</sup>. Because if it were allowed, no one could live in this world. We all think we have the right to revenge. No, we must forgive our enemies and let God punish them in the other life and the public authorities

<sup>1780</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2303

<sup>1781</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2302

<sup>1782</sup> GREELY: *El Mito de Jesús*, VII Ed. Cristiandad. Madrid. 1973

<sup>1783</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2262

in this one. We must learn to do as Paul says in his Letter to the Romans<sup>1784</sup>, “Do not overcome by evil but overcome evil with good”. We must learn to forgive the people who have offended us.

It is of course indispensable to be willing to grant pardon if so requested and remain satisfied with a moderate light repayment for what has been done to us. Whoever denies forgiveness to his brother, should not expect God’s forgiveness. As Jesus Christ said in the Lord’s prayer, “But if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses”. This was said by **Jesus Christ**<sup>1785</sup>.

We must not be too ready to put the blame on the other person. Normally both are at fault. One obviously started the quarrel but the other one answered back probably offensive in a way. If both wait for the other to apologize they will probably wait until doomsday. The person who is most generous to God is the one who must take the initiative.

**Christ** spoke about turning the other cheek<sup>1786</sup>. This is a hyperbolic oriental formula which is used to make us understand that we must always be ready to forgive, but we must not take it literally, **Christ** himself, when struck<sup>1787</sup>, replied with energy, truth and self dominion, “If I have spoken wrongly, bear witness to the wrong; but if I have spoken rightly, why do you strike me?”<sup>1788</sup>

If the fault is ours, we have the obligation to seek pardon in some manner, shape or form, what is more, even if it is clear that the whole fault is the other person’s, virtue will be shown by he who offers to forgive, i.e. greeting him cordially, lending him a hand, saying good morning or good afternoon, etc. It is normal for some people to show a grudge for some time and during sometime we manifest our grudge with a more distant and serious attitude or by acting cold, but it should never go on for long. Except in some cases of grave offenses, it is advisable to renew normal contact as soon as possible. To refuse to say hello is unchristian, should the other person refuse to answer that is his problem, but at least you tried.

However, if after various **conciliatory attempts**, the other person refuses to return the greeting, leave it for another occasion. But you must not give up; the desire for reconciliation must be sincere. If the other person does not wish to talk to us, we must always be willing to talk to him when he wants to, and to return his greeting if he greets us on the street or in a restaurant, etc. Sometimes a third party can help to bring about a reconciliation.

One must distinguish between admitted rancor and a certain aloofness to avoid confrontation as well as the feeling of the offense and the voluntarily admitted resentment. Even though we are hurt by the offense we have received we must not wish anyone harm.

The goodness of our hearts which permits us to forgive those that have offended us does not mean that we cannot use all the just measures that are at our disposal so that justice can be done. Sometimes, although one is ready to forgive there occasionally remains an inevitable hurt that one receives from the offense committed, many people refer to this hurt when they say that they cannot forgive. It is very possible that the serenity of one’s spirit needs a certain time limit to overcome the pain caused by the offense. To prove that one is disposed to forgive one should pray for the person who has offended you, never to talk badly about him and to ask God to grant you the grace to forgive<sup>1789</sup>. When you do not like someone- -pray for him and when you feel like hurting him, say an “Our Father” for him. **Jesus Christ** says: “pray for them who persecute you”<sup>1790</sup>

If that person who we consider our enemy needs help that only we can give, we must help him, it is our obligation, and one must help his neighbor even though he may be an enemy<sup>1791</sup>.

---

<sup>1784</sup> Romans, 12:21

<sup>1785</sup> Matthew, 6:15

<sup>1786</sup> Mark, 5:39

<sup>1787</sup> John, 18:22s

<sup>1788</sup> John, 18:22s

<sup>1789</sup> B. HÄRING, C. SS.R: *La Ley de Cristo*, 2º, 1ª, 1ª, II, 2, d. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1790</sup> Matthew, 5:44

<sup>1791</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares*, 1º, 2ª, III, nº 518, 3ª. Ed. BAC. Madrid



It is not hatred of a person to hate what evil there is in her or the evil that she unjustly causes us or to others<sup>1792</sup>.

The Gospel that asks us to love our enemies does not mean we have to be friends with them, as it forbids hatred and revenge, or to wish them harm<sup>1793</sup>, and commands us to have the desire of reconciliation.

The offended one is always obligated to forgive the offending party who asks for forgiveness, be it directly or indirectly. Should he refuse to do so, he is committing a grave sin against charity and regularly would not be absolved of his sin so long as he continues in his obstinate<sup>1794</sup> ways.

Of course, it is licit to demand satisfaction for an offense committed against you, but not for revenge or hatred, but with a desire for justice<sup>1795</sup>.

The good will of truly forgiving from the heart those who have offended us, does not exclude using all just means to see that justice is done.

It is true that there are persons, who are **unworthy** of our forgiveness, but we do not forgive them because they are worthy to be forgiven; no, we forgive them because **Jesus Christ** asks us to. We have his example before us. He manifested it not only in his heart but outwards. Christ's pardon on the cross is the model we must imitate. Those who have generous souls have an immense field of perfection and sanctification<sup>1796</sup>.

The world could become a more humane place if we introduce forgiveness, which is so essential in the Gospels, in our relations between one another<sup>1797</sup>.

### 3. There are three occasions in which it is **legitimate to kill** someone:

#### 1). In a just war.

War, of course, can never be a normal solution for any conflict. All heads of government and all citizens are required to do their best in avoiding a war<sup>1798</sup>

According to the moralists if war is to be considered just there are several conditions that have to be met:

- a) Impossibility of a peaceful solution,
- b) A just cause such as legitimate defense should there not be a competent and efficient supranational authority, like the U.N.
- c) That the decision taken by the corresponding authority legitimizes those who are responsible for the well-being of the nation,
- d) A straightforward intention seeking justice and not revenge.
- e) That the benefits that are to be derived are greater than the damages that are to be produced<sup>1799</sup>

The appreciation of these conditions of moral legitimacy belong to the sound judgment of those who are in charge of the common good<sup>1800</sup> "Public powers in this case have the right and obligation to impose upon the citizens the required duties for national defense<sup>1801</sup>, but they will take equally into

<sup>1792</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares*, 1º, 2º, III, nº 538, 2º. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1793</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares*, 1º, 2º, III, nº 538, 2º. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1794</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares*, 1º, 2º, III, nº 518, 4º. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1795</sup> JOSÉ Mª CIURANA: *La verdad del cristianismo*, III, A. C, g. Ed. Bosch. Barcelona, 1980

<sup>1796</sup> OTTO ZIMERMANN, S. I.: *Teología ascética*, nº 96. Seminario Metropolitano, Buenos Aires.

<sup>1797</sup> JOHN PAUL II: Encyclical *Dives in misericordia*

<sup>1798</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2308

<sup>1799</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares*, 1º, 2º, III, nº 870 – 873 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1800</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2309

<sup>1801</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2310

consideration those whose case is, by reason of conscience, refuse to bear arms; they are obligated to serve in another fashion the human community<sup>1802</sup>

One thing is to use military force to defend oneself justly, and another, very different is to want to conquer other nations<sup>1803</sup>.

To deliberately look for war is absurd. To try to avoid it as a principle could be cowardice before injustice. A believer must act honorably while fighting to establish justice in the world. Peace is the ideal of man, but this peace must result from justice to have a conformist pacifism with injustice is not Christian; a good Christian can never be uninterested in the well being of society.

The danger of a third world war which could destroy humanity because of the armament that man now has; disarmament of all nations is highly desirable. But for this to be truly effective, it must be done by all sides, with the notation of mutual inspections.

Even if the war is just, "not everything is fair amongst contenders"<sup>1804</sup>. Respect must be tendered to moral law and to the rights of people, "Actions deliberately contrary to the rights of the people are considered to be crimes"<sup>1805</sup>. "There is a moral obligation to disobey those decisions that order genocides"<sup>1806</sup>.

2). In self-defense<sup>1807</sup>. When someone tries to kill us or to do harm to our earthly possessions, similar to death, one can legitimately kill if there is no possible way to defend oneself. It is not necessary to wait to be attacked, it is enough to know that the enemy is going to try to kill us and is only waiting for the right moment, if we realize there is no possible way to save our lives, then, we can attack first<sup>1808</sup>.

This is on moral grounds and is independent of the civil law in force.

What is allowed in self-defense is also allowed in favor of anyone who is unjustly attacked. Fraternal charity may oblige a person to do this, but one must not risk one's life unless very necessary, or if one is forced contractually. (guards, police)<sup>1809</sup>

3). The public authorities. Where the death penalty is in effect, the public authorities can kill a criminal to defend innocent people. The bible says "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed"<sup>1810</sup>. "He, who voluntarily kills another, shall be punished with death"<sup>1811</sup>.

**Salvador de Madariaga**, a well known Spanish intellectual and international writer who died at 92 in Lugano, Switzerland, said "The death penalty will no longer be necessary the day the murderers first suppress it"<sup>1812</sup>.

In terrorist attacks, many innocent people die, some terrorists can assassinate more than once, if that terrorist had been executed for the first death that he was responsible for, the rest of his victims would be alive today. No one desires the death of another person, but if to save innocent lives it is necessary to execute the murderer, perhaps this could be a demand for the well-being of the people<sup>1813</sup>.

<sup>1802</sup> New Canonic Code Law, nº 2311

<sup>1803</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*: Constitution on the Church in the current world. Nº 79

<sup>1804</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2312

<sup>1805</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2328

<sup>1806</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2313

<sup>1807</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2264

<sup>1808</sup> JULIAN PEREDA, S. I.: ESTUDIOS DE DEUSTO Magazine, 30 (IV-1967)9-34. Bilbao

<sup>1809</sup> B. HÅRING, C. SS. R.: *La Ley de Cristo*, 2º, 2ª, 2ªIV, 3. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1810</sup> Genesis, 9.6

<sup>1811</sup> Exodus, 21:12-14

<sup>1812</sup> SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA: *Dios y los Españoles*, V. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona. 1975

<sup>1813</sup> YA Newspaper, 27-IX-79. Pg. 4

At Christmas time of 1986, in a Boeing 737 that had been hijacked by a group of terrorists, 62 people lost their lives<sup>1814</sup>.

On July 19th of 1987, a terrorist bomb that exploded in a big supermarket in Barcelona caused 20 deaths<sup>1815</sup>.

One cannot understand why a criminal **can apply** the death penalty to his victim, but the judge cannot apply the same penalty to guilty murderers. This supposes a clearly demonstrated guilt. The same way that it is licit to kill an unjust aggressor in self defense<sup>1816</sup>, what is more, authorities may apply the death penalty in order to defend the lives of innocent citizens.

**Legitimate self-defense** is accepted all over the world. With the death penalty, authorities defend the innocents who are always exposed to the risk of falling into criminal hands. "The legitimate defense of society has led to justifying the death penalty in some very grave cases<sup>1817</sup>". The authorities have the obligation to defend the lives of innocent citizens<sup>1818</sup>.

That is why 73% of British agree with the death penalty for terrorists, this according to a **Harris** opinion poll<sup>1819</sup>.

According to a poll of the Sociological Investigation Center, half of the Spanish people are in favor of the death penalty for terrorists and murderers<sup>1820</sup>.

In the United States of America, the death penalty has been reestablished in many states<sup>1821</sup>

It is not the same for one that kills in a moment of passionate fury, than the professional of crime. An assassin is a danger for innocent people. Life terms are not enough, as murderers can escape. Sometimes in a spectacular way. In 1986, **Michel Bagour** escaped from the jail of *La Santé* in Paris, in a helicopter piloted by his girlfriend **Nadine**<sup>1822</sup>.

In Germany, a convict escaped in a military tank, which his friends had stolen, and it entered the gate by knocking it down<sup>1823</sup>.

In Copenhagen, twelve prisoners escaped from jail when part of the prison wall was knocked down with a bulldozer driven by an accomplice of the men jailed<sup>1824</sup>.

At the beginning of May, 1982, **Freddy Horion** escaped from a top security prison in Lovaine; Freddy had his death penalty commuted to a life sentence. His crime? He had murdered five members of the same family.<sup>1825</sup>

Two Spanish separatists (Basque), members of the ETA, escaped the San Sebastian jail, hiding in the loudspeakers of a singer who had performed at the jail<sup>1826</sup>

Or about a prisoner that does not return to jail after a weekend pass, as the one who did not return to the jail of Ocaña, where he was serving a 36 year sentence, and when recognized, he fired upon two policemen who were about to detain him, killing both of them<sup>1827</sup>. And the nine year old girl from the north of Spain, who was raped and killed by a prisoner who was out on leave<sup>1828</sup>. In a single day, there were five prisoners who escaped while on weekend furlough<sup>1829</sup>. According to government

<sup>1814</sup> YA Newspaper, 27-XII-86. Pg. 19

<sup>1815</sup> YA Newspaper, 4-VIII-87. Pg. 4

<sup>1816</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2264

<sup>1817</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2266

<sup>1818</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2266

<sup>1819</sup> Hay Newspaper. 24-X-84, pg. 15

<sup>1820</sup> CADIZ DAILY Newspaper, 18-I-89, pg. 14

<sup>1821</sup> YA Newspaper, 30-VIII-87. Pg. 13

<sup>1822</sup> YA Newspaper, 28-IX-86. pg. 48

<sup>1823</sup> ABC Madrid Newspaper, 5-IV-95, pg. 56

<sup>1824</sup> CADIZ Daily. 29-VIII-95, pg. 28

<sup>1825</sup> YA Newspaper, 2-V-82. pg.38

<sup>1826</sup> YA Newspaper, 8-VII-85. pg.3

<sup>1827</sup> CADIZ Daily Newspaper, 12-XI-88, pg.1

<sup>1828</sup> YA Newspaper, 29-VI-92. pg. 2

<sup>1829</sup> YA Newspaper, 6-XI-88. pg. 21

information, from January 1, 1982 to October 1st, 1988, over five thousand prisoners did not return after their permits<sup>1830</sup>. A convict that was serving a sentence for robbery with homicide, during a leave, murdered two youngsters<sup>1831</sup>. Another inmate, in a minimum security prison, murdered a woman in Madrid while on leave<sup>1832</sup>.

In other instances, the terrorists will kidnap an innocent person demanding the freedom of their imprisoned cohorts, under the threat of murdering the kidnap victim: two opposing and recent events will shed some light. In Italy, where there is no death penalty, the kidnapers of **Aldo Moro**, knew that although they killed their hostage, nothing was going to happen to their fellow terrorists in prison, but in France, where the death penalty exists, the kidnapers of the industrialist **Jean Eddouard Empain** freed him after two months when the authorities threatened to execute the chief of the gang of the kidnapers, **Alain Caillol**, who was at that time in prison<sup>1833</sup>.

A murderer is always a danger for innocent people, they can escape even from top security prisons as we so often read in the newspapers, or very often their fellow terrorists or criminals kidnap people to force the authorities to free them by threatening to kill the hostages;

In December 1984, the hijackers of a Kuwait airliner, killed five passengers so as to force the Kuwaiti Government to free 13 terrorists that were imprisoned for different acts of terrorism<sup>1834</sup>

The death penalty is in force in most parts of the world<sup>1835</sup>

Of the one hundred and sixty free countries in the world, only about two score have abolished the death penalty from their laws<sup>1836</sup>

It is necessary to take into account that the “death penalty” does not suppose the right to kill an innocent, but the right to execute a guilty individual<sup>1837</sup>. The evidence of guilt must be clear and certain, and the damage irreparable<sup>1838</sup>.

The convenience of the abolition or not of the death penalty’ a complex and polemic problem, and one cannot expect clear or definitive answers<sup>1839</sup>

.At the present time, there is an ideological current against the death penalty. In January 1978, the Social Commission of the French Bishops published a statement supporting the abolishment of the death penalty; however, they also said that the dispositions of the law that imposes the death penalty so as to protect society are not illicit; the Church does not condemn the execution of a criminal that has been fairly judged and condemned by the legal authorities<sup>1840</sup>.

4. When there is respect for one’s own life and that of others, we are obliged to consider the importance of observing a **Driving code**. The New Catechism of the Catholic Church says: “Whoever, while being under the influence of drugs or alcohol, or because of a passion for speed, jeopardizes the safety of others and their own on the highways, in the air or at sea, is gravely guilty<sup>1841</sup>. Even small infractions of the code can cause serious accidents. One can sin by putting another person in danger of hurting himself or even putting his own life in danger without a just cause. One can even sin against charity by placing someone in such a difficult situation that they can lose their serenity. One sins from the moment that someone sits behind the wheel of the car without

<sup>1830</sup> YA Newspaper, 30-XII-88. pg. 14

<sup>1831</sup> YA Newspaper, 20-I-89. pg.24

<sup>1832</sup> ABC Madrid Newspaper, 3-IX-96, pg. 79

<sup>1833</sup> LA VANGUARDIA of Barcelona Newspaper, 28-III-78, pg. 3

<sup>1834</sup> YA Newspaper, 7-XII-84. pg. 5

<sup>1835</sup> YA Newspaper, 30-V-86. pg. 30

<sup>1836</sup> RAFAEL GOMEZ PEREZ: *Problemas morales de la existencia humana*, 3º, VIII. Ed. Magisterio Español. Madrid. 1980

<sup>1837</sup> Con vosotros está, 2º XXXVII, 2. Madrid, 1976

<sup>1838</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares*, 1º, 2ª, III, n 560 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1839</sup> JAVIER GAFO, S.I.: Badajoz Daily Newspaper, 9-II-78, pg. 2

<sup>1840</sup> ROLAND LAWLER, O.F.M. *La Doctrina de Jesucristo*, XX, 2, c .Ed. Galduria. Jodar (Jaen) 1986

<sup>1841</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2290

the intention of observing the rules of the driving code. Whatever has been the cause, through one's fault or not, of a road accident and wants to avoid responsibility by fleeing from the scene of the accident is guilty of a very serious, moral offense and they are obliged before their conscience and before God to spare no expense in making up for all harm and damages that are caused by one or another motive. It would be a serious crime to let someone die by not finding or giving immediate help after a serious accident<sup>1842</sup>.

According to paramedics, there are wounded people that should only be transported in ambulances. For this reason it is not always advisable to pick up a wounded person. But one must always notify an emergency service.

5. **Abortion** is a very serious sin against this commandment. An abortion is an interruption of the pregnancy because the fetus cannot survive outside the mother's womb and achieve complete development.

To directly provoke an abortion is a homicide, as a fetus is a new individual completely capable of full development. A person's life begins at the moment of conception; because of this a provoked abortion is a crime. The II Vatican Council called it an "abominable crime"<sup>1843</sup>.

It is the most **cruel and cowardly form of killing** because the victim is a totally innocent and defenseless being who cannot escape, or shout in protest against the injustice that is being committed against him.

Future generations will not understand that in our times mothers were permitted to kill their unborn children. They will call us the "murdering generation".

Pro abortionists are bothered if they are called murderers, but, how else would you call those who have condemned to death over forty million innocent beings? And they say: "The Church is cruel, because those who carry the trauma of an abortion must also carry the burden of being excommunicated. This reasoning is absurd. It would be like taking away the policemen in order not to worry the terrorists. To defend the abortionists is like defending terrorists that kill, and don't worry about their victims. To allow an abortion to avoid the danger to the women who abort in a clandestine form is like allowing murders in order to not endanger the life of the murderers.

Many of the most brilliant investigators, one of which is **Dr. Jerome Lejeune**, who holds the chair of Genetics at the Sorbonne University of Paris<sup>1844</sup>, says: "This first cell which is the result of conception is already a human<sup>1845</sup> being. It has the 46 chromosomes corresponding to the human race. At another time he said: To accept that after conception, a new human being is starting to exist, is no longer a question of opinion or taste, but experimental evidence<sup>1846</sup>. He continues to say: if the embryo is not from the first moment a member of our species, then he will never be. To say he is not a human being is the same as the Nazis used to say "a prisoner is not a man"<sup>1847</sup>

The same conclusion was reached during an international conference held in Washington, in which numerous experts in different fields of Medicine took part<sup>1848</sup>.

Abortion is illicit even in the case of doubt. If I am given a package so that >I throw it into the ocean, and they have told me that it is a dead cat, but I suspect that it is a living child, I cannot throw it into the sea without making certain of what it is. And should I do it without making sure it is not a living child, and it is, then I am guilty of homicide.

<sup>1842</sup> YA Newspaper, 18-VI-76

<sup>1843</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes* Constitution on the Church in the current world. ° 51.

<sup>1844</sup> YA Newspaper, 19-V-81, pg. 8

<sup>1845</sup> RAFAEL GÓMEZ PÉREZ: *Problemas morales de la existencia humana*, IV, 3. Ed. Magisterio

<sup>1846</sup> Dr. TOMAS MELENDO: *Fecundación in vitro, y dignidad humana*. III, 1. Ed. Casals. BarcelonaG

<sup>1847</sup> YA Newspaper, 17-III-85, pg. 23

<sup>1848</sup> YA Newspaper, 9-VI-79, pg. 6

In Theology, we are taught that there is a new human being from the same moment of conception and most doctors confirm this. "The fertilized ovum is human life right from the beginning though it is not individual life until the moment that the blastocyte splits and consolidates itself in one or more embryos" as said by **Federico Mayor Zaragoza**, Director of the Center for Molecular Biology<sup>1849</sup>.

From the beginning of the embryonic process we observe separate genetic individuality and even different from that of the parents<sup>1850</sup>.

The **genetic code** contains all the characteristics, human and individual of the new being. Everything that each human individual possesses, uniqueness, singular and unrepeatable during his whole history, is present in his genetic code. A human person exists in the embryo with all the potentials that will develop throughout his existence.<sup>1851</sup>

That is why the Swedish Gynecological Association, has requested that for this effect, the fetus be called a child, in other words "calling a spade a spade, as aborting is tantamount to killing a child"<sup>1852</sup>

In 1976, **Dr. Jose Botella** who then held the chair of Gynecology at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, in an article entitled "*The Right To Be Born*", declared that human individuality depends on the genetic code and that this code is constituted at the moment of conception and belongs to the new being; it is different from the codes of its parents. Which means that the new being is an individual from the moment of conception and therefore should be, protected by human rights. To eliminate him, it is to eliminate a human: a homicide. A man, apart from his right to life, carries within him the right to live a chain of other possible future human beings, among which there could be geniuses, artists, scholars and saints.

**Stephen W. Hawking**, the "Einstein" of our days, that everyone can see on television, paralyzed, in a wheel chair, unable to speak except through a sound synthesizer, would not have been born, if in 1942, someone had discovered in the chromosomes of his embryo that they carried the gene of his illness<sup>1853</sup>.

The newspaper YA, on February 15, 1979 published a document from the Official College of Doctors, where it states that: "From the scientific point of view, life begins at the time of conception"<sup>1854</sup>.

**Dr. José Antonio Abrisqueta**, Chief of the Human Genetics Unit of the Center of Biological Investigation of the Superior Council of Scientific Investigations of Madrid, affirms: "No scientist would doubt to affirm that human life starts at the moment of conception."<sup>1855</sup>

Contemporary biology states that the human embryo is an individual, strictly determined, owning a genetic potential, from the instant of conception<sup>1856</sup>

"No biologist has any doubt today that at the very same moment of the reunion of the gametes, not only has a new and independent life been engendered but it also has its own unique individuality"<sup>1857</sup>

Professor **Herranz**, Dean of Histology and General Embryology of the university of Navarra, has said: "The human embryo is a human being, it has human life, Its DNA is the same which he will have throughout his life"<sup>1858</sup>

<sup>1849</sup> YA Newspaper, 15-III-87, pg. 42

<sup>1850</sup> TRIBUNA MEDICA Magazine, 11-X-74, pg. 37

<sup>1851</sup> VICTOR GARCIA DE LA HOZ. Sunday ABC Newspaper, 27-II-77, pg. 19

<sup>1852</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 3-II-97. pg. 53

<sup>1853</sup> CADIZ Daily, 7-X-87, pg. 13

<sup>1854</sup> YA Newspaper, 15-II-79, pg. 36

<sup>1855</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2796 (6-VII-96) 11

<sup>1856</sup> ANDRE LEONARD: *La moral sexual explicada a los jóvenes*, IV, D, b, Ed. Palabra. Madrid. 1994

<sup>1857</sup> DR. BOTELLA LLUSIÁ: YA Newspaper, 11-V-79, pg. 7

<sup>1858</sup> TELVA Magazine, 550 (IV-87)116

**Dr. Severo Ochoa**, Nobel prize winner for Medicine in 1959, stated that a man is what his genetic code determines. This code is established from the moment the zygote (ovum) is constituted. From this moment, this new being has personal rights. No scientist could ever consider a fetus as an integral part of the mother, as for example, a wart or the appendix, that can be removed at will. The life of the fetus is not that of the mother, but its own and it has all the rights to be respected as one should respect the life of an adult<sup>1859</sup>. Abortionist women say that they can do with their body whatever they want, but the fetus is not a wart, It is a human being.

**Julian Marias**, of the Royal Spanish Academy, in an article published in the newspaper ABC<sup>1860</sup> relates some very true thoughts: This nonsense that the fetus is a part of the mother's body is an illustrious falsehood, because he is not part, he is "lodged in her, "implanted" in her. A woman will not say "I am going to have a tumor", but will say "I am going to have a baby". Sometimes, a refined expression is used to give a name to a provoked abortion: it is called an "interrupted pregnancy". As if hanging were to be called "a breathing interruption".

That new life, which has been formed in the mother's womb, does not belong to her, it belongs to the human race, and it belongs to God<sup>1861</sup>.

God has disposed that the first days of a human being, develop within the womb of the mother so that this new life is protected. This, for some new human beings, instead of being a defense, is a risk, because mothers that would not dream of killing a 2 year old have the audacity to do so with the new being in their womb of only a few months. These mothers betray the mission that God has entrusted them with... All animals defend their young. Just because in some countries abortion is legally allowed, does not mean to say that this makes it licit. Absolute moral norms are totally independent of man's will. God's law forbids abortion and no manmade law can make the death of an innocent, lawful. We are talking about the **universal law of God** which means that even non-believers are obliged to follow. One shall not kill, one shall not steal, one shall not commit adultery, etc. Even if a country decided to make calumny legal, it would not alter the fact that calumny is an injustice.

In July 1980, the Vatican in a declaration about euthanasia said "No-one can authorize the death of an innocent whether that innocent be an embryo, fetus, sick or old person, without committing a very serious crime<sup>1862</sup>".

Biologically, there is no difference between killing a human embryo who is 24 hours old and a two year old child<sup>1863</sup>

Pope **John Paul II** said in 1982 "One can never legitimize the act of condemning an innocent to death<sup>1864</sup>".

In Feb. 1983, the Permanent Commission of the Spanish Episcopate said "We wish to state that the fact that abortion is no longer penalized, is a very grave injustice and completely unacceptable. No Catholic could in conscience, collaborate in the carrying out of an abortion. What today is called "a voluntary interruption of a pregnancy" cannot escape the moral qualification of homicide".

To want to de-penalize abortion just because many women practice it, is an aberration, it is like saying that because there are so many burglaries and street attacks it would be better to legalize them because they occur so frequently. **The de-penalization of criminal abortion** to appease the voices who claim it, does not convert the abortion in something good. Things are made good for being frequent. In this case, egoism, so frequent, would be good, and heroism, so rare, would be bad.

<sup>1859</sup> YA Newspaper, 7-I-79, pg. 44

<sup>1860</sup> ABC Newspaper of Seville, 10-IX-92. pg. 3

<sup>1861</sup> YA Newspaper, 14-III-76

<sup>1862</sup> Statement by the Vatican on euthanasia, July, 1980

<sup>1863</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2261

<sup>1864</sup> YA Newspaper, 28-IX-79. pg. 6

To permit abortions so as just to avoid the danger that some women take because they go to clandestine abortionists is like allowing murders so as not to put the lives of the murderers in danger. In many countries where abortion is legally permitted it has been noticed that there has not been a notable descent in the number of clandestine abortions.<sup>1865</sup>

Two years after abortions were legalized in France, according to the Health ministry of France, only 45,000 abortions of the hundreds of thousands performed were reported, this is taken from the information provided by the Ministry<sup>1866</sup>

For example, in 1978 the French Episcopate published a document against abortion in which they showed that in the five years since the law was passed permitting abortion, the number of abortions had increased and that the above mentioned law had done nothing to solve the difficulties that the Government thought it would<sup>1867</sup>.

57% of single women in France -where contraceptives are available to anyone; get married having already had two or three abortions<sup>1868</sup>.

In the U.S.A., where contraceptives are easily available, the number of abortions are increasing, in 1973 about a million abortions were performed, in 1981, 1,500,000 were performed<sup>1869</sup>. Since the abortion law was legalized in the U.S.A. 15 million legal abortions have taken place<sup>1870</sup>. In England, there were 543 abortions performed on girls under 16 years of age, in the first half of 1970<sup>1871</sup>

On the other hand, the fact that abortion is now legally allowed so as to avoid the dangers of clandestine abortions has had very bad consequences; many people think that because it is legally allowed in cannot be that morally bad and so the number of abortions has grown enormously.

In Rumania, after de-penalizing abortions in 1965, 25% of women in child bearing age had abortions, this represented about four abortions for each birth. This caused the Rumanian government to review the legislation on abortion<sup>1872</sup>

These killings of innocent people have generalized in today's society in a terrifying way. According to the report of the Attorney of the Supreme Tribunal on Criminality, there are over three hundred thousand provoked abortions a year in Spain<sup>1873</sup>

In the United States of America, there are over a million induced abortions a year<sup>1874</sup>

According to the World Health Organization about 50 million abortions are carried out every year in the world. Fifty million legalized killings!<sup>1875</sup>

It is hypocritical to defend the democratic freedoms of the human being as party policy, and then defend abortion, depriving an innocent person of the right of life, since he cannot defend himself, nor even protest. Abortionists defend and think of the many inconveniences that a mother will have by giving birth to an unwanted child, but they do not think of the rights that the child has to continue living.

In 1996, **Dr. Bernard Nathanson** was baptized into the Catholic Church. He was formerly known as the "Abortion King", as he had, since 1945, performed over 75 thousand abortions. He was the Director of the largest abortion clinic in the USA. In the 80's he was convinced that the fetus was a human being, and became an anti-abortionist. He is the author of the book "*Aborting in America*"

<sup>1865</sup> YA Newspaper, 28-XI-79, pg. 6

<sup>1866</sup> LA VERDAD Newspaper, Murcia, 12-XI-77

<sup>1867</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1934(19-V-79)3

<sup>1868</sup> Spain National Radio: "Protagonistas Nosotros", 29-X-79

<sup>1869</sup> YA Newspaper, 30-I-82, pg. 10

<sup>1870</sup> YA Newspaper, 23-I-85, pg. 31

<sup>1871</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine. 1510 (26-IX-70) 39

<sup>1872</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO DE SOBRINO, S.I.: Onda Familiar, Aborto, 1

<sup>1873</sup> YA Newspaper, 16-IX-74, pg. 15

<sup>1874</sup> Letter from Cardinal COOKE, 27-I-78

<sup>1875</sup> JUAN N. LUMBRERAS, S.I. *Cristianismo es amor y exigencia de justicia*. XX, 2. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao



and of the film “*The Silent Scream*”. Members of the Pro Life Movement made him question himself as to the atheism he had been raised in. He states: “I started to seriously consider the idea of God. I found in the New Testament the God in which I could find the forgiveness that I had desperately been seeking for such a long time. Convinced that God would forgive my crimes. This was a tremendous consolation for my afflicted spirit<sup>1876</sup>”

**It is inconceivable** that people who are against the death penalty for criminals, which are a menace to society, allow **innocent beings** to be murdered by legal abortion. What can we expect of a society that permits the murder of unborn children, because of the ego of the elders? What values will be respected by those who do not respect the right to life of innocent children<sup>1877</sup>

**Pope John Paul II**, speaking in Poland in 1991, said: “No government has the right to authorize the death of innocent human beings. Man progresses in a proportionate way to his betterment. To progress is not to have more, but to be more and better. To allow the murder of unborn innocent human beings

The Permanent Commission of the Spanish Episcopate has made and published a statement where it affirms that: “the State does not have the authority to decide that it is permissible to end the life of an innocent human being<sup>1878</sup>”

On October 15, 1993, Monsignor **Elias Yanes** said, “The right to live is a fundamental right, that the legislator does not create but must recognize and protect”. Nobody, even a non-believer, has the right to condemn an innocent person to death. The right to live of an innocent being does not depend on human opinion. The government cannot legally approve the killing of an innocent being. Natural law is above human law, and no government can legislate against natural law. If human law were sufficient to make anything morally acceptable, **Hitler’s** and **Stalin’s** crimes would be justified, as if they were legal”.

The government has no authority to decide whether it is acceptable to kill an innocent human being, as the right to life existed before the government. The government has the obligation to protect this right.

**It is curious** that many ecologists are abortionists. They defend the plants and the little birds, yet they do not mind murdering human beings. A priest in the parish of la Rioja was fined for having taken down some stork eggs from the bell tower; but a mother who kills her unborn is not punished. And this is, as said by monsignor **Bira** Bishop of Rioja, “the human fetus is not a protected species<sup>1879</sup>”.

Monsignor **Gea**, Bishop of Mondoñedo, has published a pastoral entitled *Man, an unprotected species*. In it, he says among other things “It is correct to fine those who destroy stork nests or bald eagles’. But that those who destroy a human life are not punished is a paradox.. Is he who destroys a life inside the mother’s womb less of a murderer than the terrorist who uses a car bomb to kill innocent people? What will politicians, who defend abortion because of the anguish that the mother may have do if we were to refuse to pay high taxes for the angst that this produces in us.<sup>1880</sup>

In mid September 1994, on the same day, two children died, **Marcos Alegre** aged thirteen, and **Judy Rivera**, fourteen, just because their parents, **Jehovah’s Witnesses** refused to allow a blood transfusion which would have saved their lives. This is truly pitiful. But that the Socialist Minister of Social Matters, **Cristina Alberdi**, make solemn manifestations<sup>1881</sup> against the fact that for religious reasons, some parents will allow their children to die, as parents do not have the right to

<sup>1876</sup> ALEX ROSAL: HOGAR DE LA MADRE Magazine, 71. (VII,VIII-96) 35

<sup>1877</sup> RICARDO M. CARLES, Archbishop of Barcelona: *Fe y Cultura*, XIV, 3. Ed. Claret. Barcelona. 1990

<sup>1878</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2704 (1-X-94) 10

<sup>1879</sup> YA Newspaper 7-X-92. pg. 29

<sup>1880</sup> YA Newspaper 22-IX-92 pg. 25

<sup>1881</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid 19-IX-94. pg. 61

decide on the life of their children. And later on promotes a law that allows thousands of mothers to murder their own children, if they so desire

To defend criminal abortion as a woman's right is like defending the freedom of the murderer to kill, and to forget the right of the victim to live.

What happens when a pregnancy occurs due to rape? The situation of a girl who has been raped and becomes pregnant is very, very sad, but it does not justify abortion. It is not the baby's fault, why should he be condemned to die? If someone has to be punished it should be the rapist. The child should not pay with his life the sin of his father.

A mother's honor does not justify her right to kill the child. If it is an unwanted child, she should put it up for adoption, but to kill it is a crime.

That the mother can dispose of the life of her child is a monstrosity. She has the obligation to see that the child lives and if she is guilty of its death, nobody will be able to take away her guilt and remorse<sup>1882</sup> Abortion may be not punished by law, but this is not true of the conscience. Remorse will not allow you to sleep peacefully. I was assured of this by a girl who woke up in a sweat at night, a long time after she had an abortion performed on her, because of the remorse of having murdered the child in her womb. She told me: "Father, sometimes I wake up seeing the child I murdered"

Dr **D. Antonio Peco**, a gynecologist with more than thirty years of experience in Social Security and in his own private clinic, talked to me about the psychic trauma that lingers on after the abortion.

- a) A conscientious remorse for having killed your own child.
- b) Women who have one or two children and then abort the one on the way. They later lost one or both of the children, and had a desperate life, as it was too late to have another one.
- c) Marriages that do not have the courage to look at each other face to face after an abortion, and end up separating definitely.
- d) Fathers who help their daughters to abort and then end up hating each other.

Many psychologists admit that the number of neuroses and depressions are far greater in women who have voluntarily aborted than in women who have not<sup>1883</sup>.

**Dr. Henry P. David**, Professor of Psychology at Maryland University, Baltimore, said "64% of the women who had a voluntary abortion were admitted to psychiatric hospitals"<sup>1884</sup>. Doctor **Wilke** said that "it is easier to extract a baby from the uterus of a woman, than from her conscious"<sup>1885</sup>.

Abortion cannot be admitted even if there is the danger that the child might be **born subnormal or defective**". Don't sick people or invalids have a right to live? Are we going to kill people just because they are sick, invalid or subnormal? Is killing the sick a solution for all types of illnesses? What a cheap and easy solution! No more problems for a National Health Service. But nobody can ever justify condemning an innocent person to death.

Sometimes, a child, still in its mother's womb, has been diagnosed to perhaps be subnormal; very often enormous errors have been committed in this field. This happened in Seveso, Italy, when pregnant women were recommended to abort of the fear that the children they were carrying would be born subnormal. About 400 mothers did not heed the recommendation to abort and later had perfectly healthy children<sup>1886</sup>.

Again in Spain, with the infamous case of the colza oil, pregnant women who were ill because of the effects of the oil were recommended to abort because of the danger of having subnormal children:

<sup>1882</sup> JOHN PAUL II *Mulleris Dignitatem*, n° 14. 15-VIII-88

<sup>1883</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 27-IV-80 Pg. 86

<sup>1884</sup> TELVA Magazine 550(IV-87)63

<sup>1885</sup> YA Newspaper, 24-IV-89. pg. 15

<sup>1886</sup> YA Newspaper, 13-V-83 pg. 28

Results were, according to **Dr. Zamaniego**, Chairman of the Board of the National Program to Prevent Abnormalities, that of the 450 cases of these women's births, not one child was affected<sup>1887</sup>, but if they had listened to the recommendations, 450 innocent children would have been killed.

**Dr. Lopez Ibor** presents the case of a woman who had been recommended to terminate her pregnancy, as she would give birth to a defective child. He dissuaded her, and a year later she showed up with a perfect and beautiful baby<sup>1888</sup>.

An Italian woman, **Marisa Ferrante**, during her fourth month of pregnancy, was recommended by her doctor to have an abortion, as he said that she should give birth to a girl with tremendous malformations; a true monster!. She did not want to abort. And when her "monster" was 20 years old, she was elected "Miss Italy"<sup>1889</sup>.

A new **abortive pill** has appeared recently, it is the RU 486, which has produced malformations in the fetus when it has not been effective<sup>1890</sup>. A thirty one year old French woman, who was taking the pill died of a cardiovascular accident. As the accidents and deaths have multiplied, and have been ill explained as to the causes of death of those women who have taken it, the French government is "reexamining" this abortive pill<sup>1891</sup>.

For this reason the United States Supreme Court has forbidden the RU-486 pill in the United States territory<sup>1892</sup>, as it is considered dangerous merchandise<sup>1893</sup>.

The Official Gazette of the French State, restricts the use of the RU-486 abortive pill, because "it can represent a serious damage to public health".<sup>1894</sup>.

The erroneously called "birth control vaccine" is neither a vaccine nor is it a birth control method. It is not a vaccine as it does not prevent any illness, but rather it kills a human being. And it is not a contraceptive, as what it does is to impede that a conceived human being is not allowed to continue to live. In other words, it is an abortive pill.

The IUD (Intra uterine device), besides being abortive, as it impedes the nestling of the fertilized ovum, is also dangerous to health, as it can cause infections and even perforate the uterus<sup>1895</sup>.

One must distinguish between **spontaneous abortion**, which occurs involuntarily, and provoked abortion which is a very serious sin.

There is also a difference, between this last one and the **therapeutic abortion** where the doctors try to save the child. If one has to choose between the two lives, that of the fetus or of the mother, one can choose the life that seems to be more important, but if humanly possible one should try and save both lives. In such a case, the moral principle of a double significance action is applied and with this new focus, a therapeutic abortion could be justified. This is the reasoning of Jesuit Fr. **Marcelino Zabla**, who holds the chair of Moral Theology of the Gregorian University of Rome<sup>1896</sup>. If at all possible, both lives were to be saved.

But it would never be licit to procure a voluntary abortion.

**Dr. John Peel**, gynecologist to Queen Elizabeth II, praised the "very valuable scientific" work of **Dr. Wynn** who through his investigations, found that mothers who had voluntarily undergone previous abortions very often later on gave birth to defective children<sup>1897</sup>.

<sup>1887</sup> YA Newspaper , 15-III-83. pg. 25

<sup>1888</sup> YA Newspaper , 10-III-87. pg. 34

<sup>1889</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid. 8-IX-95. pg 95

<sup>1890</sup> YA Newspaper , 29-X-88, pg. 16

<sup>1891</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 10-IV-91. pg. 48

<sup>1892</sup> PALABRA Magazine, 330s, (VIII-IX, 1992) 19

<sup>1893</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid 3-IV-93, pg. 20

<sup>1894</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 1-I-89, pg. 14

<sup>1895</sup> Dr. JEAN BAPTISTE JOURDAIN: MUNDO CIENTIFICO Magazine, 51 (X-85) 984

<sup>1896</sup> MARCELINO ZALBA, S. I.: ESTUDIOS ECLESIASTICOS Magazine, 52(1977)9-38

<sup>1897</sup> MUNDO CRISTIANO Magazine, 130(XI-73)34

In the case of an abortion, besides the mother, the people who advise it, collaborate and carry it out also sin and not only do they sin but they are automatically ex-communicated<sup>1898</sup>. The Vatican reminds sanitary workers that they have a grave obligation to consciously object in the case of abortive legislation<sup>1899</sup>. Whosoever practices abortion is excommunicated<sup>1900</sup>. Also, those who voluntarily and efficiently collaborate in the act<sup>1901</sup>. In other words, the felony would not have taken place without their participation<sup>1902</sup>.

**Excommunication** is the canonic penalty that the church imposes on certain grave sins, so that they are not committed. This consists in the punishment that the excommunicated is not allowed any of the sacraments, with the exception of confession. But not all priests can withdraw excommunication.

The Church condemns abortion from the time of the *Didaje*<sup>1903</sup> in the first century. "From the first century the church has affirmed the moral malice of any provoked abortion"<sup>1904</sup>

6. In March 1987, the Holy See published *Donum Vitae*, a document about **Bioethics** imposing moral barriers on genetic manipulation. The Church is in favor of man but it does not accept that human beings can be manufactured in series so that later they can be destroyed when they are no longer of any interest<sup>1905</sup>...

The right to create human life with the object of later destroying it cannot be allowed. I have read that to successfully achieve some 600 test-tube babies in laboratories, they have had to destroy 23,400 fertilized ovum "in vitro", in other words, 97.5% of the human lives that were started, were lost!<sup>1906</sup> In France, in 1986 there were 800 "test tube" babies, but over 11,000 embryos had been obtained "in vitro", in other words, 10,200 human beings were destroyed<sup>1907</sup>.

Dr. **Julio Aznar**, Chief of the Clinical Biopathology Department of the Hospital de la Fe in Valencia, states: "That for every "in vitro" child that is born, about forty human lives are lost"<sup>1908</sup>, because in order to obtain a single test tube baby. About 50 ovum are fertilized. Scientific experimentation cannot legitimize this destruction of human lives.

Dr. **Jacques Testart**, relates in his book *El Embrión Transparente*, how at the Clamart Clinic, where he works, in some instances, there are in the same room, a woman who has just had an abortion performed, with a woman who is being subjected to a treatment for an "in vitro" fertilization. Would it not be better that the second woman adopt the child of the first, instead of having 50 children die so that she may have one?<sup>1909</sup>

Scientific experimentation can never be a legitimate excuse for the destruction of these human beings. Cardinal **Ratzinger**, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, when he presented the document said "Scientific activity, where human activity is concerned, is submitted to ethical laws. Science is not a dictum where everything should be sacrificed in its name and certainly not human dignity". Progress which goes against human dignity is not true progress.

Here forth are some ideas that appear in the document *Donum Vitae*:

<sup>1898</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2272

<sup>1899</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 24-X-94 pg. 89

<sup>1900</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1398

<sup>1901</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1398

<sup>1902</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1329, 2.

<sup>1903</sup> *Didaje*, II, 2.

<sup>1904</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2271

<sup>1905</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2275

<sup>1906</sup> YA Newspaper, 7.IV.88, pg. 13

<sup>1907</sup> JAQUES TESTART: *El embrión transparente. Attachment 4* Ed. Granica. Barcelona. 1988

<sup>1908</sup> YA Newspaper, 14-IV-88, pg. 15

<sup>1909</sup> JAQUES TESTART: *El embrión transparente. II, 8*. Ed. Granica. Barcelona. 1988

If technological progress is not bound by moral, it may attempt against human dignity. (Introduction nº2), Not everything that is technically feasible, is morally admissible (Introduction nº4). Science and morality demand, unconditional respect to the fundamental moral criteria: they should be at the service of the human being. (Introduction nº2). The human being must be treated as such from the instant of conception (1,1). It is immoral to produce human embryos destined to be exploited as “available material”. It is a must to report the extreme gravity of the voluntary destruction of human embryos obtained “in vitro”, with the purpose of clinical investigation(1,4). In the case of fetuses as well as with the remains of adult beings, any and all commercial practice is illicit and must be forbidden (1,4). From the moral point of view, the one who is truly responsible, for he who is to be born, is the procreation which is the fruit of the marriage. The fidelity of the spouses, in the unity of marriage, share the common and reciprocal respect of their right to become a mother or father, but exclusively through each other. The child has the right to be conceived, carried in the womb, brought into the world and educated within the marriage (II,1)

A child conceived with the assistance of a gamete that proceeds from a third party, is an adulterers’ son. Therefore, for the same reason, “surrogate wombs” are also forbidden, as they go against matrimonial unity, and the freezing of embryos, which exposes them to the possibility of manipulations against the dignity of the human being. Techniques which provoke a disassociation of paternity through the intervention of an alien to the spouses (donation of sperm or of the ovum, rental of the womb) are gravely dishonest<sup>1910</sup>.

Jesuit **Fr. Javier Gafo**, who holds the chair of Bioethics at Madrid University, says: “Technical development is not in itself an absolute value, in whose name any type of advancement can be legitimized. New human reproduction techniques can lead to abusive manipulations of the embryo and a degradation of their human value<sup>1911</sup>. Severe perversions can be done<sup>1912</sup>. Manipulating the human chromosome of aggressiveness, individuals with a criminal tendency could be obtained for use in terrorism. Genetic engineering could create under-endowed individuals who could be placed at the service of the “smart” ones who created them<sup>1913</sup>. It would mean a new type of slavery. And no man is to be exploited by whom is stronger than he, be it economically, culturally, physically or psychologically. Any man, born or unborn, healthy or sick, is God’s child. He cannot be exploited by another man. Nobel Prize winner, **Dr. Severo Ochoa** while being interviewed by journalist **Pilar Urbano**, said: “There are many instances where scientific discovery escapes our hands and turns against man<sup>1914</sup>”.

It is evident that **not everything that is technically feasible is morally acceptable**. The means of information propagated that two lesbians from the Basque country had had a child, one was pregnant with the sperm from a sperm bank, and the ovum that was fertilized was implanted in the other. This is a monstrosity. This child will live traumatized when he realizes that he is the child of two abnormal women. It will always be true that any and all science will need of the use of the conscience. “Intervention of the human embryo will be licit, if their purpose is to improve its life conditions<sup>1915</sup>”.

In February 1997, all communications media broadcasted the cloning of a sheep in Scotland, removing its genetic code of an ovum and fertilizing it with another cell with its genetic code. In this way a new life is born with the genetic code of the first. The new being is identical to the first. At this time, the comments of the applications to the cloning of human beings was abuzz. One of them, was that of **Juan Antonio Martínez**, Delegate of the Spanish Episcopal Conference, who spoke on television saying “The Science without conscience will turn against man” Effectively, it would be a

<sup>1910</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2376

<sup>1911</sup> YA Newspaper 11-III-87, pg. 5

<sup>1912</sup> JAQUES TESTART: *El embrión transparente .IV, 4* Ed. Granica. Barcelona. 1988

<sup>1913</sup> ABC Newspaper Seville, 9-II-94. pg. 119

<sup>1914</sup> EPOCA Magazine, 142 (3-XI-87) 54.

<sup>1915</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2275

monstrosity that some men “fabricate” other underdeveloped or intellectually inferior beings, docile and submissive, but physically strong, to be put at their service in hard labor or in dangerous work. It would be a new form of slavery.

A convention on Bioethics was convened in Oviedo in April 1997. Representatives of twenty countries signed the European Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine, sponsored by the European Council. This document includes a special attachment which especially forbids human cloning.<sup>1916</sup>

7. **Jehovah’s Witnesses** forbid **blood transfusions**, they say that they are forbidden by the Bible and they are capable of allowing a person to die before letting him have a blood transfusion. This idea, of course, is false. Nowhere in the Bible does it mention blood transfusions. The Bible cannot forbid something that was totally unknown in its time. What the Bible does forbid is eating animal’s blood<sup>1917</sup>, because this action used to be related with idolatry, when they saw other people sacrifice animals as an offering to their idols. The Bible also says: that you shall not eat fat<sup>1918</sup>. And they do not heed to this command.. Also, **Christ** abolished some practices of the Old Testament, and transformed into the New<sup>1919</sup>. Many of the laws of the Old Testament are no longer applicable in the New (e.g. Circumcision, pilgrimage to Jerusalem, death penalty for adulterers, etc) The forbiddance of drinking blood was maintained at the beginning<sup>1920</sup> in consideration of the Christians that originally proceeded from Judaism, who were very strict about their customs and they were not prepared to partake of foods that had been forbidden all their lives, and no-one could allow these people to be scandalized. The transit from the Old Testament to the New Testament required of time for the Jews who had to extricate themselves from their old habits. but very soon Christians were allowed to eat all classes of food. **St Paul** says “Food will not commend us to God. We are no worse off if we do not eat, and no better off if we do”. Later he says that one can eat everything<sup>1921</sup>: “Eat whatever is sold in the meat market without raising any question on the ground of conscience<sup>1922</sup>” To abstain from eating blood was a transitory, circumstantial norm used to discipline people, that fell into disuse when the communities of Jewish-Christian-Palestinians disappeared in the war of the year 70<sup>1923</sup>. That is why **St Paul** and none of the Father Apostles ever mention it again in their writings

On the other hand, the prohibition of fornication is frequently repeated in **St. Paul** and in the Apostolic Fathers.

**St. Matthew** says “*It is not what goes into the mouth that defiles a man; but what comes out of the mouth*”<sup>1924</sup>.

On the other hand, the Bible very clearly says that we shall give our lives for our fellow men<sup>1925</sup>, because this is the best way to demonstrate our love for them<sup>1926</sup>. So if we are willing to give our lives for others, the more so we should give our blood (which on the other hand we recover very easily) to save the life of a dangerously ill person. So, blood transfusions are not only not against the Bible, they are actually very much in agreement with the Bible because it tells us that we must sacrifice ourselves for our fellow men. The people who oppose blood transfusions are very far from

<sup>1916</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 5-IV-97 pg. 59.

<sup>1917</sup> Leviticus, 3:17

<sup>1918</sup> Leviticus, 3:17

<sup>1919</sup> Galatians, 3

<sup>1920</sup> Acts, 15:20, 29

<sup>1921</sup> Corinthians, 8:8, 13

<sup>1922</sup> Corinthians, 10:25ss

<sup>1923</sup> SALVADOR MUÑOZ IGLESIAS: *Los problemas de los primeros tiempos, II,3. ADUE. Madrid.*

<sup>1924</sup> Matthew, 15:11

<sup>1925</sup> John. 3:16

<sup>1926</sup> John, 15:13

knowing the Bible and the message of love that the sacred book contains from knowing the Bible and the message of love that the sacred book contains for the good of all.

8. Another sin against this commandment is to take one's life -in other words: commit **suicide**<sup>1927</sup>. Which is to take one's life in a deliberate and self-conscious manner.

Man has the obligation of conserving life itself<sup>1928</sup>. For this reason it is not licit to carelessly expose one's life when reason dictates that it should not be exposed, other than for a reason of charity or duty<sup>1929</sup>. Self mutilation, unless it is the only way to provide health to the rest of the body<sup>1930</sup>.

Suicide is a grave sin as life does not belong to us, but to God, who has given it to us in usufruct<sup>1931</sup>. I cannot burn down the house in which I live because it is not mine: I have only rented it. Have I given myself life, so that I can consider it mine? But generally, the suicidal normally does it in a moment of desperation or fury, and this is an extenuating circumstance

Difficult situations, can be overcome by asking God to free us from them or to give us strength to resist. But suicide does not fix anything. It damages everything and forever. That is why only insanity or irreligiousness can lead to suicide

The causes for suicide are frequently those which make a person be besides himself, be it for illness or other causes. Ordinarily, it is difficult to measure the degree of responsibility and guilt they may have<sup>1932</sup>. Grave mental problems may diminish the degree of responsibility of the suicidal<sup>1933</sup>.

The Church prays for those who have attempted against their life<sup>1934</sup>.

To lose one's life in an act of service or in a courageous action<sup>1935</sup>, such as saving a drowning man, etc. **is not suicide** even though one knows that by doing so, very possibly they will lose their own life: It is not suicide because one is not looking directly for death, one loses one's life because he wanted to save another life.

9. As one is not allowed to take one's own life, neither can anyone shorten it directly, as happens with **euthanasia**. Euthanasia is a deliberate act to end a life of a person, To anticipate death, no matter how certain it may be, and how unbearable life may be, is to grant oneself a right that only pertains to God. And even if the patient agrees and requests it vehemently, as he cannot grant a right that he does not possess, as he is not the owner of his body and his being<sup>1936</sup>

Euthanasia wants to portray itself as "dignified death", the same way that the provoked abortion wants to hide behind the façade of "pregnancy interruption"

After abortion, **euthanasia** is sure to follow. For the same reason that unwanted babies are killed, they will allow the sick to be killed as well as the elderly who are a nuisance. Let nobody be fooled. First it was the unborn, now the elderly, next will be the one who is in the way of the one in command, or he who dares to dissent. The culture of death is unstoppable, even if its arguments are null. So has said **Santiago Marin**<sup>1937</sup>.

<sup>1927</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares*, 1º, 2ª, II, nº 447. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1928</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 1938c. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1929</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 1939 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1930</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 2246, 2348 Ed Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1931</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2280

<sup>1932</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Esta es nuestra fe*. 2ª, III, 7,2,2. c EDICE, Madrid. 1986

<sup>1933</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2282

<sup>1934</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church nº 2283

<sup>1935</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares*, 1º, 2ª, II, nº 444, 3º Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1936</sup> JESUS FERRER. *Dolor y eutanasia*. Pg 26. EUNSA, Pamplona. 1976

<sup>1937</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 3-III-97. pg. 73

It all begins with a label of propriety, dignified death, helping one to die in order to avoid his suffering. But then it does on to terrifying actions, such as the case of a young couple who wanted to eliminate “granny” because they needed her bed<sup>1938</sup>. During the 70’s, in Communist China, there was a “sudden” disappearance of lepers, blind, crazy and handicapped. This “purge” explains in part the impressive “hole” discovered by demographers, of over 50 million inhabitants of the Chinese population<sup>1939</sup>. For this same reason, for which some of those who defend the abortion, tomorrow they themselves will be eliminated by their own children, who will consider them a useless load. **Diego Diaz** in his book *La Ultima Edad*, recalls the words of the American demographer **Dr. Gallop**, who hails from the University of Manitoba, Canada: Once you have allowed the death of the fetus, the cycle will not be closed. There will be no age limit. A chain reaction will have started, that will put you in place as a victim. Your children will want to kill you, because you allowed that their brothers and sisters are killed. They will want to kill you as they cannot stand your old age<sup>1940</sup>. Here is even the case of someone who boasts that he purchased his car with the money of the life insurance of the patient that he let die through lack of attention<sup>1941</sup>. And as **Dr. Gallop** says: If a doctor accepts money to kill an innocent in the womb of the mother, the same doctor will kill you with an injection, when someone pays him to do it<sup>1942</sup>.

On June 4, 1987, we were able to see on television, in the program *Debate*, how a defender of euthanasia was saying that we all should have the right to die in a dignified way, and the Doctor from the Basurto Hospital, responded that he was right in that matter, but euthanasia consists in killing the patient, and doctors are to heal not to kill.

To die in a dignified manner is to assume death in a Christian and humane manner.

All of the newspapers in Spain wrote about the case of the minor **Mercedes Rodriguez**, from Bilbao, whose father, Emilio, asked through all means, that the doctors kill his sickly daughter. There was a couple who was willing to take care of her. Later on, a remedy was found for some of the illnesses that afflicted her<sup>1943</sup>. A nurse at the Dutch Hospital of Vliethoven, murdered through an injection, up to nine elderly people<sup>1944</sup>. Four nurses in Austria were condemned for having “liquidated forty nine patients, who were a bother to them”<sup>1945</sup>. One of the nurses, **Waltraud Wagner**, recognized having killed eleven patients<sup>1946</sup>.

There are over two thousand cases of euthanasia a year registered in Holland, of which, over a thousand were done without the patient “asking” for it.<sup>1947</sup> Legalization of euthanasia in 1992 has provoked an enormous diffusion of a card where it says that the bearer does not want to have euthanasia practiced on him, and eighty of one hundred elderly over the age of seventy five don’t even want to hear about a hospital, in fear that they may be eliminated. The fear of euthanasia being practiced on them has made the elderly Dutch associate in the NPV to defend themselves from euthanasia. The NPV has seventy three thousand members and in the last few weeks, five thousand new members have registered<sup>1948</sup>.

I know of cases of terminally ill patients, where everything possible has been done and who die desperate believing that they have been abandoned. If this were to occur in a situation where euthanasia is rejected. How many would die desperate thinking themselves abandoned in a situation where euthanasia is legalized?

<sup>1938</sup> TIHAMER TOTH: *Creo en Jesucristo, el Mesías, XXV*, 2. Ed. Atenas. Madrid

<sup>1939</sup> 30 GIOORNI Magazine, 1 (VI-1987) 10

<sup>1940</sup> YA Newspaper Sunday Edition, 6-II-77. pg. 3

<sup>1941</sup> YA Newspaper 23-IV-88. pg. 11

<sup>1942</sup> YA Newspaper 11-XII-97. pg. 17

<sup>1943</sup> YA Newspaper , 20-III-86- pg. 35

<sup>1944</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 15-IX-95, pg. 30

<sup>1945</sup> YA Newspaper , 11-IV-89. Pg. 13

<sup>1946</sup> YA Newspaper , 21-IV-89. Pg. 17

<sup>1947</sup> SIEMPRE P’ALANTE, 251, (1-III-93) 15

<sup>1948</sup> ABC Newspaper Madrid, 18-II-95. pg. 66



In Australia, the law allowing euthanasia has been repealed<sup>1949</sup>.

It is not licit to administrate an injection to accelerate the time of death however inevitable, supported by the pious desire to stop the suffering. It is not licit to directly provoke death through an artificial method<sup>1950</sup>, not even at the request of the patient, but it is licit to stop as much pain as possible even though the doctors know that by giving an injection they might accelerate the moment of death<sup>1951</sup>.

If the dosage used even though it does not cause the death of the patient, leaves the patient senseless up to the point of death, it should not be used on those near death, unless they are spiritually prepared. If they are not, such an injection could prevent them from an adequate preparation for eternity, which is much more important than physical relief<sup>1952</sup>.

We must all try through **all available means** to conserve or recover our health. But we are not under any obligation to take drastic and heroic measures, for example: having to take very expensive drugs or undergoing extremely painful surgical procedures<sup>1953</sup>. If a patient, according to his doctor, has no hope of a cure, it is not necessary to prolong his life indefinitely through the use of drugs or other means that will only prolong his life which is inevitably running out<sup>1954</sup>. This is true above all, when life is prolonged artificially, when the person affected is living like a vegetable, without human reactions; in these cases, it is perfectly licit to interrupt these measures and let nature take its course<sup>1955</sup>. An irreversible vegetative existence that is no longer human can have no reason to prolong it. Of course if the family or relatives of the sick person do not agree and want to employ any scientific method they think will help, they are perfectly within their rights to hold hope until the last minute.

In September 1989, the Spanish Episcopal Conference issued a *Vital Testament* for the ill who find themselves in a terminal stage of an illness. It goes like this. I \_\_\_\_\_ hereby request that if by cause of my illness, I should be in a critical or irrecoverable situation, that my life should not be maintained by extraordinary treatments or means, that an active form of euthanasia not be applied, nor should my transit to death be prolonged in an abusive or irrational way; but that treatments be given to alleviate my suffering.

I also request help in order to attain my Christian and humane death. I wish to prepare myself for this final act of my existence, in peace, with the company of my loved ones, and the consolation of my Christian faith.<sup>1956</sup>

The Church doctrine on euthanasia can be summed up in the following "Decalogue":

1. It is never licit to kill a patient, not even to avoid his suffering, even if he expressly asks for death. Nobody has the right to provoke death, neither the patient, the doctor nor the relatives.
2. No action that directly or deliberately causes death is allowed.
3. It is not licit to suspend a patient's treatment if this leads to death, e.g. tube feeding, even if the patient's illness has no cure, he is terminally ill or in an irreversible coma.
4. It is not licit to refuse available medical treatment, even if it is only partially effective. Treatment should be maintained for a patient in coma if there is a possibility of recovery, although it may be interrupted if it has been declared useless. In any case, sustenance measures should always be maintained.
5. A terminally ill patient should not be subject to new surgical procedures if they do not guarantee to make his life more comfortable.

<sup>1949</sup> CADIZ Daily, 11-XII-96. pg. 28

<sup>1950</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2277

<sup>1951</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2279

<sup>1952</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación*, 3ª, I, n° 177,2, a. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>1953</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: *ECCLESIA Magazine*, 1990(12-VII-80)28

<sup>1954</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2278

<sup>1955</sup> VITTORIO MARCOZZI: *LA CIVILTA CATTOLICA*, 15-XI-75

<sup>1956</sup> YA Newspaper , 29-IX-89, pg. 15

6. It is licit to administer narcotics and analgesics to relieve pain even if they reduce consciousness and indirectly shorten the patient's life. The objective must be to relieve pain, not to accelerate death. The morality of this kind of action depends on the intentions it is done with. There should also be a balance between the lessening of pain and the negative effect on the patient's health.

7. It is licit to interrupt excessive treatment on a patient in an irreversible coma when he is brain dead. Such an action would not be licit if the brain shows vital functions.

8. Deformed or invalid people have the same rights as everybody else. They should receive the same medical treatment as people who are not invalid or deformed. In the pre-natal and post-natal phases of a child, the same assistance should be rendered as to a normal child.

9. The government has no right to legalize euthanasia, as the life of an innocent being is more powerful than a government ruling.

10. Euthanasia is a crime against human life and divine law. All those who intervene in the decision and act are responsible for the homicide<sup>1957</sup>.

10. A very charitable action is the **organ donation** to be used for transplants<sup>1958</sup>. To donate one's body so that another person can use an organ is an act of charity that all of us should do. It is necessary to carry an "organ Donor" card

If one decides to donate a vital organ during one's life, there are a few conditions to be met<sup>1959</sup>:

- a) The donor must be well informed and he must freely and responsibly donate his organ;
- b) That the operation must have the possibility of a certain degree of success in proportion to the inconveniences that the donor has to put up with.
- c) That the organ be double or can regenerate, such as blood.

Exceptions are the cases of medical prescription, therapeutic reasons, the **amputations, mutilations or sterilizations**, willingly done by people are contrary to moral law<sup>1960</sup>

In most countries to-day one can ask for a donor's card which one should always carry on oneself in the case of a fatal accident outside the home or office.

11. One's **home country** should be the most important thing after God and one's religion. Home country is not only the territory in which one is born. It also includes a mesh of ideas, history, traditions, customs, religion, etc., which identify the personality of the people. "For a Christian soldier to die for God and Country is the ultimate act of charity. Should you die for the country in the Grace of God, you will have great merit and little purgatory" **Fr. Vilariño, S. I.**

A country must be loved and defended by the citizens, to the point of losing one's life<sup>1961</sup>. Those who dedicate themselves to serve the country in the military, are in the service of the security and liberty of the people<sup>1962</sup>. Public posers will be equally attentive to those who for reasons of conscience, refuse to bear arms. They are obliged to serve the human community in another way<sup>1963</sup>. The love of country is one of the most pure and dignified loves one can hold in his heart. "Raise your

<sup>1957</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine 2624 40 20-III-93) 40. Euthanasia, one hundred questions and answers on the defense of human life and the attitude of the Catholics. Text of the Episcopal Committee for the Defense of Life, of the Spanish Episcopal Conference. Published Feb. 14, 1993. N° 94.

<sup>1958</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2301

<sup>1959</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2296

<sup>1960</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2297

<sup>1961</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 1936<sup>a</sup>*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>1962</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2310

<sup>1963</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2311

citizens with magnanimity and loyalty in love of the country, but without narrowness of spirit, so that they can also always look forward to the good of the whole human family<sup>1964</sup>

A Christian soldier who dies in an act of service for his country this is a sublime act of charity. If he dies for his country and is in a state of grace, he will obtain great merit and very little purgatory. The love one has for one's country is one of the purest and most worthy that one can carry in one's heart. Vatican Council II in *Gaudium et Spes* says "Cultivate the citizens with magnitude and loyalty to their country but without narrowness of spirit, so that they can always look after the welfare of all the human family".

"Love of one's country is legitimate, just as the love of one's home and one's mother is legitimate. Even better, it is an ineludible demand of any great-hearted person. Anyone who despises his mother or home is a dastard; one that despises his country or insults it is also dastardly. Christianity prescribes and foments the love of one's country and it even elevates it to the supernatural. A disciplined love of country is a moral duty of all Christians<sup>1965</sup>".

We must all endeavor to add to the greatness of our country by our service and work, by our collaboration and, sometimes, even by the sacrifice of our own lives, should this be necessary, to defend it when in danger<sup>1966</sup>. Our duty to our country is: to love it, defend it, obey its laws and contribute to the welfare of all that live in it<sup>1967</sup>.

We must be proud of our country, of its qualities and virtues. But we should also be aware of the shortfalls of our race and work to correct them, and by doing this we contribute to its greatness. We must never be fanatical nationalists believing that we are better than anyone else. But on the other hand, we must not be naïve admirers of all that is foreign, believing it is better and superior in everything.<sup>1968</sup>

Everyone knows the attitude of **Jehovah's witnesses** towards country and flag. They will refuse to fight for their country because they do not believe in any fatherland except God's own country, they refuse to salute the flag, because, according to them it is a form of religious adoration. What a sham! What ignorance, or desire to confuse people. When one salutes the flag of one's country it is always a military act which includes patriotism, it has nothing to do with religion<sup>1969</sup>.

12. **Civil laws**, morally just, ordered for the common good, obligate through the conscience. But the unjust law which goes against reason, conscience or God, does not oblige.<sup>1970</sup>

Some governments these days, with their laws, more than defending public morality and stimulating moral behavior, what they do is to authorize, through laws, immoral behavior, for example, abortion. They do not worry about what should be done, but to authorize what is being done. We are in a permissive society. Through a respect for freedom, everything is allowed, without worrying about orienting freedom to the common good<sup>1971</sup>. Man is fulfilled in society. He is a sociable and social being. God has made him so. That is why norms are to be established and authorities must exist in order to be at the service of functioning societies. The authority is, therefore, a service to the community, not a privilege for the one who exercises it. And if it is legitimate, it comes from God in the last instance. That is to say, obedience, properly understood, ends in God's will. But of course, all authority is limited, it has a sphere of action. If it were to order out of its limits, there is no place for obedience<sup>1972</sup>. God has wanted that men live in society- The social organization helps

<sup>1964</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*. Constitución sobre la Iglesia en el mundo actual, n° 75.

<sup>1965</sup> VICENTE ENRIQUE TARANCON: *La incógnita de la juventud VII*, 3 Ed. PYLSA. Madrid

<sup>1966</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º*, n° 860-870

<sup>1967</sup> Catechism. Spanish Text. Third Grade, n° 250. Madrid

<sup>1968</sup> EUSTAQUIO GUERRERO, S. I.: *RAZÓN Y FE Magazine*, 163 (II-61)183

<sup>1969</sup> JUAN ANTONIO MONROY: *Apuntando a la Torre, XII*. Ed. Imayol. Madrid

<sup>1970</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2242

<sup>1971</sup> ROCA VIVA Magazine, 336(VIII, IX-1996) 339

<sup>1972</sup> BALDOMERO JIMÉNEZ DUQUE: *Volver a lo esencial, XXV*, 2 Ed. Tau. Ávila

man's development. In any society there are authorities which issue laws, and see that the laws are complied with. All citizens have the right and obligation to elect by ballot, those who will govern them, considering that they are the most capable to attain the society's goals. Society goals are attained when all citizens are sure of their rights. Christians must cooperate with all their might to promote the common good. It is also a Christian duty to worry about peace, justice and the union among mankind, and to work, considering each one's possibilities, to attain it.<sup>1973</sup>

Those who exercise authority, must do so as a service<sup>1974</sup>.

To exercise political rights is destined to the common good of the nation and of all mankind<sup>1975</sup>.

In late September 1989, the Permanent Commission of the Spanish Episcopate published a document in the proximity of the elections entitled *Responsabilidad Cristiana Ante las Elecciones generales* (Christian responsibility in view of the general elections). In it, the moral duty of voting to collaborate with the common good is mentioned, and they added that the vote is to be cast with responsibility, supporting the party that best defends the type of society that is most in agreement with the values of the conscience.

**Gabino Diaz Merchan**, President of the Spanish Episcopal Conference said, during the opening of the XLIII Plenary Assembly "The freedom of political option does not mean that a Christian can involve himself in the social-political field without taking into consideration those criteria that emanate from his faith<sup>1976</sup>".

In February 1977, the Permanent Commission of the Spanish Episcopal Conference published a note which stated that the Church must keep itself independent as to the different political parties, but Christians must exclude their support to those parties or programs that are incompatible with faith. So far as priests and religious laity it says that, as any ordinary citizen, they have the right to assume their own political options, but that they must not become actively militant, nor assume leadership in the political parties. If under concrete and exceptional circumstances, the good of the community demands such commitment, a prior authorization from the Bishop must be obtained, consulting the Presbiteral Council, and, if the case requires it, also consult the Episcopal Conference<sup>1977</sup>.

The Church, by nature is **non political**. But both the Church and the State must seek the complete welfare of the individual. Each in his own sphere of influence. If this is done properly, there is no reason to have conflicts. If the State does not respect the spiritual properties of the human being, the Church has the obligation of denouncing it. "The Christian must not subject his conscience to the impositions of the party in to which he is affiliated<sup>1978</sup>". Christians, when exercising their right to vote, have the obligation to elect those parties and those people that offer more guarantees to truly favor the common good in its wholeness. Common good cannot reduce itself to the material aspects of life, with these being of primal importance. The Christian vision of the common good also includes other cultural and moral aspects<sup>1979</sup>.

It is a great responsibility of Catholics to vote for the candidates that offer greater guarantees for the defense of God's rights and Church. And they would commit moral sin by voting for the unworthy, or abstaining from voting. With the danger of contributing to the triumph of the anti-Catholic candidates<sup>1980</sup>.

On the 29th of May, 1986, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith at the Vatican published a document called "Instructions about Christian Freedom and Liberation". It says "The Church has the unswerving will to respond to the uneasiness of contemporary men and women who

<sup>1973</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Esta es nuestra fe*. 2ª, III, 7, 2, 1 EDICE. Madrid. 1986

<sup>1974</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2235

<sup>1975</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2237

<sup>1976</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2246(23-XI-1985)16

<sup>1977</sup> YA Newspaper , 3-II-77. pg. 2

<sup>1978</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Los Católicos en la vida pública*, n° 74. Ed. PPC. Madrid. 1986

<sup>1979</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Los Católicos en la vida pública*, n°118-120. PPC. Madrid. 1986

<sup>1980</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 1º, 2º, III, n° 869, 3º. Ed. BAC. Madrid

are often subjected to unbearable oppressions and who are anxious to attain certain liberties". The political and economic effort of society does not enter directly in its mission. But **Our Lord Jesus Christ** has confided to them the word and the truth so as to illuminate their consciences. The most essential mission of the Church, following that of **Christ** is to evangelize and save souls. The Church in this mission teaches man the way he must follow on earth if he wishes to enter the kingdom of God. Its doctrine covers all moral issues. The Church desires the well-being of all men in all their dimensions, in the first place as a member of the city of God and then as a member of the community on this earth. The Church does not stray from its mission when it speaks out about the promotion of justice in society. However it makes sure that its mission is not reduced only to these points of view. The Church is faithful to its mission when it apposes the intents to establish a form of social life in which the presence of God is absent, and when it judges the political parties of movements that try to fight against misery and oppression using methods and theories of action that are contrary to the Gospel.

It is necessary to warn people that **Marxism is essentially atheism**. **Gregorio R. de Yurre**, Professor of Philosophy at Vitoria University, a well-known Marxist and author of many books about Marxism, says that atheism is as essential to Marxism as the divinity of **Christ** is for Christianity<sup>1981</sup>..

The faithful who profess the Marxist and anti-Christian doctrine of the communists, and above all, those who defend it and diffuse it, are considered to be apostates of the Catholic Church<sup>1982</sup>. That is why the Permanent Commission of the Italian Episcopate has said: One cannot be Christian and Communist at the same time<sup>1983</sup>, because, "adhesion to communism is an apostasy<sup>1984</sup>. Communism leaves no place for any religion<sup>1985</sup>.

Communism is not limited to deny God, it fights it. Marxist atheism, as **Lenin** has observed, is a direct and inevitable consequence of the dialectic materialism, an essential part of the communist conception of the world<sup>1986</sup>

Jesuit **Fr. Bartholomew Sorge** who for 12 years was the director of the magazine "*Civiltà Cattolica*", official voice of the Vatican and who has deep knowledge about the social problems of our time, has recently published a book titled "*The Political Option of a Christian*", where he states "Marxism is essentially atheist. **Marx** was an unequivocal atheist. In all his works, he attacks all religion, considering it as an illness of an alienated spirit. The whole history of Marxism has been atheism. So much so that from the atheism of **Marx** he went on with **Lenin** to antitheism, a ferocious fight against religion. Even today wherever Marxism is in power, religion is impeded. In some countries, Marxists attract Christians so as to achieve political and electoral advantages but Marxism is still radically atheist. As the Italian Episcopal Commission says "One cannot be simultaneously a Christian and a Marxist"<sup>1987</sup>. **Cardinal Bennelli** Archbishop of Florence, in statements made to the Madrid Daily *El País*, says about those Christians who vote communist: "They do it because they do not know Marxism or they do not know Christianity<sup>1988</sup>". A decree of the Holy Order, dated July 1, 1949, excommunicates, as apostates of the Catholic faith, those who profess the materialistic and anti-Christian doctrine of the Marxists. In May 1971, **Paul VI** said in his apostolic letter *Octogesima adveniens*: These days many Christians feel attracted to the socialist currents...but) the Christian who wants to live in his faith, cannot adhere, without contradicting himself, to ideological systems which are radically opposed to his faith<sup>1989</sup>.

<sup>1981</sup> SILLAR Magazine, 2(VI-81)104

<sup>1982</sup> Apostolicae Sedis, 2-VII-49. pg. 334

<sup>1983</sup> L'Ossevatore Romano, 15-XII-75

<sup>1984</sup> L'Ossevatore Romano, 29-X-75

<sup>1985</sup> Sputnik ateista, pg. 179. Moscow, 1961

<sup>1986</sup> BARTOLOME SORGE, S. I.: *La opción política del cristiano*. X. Ed. Ed. BAC. Madrid popular, nº 3. Madrid

<sup>1987</sup> FRANCISCO SKODA: L'Ossevatore Romano OF 10-x-80. PG. 7

<sup>1988</sup> EL PAIS Daily, 27-X-77. pg. 7

<sup>1989</sup> PAUL VI: *Octogesima adveniens*. N° 26 & 31

The recent appearance within the Church of the **Theology of Liberation**, has been very well received by some sectors, for its Christian content of “the option for the poor”. But some have understood this Christian ideal in a Marxist Code. **Leonard Boff**, one of the better known theologians of liberation, exhorts to the “utilization of Marxism”<sup>1990</sup>. For this reason, other sectors of the Church have rebuked the liberation theologians. The Sacred Congregation of the Faith published in 1984 an instruction on the Theology of Liberation, titled: *Liberatis nuntius*, in which it states that certain forms of it, go to Marxists concepts that imply risks of a ruinous deviation for faith and for Christian life<sup>1991</sup>. On the other hand, **Marxism has failed** in a complete way in its social doctrine. After seventy years of communism. The Russian people have not come out of their misery. Only those in government lived well. To take the people out of their misery, **Gorbachev** has requested one hundred billion dollars from capitalist countries<sup>1992</sup>.

It is perhaps a good time to say something about **Masonry**.

The Great Eastern Lodge of Spain proposed to the Constitutional Courts of the Spanish Republic that in the Constitution of the Republic they should include, among other ideas, the following:

- To end Diplomatic ties with the Vatican
- Forbid any type of religious manifestation in the street.
- Embargo the properties of the Church dedicated to charity
- Nationalization of all assets of the Religious Orders.
- Expel all monks or nuns or remove them from their cloisters.
- Legal incapacity to priests to be teachers, etc. etc.<sup>1993</sup>

The Superior Council of Scientific Investigations of Madrid published a doctoral thesis, based on documents from the Archive of Simancas, where they transcribe articles that the Masonic Lodges of Spain sent to the newspapers during the Republic (1931-1936), in calumny of the Catholic Church<sup>1994</sup>.

This is the reason why the Catholic Church forbids Catholics to become Masons.

Masonry is contrary to Catholic doctrine, and those who profess it are in grave sin<sup>1995</sup>. According to the Declaration of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith of November 23, 1983, it is forbidden for a Catholic to approach masonry, and he who does it is in grave sin, and may not approach the communion table because: “it is an affiliation incompatible with the Catholic faith”<sup>1996</sup>

13. Those people **who become so drunk** that they practically lose their sense of reason, also sin very gravely against the 5th commandment. Just as we cannot take our own life, we cannot deprive ourselves of our sense of reason. This would be killing the personality, and this cannot be done without just cause, as would be to anesthetize before a surgical operation. When someone is not completely drunk, only “merry”, this is not a serious sin. But one must be careful, because if someone has drunk too much he has no dominion over himself and can very easily commit sins that not being drunk he would never commit. This is why it is so important to know how to drink in moderation and to stop in time. It is very likely that a drunk person does things that he would never do if he were sober, you are not responsible for your actions if you do not realize what you are doing, but the sin is committed before becoming drunk when you realize what you are capable of doing if

<sup>1990</sup> JOSÉ LUIS IDÍGORAS, S. I.: *Balance de la Teología de la Liberación*. Teológica Limensa Magazine. 23(1989)331-351

<sup>1991</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: *Libertatis nuntius*. Introduction.

<sup>1992</sup> YA Newspaper, 17-VII-91. pg. 52

<sup>1993</sup> ROCA VIVA Magazine: 338(XI-96) 479s

<sup>1994</sup> JUAN ORDÓÑEZ: *La apostasía de las masas* Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

<sup>1995</sup> L'OSSEVATORE ROMANO. 23-II-1985, pg. 1

<sup>1996</sup> APOSTOLICAE SEDIS ACT, 76 (1984) 300

you become drunk but in spite of realizing this, you voluntarily get drunk anyway. To drink in excess not only offends God, but it is also very bad for one's health. Alcohol weakens one's will, destroys the nervous system, harms the liver and the brain, poisons the blood and weakens the body's resistance to illnesses like T.B., pneumonia, diabetes, rheumatism, etc.

Also people who drink a lot find it very difficult to maintain a good moral life. Drink inflames sexual desires and provokes passions.

14. Now a few words about **drugs**. The use of drugs, except for therapeutic reasons is a grave fault<sup>1997</sup>. It is very sad that youth is the fertile ground for the vast business of those people who traffic with drugs. Drugs are destroying youth. They enslave in such a way that addicts cannot live without them, and as they are so expensive, they have to get money from anywhere, even going so far as to steal or kill for it. Very often drugs destroy one's health to the point of killing an addict and it very often leads to jail.

The hunger for drugs is so insatiable; the body and soul become its slaves. The drug addict is truly a sick person. He has a single thought, a single desire, a single worry, drugs. Where ever, without curtailment, without shame, without thought. He is willing to go hungry, to reduce himself to a foul smelling individual, to prostitute himself, to steal, to kill, just so that he can get his hands on some drugs. The price is immaterial<sup>1998</sup>. The withdrawal syndrome, the hangover, will lead him to unthinkable reactions in order to obtain drugs. The "monkey", is something that grows and grows, that will not stop, forcing the one who suffers it to commit any sort of craziness in order to stop that hell, which drives him crazy and converts him into a radically different being, a being that does not care about anything or anyone, to one who cares only about getting a "fix" in order to kill "the monkey"<sup>1999</sup>.

In America, there aren't sufficient beds in the hospitals as there are addicts who require medical attention. In New York alone, over one hundred teenagers die each month because of drugs. More than for all other causes put together. Therefore, be careful. Never take. Not even try. Many started by foolishly trying, and then they fell prey to the drug, and ended being slaves to the drug.

**Garrido Lestache**, a well known doctor, speaking on Radio Nacional de España, in 1984, delivered a talk on drugs and how they start to take over your life. "He who starts smoking a "joint" will end up smoking heroin. This is confirmed by experience, even against what some people who are interested in the drug culture say about it. **Traffickers** will sometimes give it away, so that youth will be "hooked". Then everything is downhill. If you start, you will end up being downcast, maybe lunatic, and even have a premature death after becoming a derelict. "If people truly knew the effects of drugs, which will deteriorate their personality in a progressive manner, physically and psychically, if they truly knew the difficulty of leaving the drug addiction "catch 22", they would react violently to the consumption of drugs. The failures of therapy are many, therefore efforts should be directed not only to cure the patients who have already fallen into drug-addiction, but above all to direct efforts to individuals in order to not let them fall prey to it."<sup>2000</sup>

**Dr. Monegal**, a specialist in drug problems, made a few points very clear in a radio program in 1974 "Hashish or marihuana slowly poison a person's system and sometimes it is extremely difficult to drop the habit. Those people who want to make it legal to smoke these weeds have absolutely no scientific knowledge of their biological and psychological consequences. Very often they produce irreparable damage, particularly to adolescents, whose bodies are still developing and very often

<sup>1997</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2291

<sup>1998</sup> BRUNO BISIO: *El precio de las drogas, II*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao . 1969

<sup>1999</sup> YA Newspaper 31-III-84, pg. 33

<sup>2000</sup> Dr. R. ALCALA SANTAELLA: YA Newspaper Sunday, 2-IV-78, pg. 27

addiction can start with the very first dose, depending on the person". There are descriptions of the reactions of the mind and other infirmities related to the use of marihuana<sup>2001</sup>

As **Dr. Cajal**, who holds the chair of Psychopathology at Madrid University said "Permissive attitudes have always favored the growth of drug dependency".

I heard a drug addict say that when he started, he was planning on only "shooting himself" once a day, but in the long run, he needed to "shoot the drug" three to four times a day<sup>2002</sup>

**Dr. Freixa**, who holds the chair of Psychiatry at Barcelona University, said in a radio program in 1980 "Nearly all the drug addicts that are hooked on heroin and with very serious physical lesions started smoking hashish or marihuana with a friend".

This is generally how addiction starts, young people want new sensations or out of just plain curiosity and then, before they realize it they are hooked. This happens very frequently. A drug addict is always a seriously ill person, because although one can cure (with difficulty) their dependency, drugs produce irreversible psychical alteration, even if the tendency is cured. The drug addict loses all interest in anything that is not the drug: neither family, nor work, nor society, nothing. Slowly, his personality deteriorates and he ends up being a nobody.

**Alejandro Vallejo-Najera**, brother of the famous psychiatrist **Juan Antonio**, who was immersed in the drug world, said, "Drugs are Hell".<sup>2003</sup>

In Spain, there have been seventy deaths by overdose in two months, and in Barcelona alone, twenty two died in one week alone<sup>2004</sup> Seven people die or overdose in Madrid each day<sup>2005</sup>.

Acción Familiar (Family Action) has edited a triptych in which parents are given **five suggestions** to help them to avoid their kids from using drugs.

1. Make home life pleasant, harmonizing authority, which must never be absent from home, with dialogue, comprehension and participation

2. Make it a habit of listening to your children, and not give undue importance to outside behaviors, which are the norm of the times.

3. Avoid being over protective, as well as being "pushover" parents, and teaching them in a reasonable austerity, making them used to a few frustrations.

4. More than sermonizing on the use of drugs, give them an example of their own sobriety, especially in the use of alcohol, tobacco and mind altering drugs.

5. Offer objectives and ideals instead of new means of comfort and ease of life, which will weaken their will when confronted with drugs .

These five points of advice are oriented to create a hearty environment at home, which will avoid and make unnecessary the emigration from home because of drugs.

Let's remind ourselves that according to the World Health Organization, one of the leading causes of drug addiction, are the family type circumstances, broken homes, overprotective parents, parents too busy to tend to the kids, lack of communication, etc.<sup>2006</sup>

15. Another sin against this commandment is the person who **scandalizes** another one, which means they teach them, or invite them or induce them to sin, whether with words, or by example or by making the other an accomplice of his own sins<sup>2007</sup>.

<sup>2001</sup> IBERICA de Actualidad Científica Magazine, 1271(I-73)44

<sup>2002</sup> Interviewed on Radio Nacional de España 12-I-77

<sup>2003</sup> JUAN ANOTNIO VALLEJO-NAJERA: La puerta de la Esperanza, X, *Ed. Planeta. Barcelona*

<sup>2004</sup> YA Newspaper 6-VIII-88, pg. 12

<sup>2005</sup> YA Newspaper , 13-III-92, pg. 29

<sup>2006</sup> Dr. Luis Riesgo: Cadiz Daily, 11-XII-91, pg. 34



Scandal is a very grave sin because it makes other people lose their state of grace which is much more precious than one's human life. A scandalizer is a murderer of souls. Guilty of scandal are those that through manipulating public opinion, deviate it from moral values<sup>2008</sup>

The public behavior of shameless couples causes scandal, besides the sins they commit in their "free time", they also commit the sin of scandalizing many souls, which, when seeing them, learn or are tempted..

**Jesus Christ** talking about scandalizers said "Whoever causes one of the little ones who believe in me to sin, it would be better for him to have a millstone fastened to his neck<sup>2009</sup>, as great is the punishment he will receive in the other life.

The person who has done spiritual damage against another one, has the obligation of repairing the damage according to his possibilities. He must try to show his victim the right path by trying to persuade him with words and good example. He must pray for him<sup>2010</sup>. You must never be a **bad friend**. Those who lead you to sin, are doing the work of Satan. And you, be very careful with bad friends and influences. *Run from them like the plague. If not, you will be sorry in this life and in the other. A rotten apple putrefies the rest in the box.*

*To save someone from drowning you must be able to swim very well, if not, both of you could drown. To convert someone you must be spiritually strong yourself. As an experienced priest, I will tell you what you should do. We must transform environments. To row against a current means you have to be very strong, if not the current will undoubtedly carry you out to sea.*

16. **Grave sins against the 5th commandment** are: suicide, murder, abortion, hatred in extreme, drug addiction, drunkenness to a point of losing one's reason and, finally, inducing someone else to commit a mortal sin.

## **68.- THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT OF THE LAW OF GOD IS: THOU SHALL NOT COMMIT IMPURE ACTS.**

1. The inordinate desire of sexual pleasure is called lust<sup>2011</sup>.

"There are two erroneous attitudes towards sex. Both of them are quite common. One is that of the modern hedonist, for whom the highest personal aspiration is a life of pleasure. The hedonist sees the sexual capacity as a personal possession, one in which you are not accountable for to anyone. For him, or her, the purpose of the genital organs is their personal satisfaction and physical gratification, and nothing more. This attitude is that of the philandering bachelor or of the easy pickup spinster, who have affairs but never have love. It is an attitude that is easily found among the couples that are separated or divorced, always in search of new worlds of pleasure to conquer.

The other erroneous attitude is that of the prude, who thinks that anything sexual is low and ugly, a necessary evil with which the human race is tarnished<sup>2012</sup>.

The intermediate position is the correct one, sex is not bad, as God has made it, but one has to use it in accordance with God's law.

The sixth commandment asks us to be pure and chaste in word and deed, and that we should treat with respect everything that is related to sexuality. We use the word sexuality in its common sense, although it is more extensive than genitality.

<sup>2007</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2326

<sup>2008</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2286

<sup>2009</sup> Matthew, 18:6

<sup>2010</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teologia Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 549* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2011</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2351

<sup>2012</sup> LEO J. TRESE: *La fe explicada, XIX, 1.* Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1981

2. **Conversations** and off colored jokes (immoral, dishonest, obscene) can get to be a sin, if they are told with bad intention (impure, dishonest), if they contain an approval of evil or an inclination towards it, or they hide the danger of impure consent or scandalous behavior, and damage to the souls of others.

Obscene and prolonged conversations – especially among young men and women – are easily sinful. When it is necessary to speak about matters relating to sexuality, one must do it with serious respect.

In dishonest conversations, the one who sins is: a) he who starts; b) he who doesn't start, but goes along with some intervention; c) he who doesn't participate, but is listening voluntarily and with pleasure. But he who hears unwillingly, who wishes that the conversation would turn to something else, or who tries not to pay attention to the matter, he does not sin.

When a conversation starts in a group in an indecent manner, if you can, easily, try to change the conversation. If you are not the leader, or you do not have influence over the rest, to try to radically change the topic can be counterproductive. But if it is possible, withdraw, in such a manner that the rest understand that you do not like that type of conversation. If it were too violent to withdraw, and if it is not a cause of sin, you may stay, so long as you do not participate, and, if you can, try to indicate in some manner that you do not like this type of conversations. But, of course, it should be understood that you do not like these conversations, and that you do not approve of them. In the last case, you can be uninterested in what is said, go to another person in the group and start a different conversation.

To clearly state your position on this matter will help you avoid many dangers, as the rest will realize that they cannot count on you.

I tell you the same thing on **immoral drawings and indecent novels**. To read pornographic magazines, because of the danger of sinning it supposes will surely never cease to be a sin. There are also a great variety of novels, which, without being openly immoral, do tend to foment morbidity and praise concupiscence. Their reading always causes harm.

Obviously it is a sin to read dishonest and impure writings to arouse sexuality. Even if you do not have the intention when you start to read, interrupt it, if it is not necessary, when you realize that it awakens voluptuous and tempting feelings. If the book is academic or formative, then it is not necessary to leave it, but it is convenient to lift your heart to God, purify the intention and reject all consent.

To read obscene and pornographic novels, for the danger that they present, it will almost never cease to be a sin. There is also a cloud of novels, which, while not being outwardly immoral, they encourage morbid and praise concupiscence. Their reading is always harmful.

If you like to read, pick out some books that may interest you from the large and numerous collections of formative books. And if you do not know of any, ask a competent person who may be able to orient you.

Also, be very careful not to hum or sing softly the music of certain songs that could make your companions believe that you approve of the obscene lyrics they contain.

You should also be careful of **staring**. Sometimes our eyes wander without warning. Whenever you realize that you are staring at something you shouldn't look at, just simply look the other way and that is that. Do not worry. For a stare to be a sin, it is necessary to stare fixedly and voluntarily at dishonest things, as there is the obligation of avoiding all danger of carnal excitement, unless there is a justifiable reason to do so.

In general, I recommend that when you see immoral things, that you know how to "look the other way", and when you hear them, show indifference.

3. But if it is true that those involuntary stares should not worry you, even though they cause physical responses (which you should reject), however another very different thing is the excitement that is caused by those **hugs**... by those **kisses**.

But, is it a sin to kiss? Is it a sin to hug?

It all depends. A kiss can be an expression of a healthy and clean feeling. But it can also be an outpouring of lust and passion. The persons involved are the ones who have to distinguish, knowing full well that you cannot search or admit to sexual satisfaction outside of marriage<sup>2013</sup>. A peck on the cheek is not the same as a strong and passionate kiss which opens the floodgates of lust and which will easily lead to worse things<sup>2014</sup>.

What is the difference between a kiss that is not sinful and a kiss that becomes a sin or an occasion of sin? Simply in the passion! And passion is an element that is very easy to recognize. One feels it immediately, and it is also clearly perceived in the other person. A kiss **can be a danger**. A kiss can be an occasion for sinning. And sometimes, an immediate occasion.

Youth is highly flammable by nature. Be your temperament whatever it is, I recommend that you do not surrender to those lascivious kisses, as this will open the doors of passion. And **Jesus Christ** says that it is a sin to desire that which is forbidden to do<sup>2015</sup>. And it is a sin to voluntarily provoke sexual excitement. A kiss on the mouth, prolonged and fiery, is especially exciting, as it goes together with sexual appetite. The lips are an erogenous zone. Police in the United States inform of the possibility that the practice of passionate kissing can turn into a genital union<sup>2016</sup>.

**A very different thing** is a brief kiss, soft and delicate, expression of a healthy and hale affection. But that other kiss, voluptuous and lascivious that turns on concupiscence is inadmissible. That sensual kissing that the movie industry has propagated in the world is permissible only between those who are married. This type of kissing supposes privileges, which are exclusive to married couples.

On the other hand, the kiss on the mouth, "wet" is unhygienic. **Ramon y Cajal** says: "For the scientist, the kiss is simply an interchange of germs"<sup>2017</sup>. As it is, there are three hundred species of microorganisms in a person's mouth<sup>2018</sup>, and with a "wet kiss" these can pass from one person to the other. Through a kiss, you can infect a person with infectious mononucleosis, also known as the "kissing disease", hepatitis A and salmonellas<sup>2019</sup>.

Doctor **San Martin** a sexologist said on Tele -5, on January 21, 1997, that syphilis could be transmitted through a kiss.

4. To defeat **temptations**, take into account these six bits of advice:

- 1). Remain calm: be sure that all temptations can be defeated with God's grace.
- 2). Remember that you can only sin by will, therefore maintain it inflexible.
- 3). Put yourself in God's hands and also the Immaculate Virgin's, who never abandon those who go to them.
- 4). Disengage yourself from the occasion as soon as you can. If there was victory, give thanks to God, if you stumbled and fell, repent and draw experience from the lesson for another time.
- 5). After every fall, make an act of contrition, confess immediately and offer in recompense, a costly mortification.

<sup>2013</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1140 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2014</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 601. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2015</sup> Matthew, 5:28

<sup>2016</sup> LODUCHOWSKY: *La coeducación de los adolescentes*. Pg. 22 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2017</sup> RAMON Y CAJAL: *Charlas de café*, XI, 83, pg. 35 Imprenta Juan Pueyo. Madrid.

<sup>2018</sup> ALGO Magazine, IV-85, pg. 19

<sup>2019</sup> ABC Newspaper of Seville, 25-II-90. pg.88

6). Do not think again about temptation, occupy yourself with something<sup>2020</sup>

For your ease of mind, you must know that **Paul** says that God has never allowed us to be tempted above and beyond our strengths<sup>2021</sup>.

**Saint Augustine**<sup>2022</sup> says, and the council of Trent repeats it, that “God asks no one for impossible things, but that you do what you can, and ask for what you can’t, as He will help you so that you can<sup>2023</sup>”.

Three things can occur after a temptation:

1. Clear Victory, as you totally rejected it after you realized the temptation: give thanks to God that He has helped you overcome it.

2. Clear Defeat, as you consciously let yourself be led, repent and humiliate yourself before God and ask Him to help you to be victorious on another occasion; make an act of contrition, and try to confess soon.

3. Doubt if you did or did not consent. You are not sure if you completely resisted temptation. In this case simply tell your doubt to the confessor, got example, telling him “I have had many bad thoughts and bad desires against purity, and I do not know if I have rejected them sufficiently.

Don’t be satisfied with leaving the confession for after the fall. Confession also has a **preventive value** as it increases the grace through the sacrament, and it strengthens the will. Whenever you feel a possible fall, go to confession even if you do not have grave sins, and if you can, go to communion, even better.

To dominate the body, **mortification** is very convenient. It is a common practice of all the saints. A mortified body is much more docile.

Being mortified strengthens the will and enriches spiritually.

Here are some ways to mortify oneself:

- Do not make useless expenses
- Be punctual, do not make people wait
- Select the worst places in gatherings
- Let others speak even though you are anxious to do so
- Don’t discuss even if you are right, if the matter is not important
- Don’t get upset, if it is not necessary
- Smile gracefully, even if you do not want to.
- Make yourself available for common services
- Choose for yourself the worst, when this is possible
- Avoid noises that bother others
- Take care of personal hygiene, avoiding body odor
- Finish what you have started, even if you are tired.
- Etc., etc., etc.

It is necessary to struggle hard to remain pure. To the bad inclinations of our passion are joined the immorality seen on the street and in the movies.

5. **Movies**, in themselves, are not bad. They are a vehicle for culture, transmitters of ideas. They are an art that, if used correctly, can serve to give Glory to God.

But unfortunately, up to now, they have been used more to do harm than to do good.

The Italian Episcopate published a Declaration on the moral situation of the movies in which it said: Except for laudable exceptions, which merit our consideration and encouragement, the vast

<sup>2020</sup> OTTO ZIMMERMANN, S. I.: *Teología Ascética*, n° 35. Seminario Metropolitano. Buenos Aires.

<sup>2021</sup> Corinthians, 10:13

<sup>2022</sup> SAINT AUGUSTINE: *De natura et gratia*, XLIII, 50, ML. 441. 271

<sup>2023</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 804 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

majority of Italian cinematographic production has constantly gone to a progressive and unbridled moral decay<sup>2024</sup>.

That is why I advise you not to be a movie buff.

The movies have a tremendous **persuasive force**. They annul the personality; they drag, hypnotize, and idiotize the viewer. -they identify us with the protagonist and project his psychology to us, his way of being, and his example. It is a phenomenal psychological weapon. And the more powerful a weapon the more dangerous the ill use of it.

Films have serious dangers. The first, although less grave than the second one, is their sexual exhibitionism. The damage depends, naturally, on the circumstances. It is not the same with the cold Nordic spectators than with the hot Mediterranean. It is not the same domination of a cultured person than the lowly reaction of the lower classes. It is not the same mature serenity of age, than the excitability of youth. But let us not be naive by closing our eyes to this real danger. Danger that not only exists while the film is being projected. The imagination will continue to work with the images that remain etched, and are easily reproduced later on to create disagreeable temptations. Let us think, for example, of how frequently we see projected a scene of love making in bed (and not precisely by spouses).

But the **worst damage** of the movies is the force with which they transmit ideas. The language of the image has a great emotive value, which conquers in an almost invincible manner, and changes the basic psyche little by little, even against your own will, which does not realize what is happening within<sup>2025</sup>.

For example, a film presents a husband that does not get along with his wife, because of incompatibility of characters. On the other hand he has fallen in love with his secretary who is of enormous qualities, and corresponds his love. But they cannot marry, as they are Catholics. Instinctively we feel bad for them as the church opposes that matrimony. AT that moment the damages, which will follow the family, are not foreseen, in general, if divorce is allowed. We instinctively approve of the adultery of two people who have won our hearts. In this manner, our mentality is changing almost without perception.

Movies focus and resolve many human problems, God notwithstanding, as if a Divine Law and a supernatural destiny of man did not exist. They are films that are generally made without criteria that does not have a bit of Christianity, and which through seeing them, one starts changing, without realizing it. They are a nail file for the Christian spirit. You do not notice it, but they always take something away. An immoral conduct portrayed by a leading actress makes us lean towards justifying it. With this, our Christian criteria starts evolving, and at the end, carried by the example of the film, one ends up by doing what one saw so many times on the screen with such a seductive force.

As all these ideas are exposed in an agreeable and pleasant form, we admit them with ease. We must filter these ideas and reject everything that is not in accord with our Christian beliefs.

Races do not die because they are battled or conquered, but because they are corrupted. The movies are having the tragic virtue of corrupting the conscience of our people. Many Spaniards of today no longer think in Spanish, or in Christianity, in such major problems as the family, and love. By force of seeing in the movies, things that are wrong, and although at the beginning we reject and censor them, little by little we become accustomed, and it is quite possible that if the occasion should arise, we might also do what before would have horrified us.

I know a couple who after four years of marriage were immensely happy, with an authentic mutual affection and enjoying the happiness of two radiant children. One good day, the wife, influenced by the light and frivolous way one sees scenes of adultery in the movies, taking advantage of her husband's absence because of a trip, did not mind having a fling (So what about it?: is the phrase with which we want to justify it all), and went to bed with another man. And like

<sup>2024</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1235 (13-III-65) 4

<sup>2025</sup> TADDEI, S. I.: *La predicación en la época de la imagen, II, B, b*. Ed. Descleé. Bilbao

everything you do, at one time or another it becomes public knowledge. It was such a tragedy that those two people never in their lives had had a worse day. The husband told me. "If it was true that she loved me, how could she do this to me?" It is that she did not love me. Everything she told me was a lie. I can never again make love to her. I feel that she is betraying me. I cannot stay with her. He was crying in desperation, fury and shame. And she too cried, in repentance, seeing that a frivolous whim had caused her marriage to break apart and destroy the happiness of her home.

In matters of love, the movies cause damage both to single and married people.

Movies damage married people because films frequently present, as the most natural thing, and almost inevitably, the extra matrimonial flings of married persons. This cannot be! Any extra-matrimonial fling of a married person is adultery. With the grace of God, you can overcome all conflicts of the heart, which may arise.

The damages that the movies do to single people is, among other things, by showing a great ease in arriving at the sexual act, an exclusive right of married people. Besides, because many times, it portrays as sufficient reason for marriage, physical attraction, and that is a lie! This attraction is a factor, but this alone is not sufficient. Many failed marriages are due precisely to having been based only on the physical attraction, and they let go by the wayside other values of importance.

Besides the damage that the movies cause with their scenes, to the emotion of the woman, there is another damage, a grave one, in her psychology: the woman feels swept to imitate the ways, attitudes and conduct of the artists who show themselves as glamorous women, and make the spectator want to, as a natural desire, be as glamorous. In the beginning, there is a clash of those things that are against morals, and therefore they are rejected, but by seeing them time and time again, their importance is reduced and they end up being assimilated.

Films have caused great damage to young girls, showing them insinuating and provocative ways, to stare unashamed, a frivolous and easy way of being, and to be condescending in love affairs. How many girls adopt daring postures and attitudes in public and in private, influenced by what they saw in the movies, realizing it or without realizing it! How many girls have become licentious because of what they saw in the movies! How many girls have fallen deeper than they wanted to because of having followed some beginning steps that they learnt in the movies!

Some girls, influenced by an erotic atmosphere, are easy prey and go all the way, without thinking of the consequences, as in the movies, they see it continuously and there is never a consequence. But in real life, there is. Real life is not the movies. How many pregnant spinsters say woe there is I after the fact! It is too late now!

There are films, which in fact are for many a true school of vice. Exhibiting prolonged and lascivious kissing scenes to the youth will entice them to do the same, making them believe that such actions are the necessary sign of love, and strengthening the conviction that that is what can be done, as many others do it. This is how slowly but surely they kill the sense of shame and the purity of the soul<sup>2026</sup>.

Many films deal with the plot of a girl that gets involved with a married man; a prostitute that seduces a youngster; a woman who cheats on her husband, etc., etc. Always through sexual sins. When will we see films that will exalt the virtues of a good father, or an honest mother and of a decent girl? It is much more difficult to do this. The former is much easier. That is why there are many more films that portray the lowness of life.

We must combat the films that present ideas contrary to Catholic morals.

The public is the one who orders in the movie industry. If a film leaves a large number of seats empty, **it will not be repeated**. But if a film turns out to be a "blockbuster", films of this type will be multiplied. If we want to moralize the movies, we must leave empty seats where undesirable films are being shown. With this method, "The Legion of Decency" in the United States was able to impose itself upon the directors of Hollywood<sup>2027</sup>.

<sup>2026</sup> DANTEC: *Noviazgo cristiano*, 3º, III, C. –Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2027</sup> ¿A que película vamos? PPC Flyer, nº 18.

In the matter of spectacles that are unacceptable for the Christian conscience, it is wise to energetically adopt the position to not go to any of them, with a triple purpose in mind: avoid personal danger, give a good example and demand that no indecent spectacles be shown through the most efficient human media, in the case of businessmen of little or no conscience, it would be to deny economic cooperation<sup>2028</sup>.

**Pius XII** in his encyclical *Miranda Prorsus*, about movies, radio and television, says: "Moral judgments, when clearly indicating which films are permitted to all, and which are harmful or truly bad, will give each one the possibilities of selecting the spectacles ...., this will avoid those which could be harmful to your soul, a damage which will be graver still because it was your responsibility in selecting bad productions and for the scandal that is created with your presence. The Second Vatican Council exhorts us to follow the indications of moral censorship and to avoid dangerous spectacles, among other things, so as to not economically contribute to spectacles that can do spiritual harm<sup>2029</sup>.

The esthetic point of view is not sufficient to justify the spectacle. Curiosity is not a sufficient motive when it pertains to degrading spectacles<sup>2030</sup>.

Let's hear again from **Pius XII**: Although some films have technical merit, they offend moral order or even if they apparently respect good customs, contain pernicious elements, which are contrary to Catholic faith<sup>2031</sup>. It is noticeable that many Christians, who are reticent to give money to works of charity and apostolate, give it unscrupulously when it comes to spectacles that de-Christianize the customs. They are frugal with their money for the good, and happily squander it on the bad.

But don't be content by not going to those films. Try to convince **other people** as well so that they also don't go. If we Catholics wanted to collaborate with the moralizing action of the church, **Jesus Christ** would reign more in the world. But there are Catholics that consider the Church as a party spoiler, who has to be humored in order to lead a more enjoyable life, and therefore are playing into Satan's hands, so that he is the one to dominate the world. It is unconceivable, and it is a shame to say, but reality is, that sometimes, it is the Catholics who are the ones that obstruct the moralizing works of the Catholic Church.

Movies are stupefying, and if your spiritual sensibility is numbed, what moral conscience will protect you? When the alarm bell of the conscience and remorse is broken down, the soul is in danger. How many times has the voice of the conscience caused an abrupt halt when encountering the abyss of sin! And also, how many times has the voice of God resounding in the soul raised a life to perfection!

6. There are souls to which God has given the desire to renounce matrimony and consecrate themselves totally to Him. If you are one of these, I congratulate you. And I assure you that **there is no bigger happiness in life** than to be consecrated to God, and feel yourself as a collaborator in His redeeming work, making the blood he shed fruitful in their souls.

Man needs to live for something that is worthwhile. He needs to give sense to his life. He needs an ideal. Living without an ideal is a sign of human immaturity. Living consecrated to God is the supreme of the ideals.

**A life consecrated** to God, with vocation, is happiness. It is lived with hope, with an ideal. But without God's vocation, no one can stand it. And of course it must be lived in communities where there is a good spirit, as there can also be lax convents.

<sup>2028</sup> Bishop de Vich: ECCLESIA Magazine, 854 (23-XI-57) 11

<sup>2029</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Inter minifica*: Decree on social communication means, n° 9

<sup>2030</sup> RENÉ BERTHIER: *101 respuestas a un cristiano*, n° 87. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2031</sup> PIUS XII Encyclical *Miranda Prorsus*. ECCLESIA Magazine, 846 (28-IX-57)

The religious state is the **road to perfection**. There are today in the Catholic Church about one and a half million people consecrated to God<sup>2032</sup>.

The obligations are concentrated in the three holy vows of voluntary poverty, perfect chastity and complete obedience. Renouncing, therefore, to earthly marriages and obliging oneself to live for God, tending to perfection.

I make these words mine:

I am a priest. I have never repented of this vocation, which God gave me. Should I be born a thousand times, a thousand times I would follow it again. Do not believe that all has gone well. Do not think that everything has been easy. But His calling has overdone everything. There is always a thought in my mind, and it decided my vocation: do something here on earth that is really worthwhile. I know that there are many things that can be done that are worthwhile. But I thought that this one was the one, which was most important than any other. And I have not looked back<sup>2033</sup>.

The Holy Fathers called the religious state: the most beautiful flower, the most precious pearl, and the richest ornament of the church. **Saint Mary Magdalene of Pazzis** says that it is the greatest grace that God can do to a soul.

The state of **perpetual and voluntary** virginity makes religious people live on earth like the angels in heaven<sup>2034</sup>. They will be the ones, which will have written on their forehead the name of God, they will sing a new song and will follow the lamb wherever it goes, as is said in the Apocalypse<sup>2035</sup>.

There are many Orders and Congregations among which you can elect the one that reflects more closely your inclinations and ideals. The fields in which you can develop your vocation can be: Missions, Hospitals, Asylums, and Colleges. Social work in favor of young men, Exercise houses, reeducation of the young, apostolate among office workers, laborers, etc... If you are enthusiastic about a life of prayer and penance, there are, for example, the Carmelites, the Franciscans, Capuchins, Silesians, etc., both in the male and female branches.

You can also consecrate yourself in one of the Secular Institutes that the church now has for its multiple forms of apostolate.

If you are undecided and do not know what to elect, maybe a book by **FR. Carrascal, S. I.**<sup>2036</sup> Titled *Orientación Vocacional*, where the vocational elements are listed, as well as the characteristics of one hundred and sixty Religious Institutes for men and women<sup>2037</sup>.

If you feel the voice of God to consecrate yourself to Him, do not comment it lightly with anyone. Consult it with a prudent and pious priest, who will advise you on whatever is best for you.

Questionnaire **to study** your vocation:

1. - Have you ever thought of consecrating your life completely to God?
2. - This desire, has it been because of supernatural powers, such as love and service to Christ, the good of the souls and your own sanctification?
3. - Even though the realization of this ideal means renuncements and sacrifices, do you think that with the help of God, you would be able to do it?
4. - Do you aspire to consecrating your life to the greatest ideal that you can live in this world?
5. - At the time of death, how would you have liked to have lived?

<sup>2032</sup> YA Newspaper, 25-XI.92. pg. 26

<sup>2033</sup> RAFAEL BOHÍGUEZ, S.I.: *El riesgo de ser joven, XIII*, Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2034</sup> Matthew, 22:30

<sup>2035</sup> Apocalipsis, 14:1-4

<sup>2036</sup> P. CARRASCAL, S. I.: *orientación Vocacional*. Ed. Terrae Santander. Fourth Edition

<sup>2037</sup> Granada, Spain – CENTRO MYRIAM, Apartado 519



Speaking of vocations, **John Paul II** says: The laudable desire to go near men and women in our times, believers and non believers, poor and rich, can take you to the adoption of a secularized lifestyle or to a promotion of the human values in a purely horizontal sense<sup>2038</sup>.

Today there are those who talk about a “temporary vocation”, as if God would withdraw the previously made calling. The so called “temporary vocation” is no more than an alibi invented wanting to justify what is unjustifiable. Whosoever puts his hand to the plow and then withdraws it, is not worthy of God.<sup>2039</sup> Another thing is if there had been no calling and it had been suffered in error<sup>2040</sup>.

Chastity must be lived with an elegant spirituality, without stealthy, always dangerous concessions.. Without half baked concessions, but with gleeful hope, with deliverance, with love. Without foolishly creating problems for yourself. But without forgetting that we are made of clay and that the environment is charged with eroticism and sensuality, and it can unconsciously intoxicate us.

**Jesus Christ** has made His Gospel a praise to poverty. This must be effective and affective. Affective: if there is ambition, there is no spirit of poverty. Effective: this depends on the concrete circumstances in which God has placed each one. The love of poverty is not at odds with common sense. It would be ridiculous, because of poverty, to want to abstain nowadays of electricity, just because **Christ** did not use it.

The sense of obedience is the imitation of **Jesus Christ** who “made himself obedient until his death upon the cross”<sup>2041</sup>. But obedience must be responsible, notifying the superior and then accepting his decision as a manifestation of the will of God<sup>2042</sup>.

7. Great things **are not done in a day**. They need time, preparation, and stages. Conjugal life is one of those big things. One must arrive to it step by step.

This preparation begins from adolescence. The adolescent has made the discovery, although still elemental, of the opposite sex. It is a whole new world, physical and spiritual, which he must explore, but without hurry. Both extremes would be deadly, the going too fast, such as to withdraw for being afraid of possible dangers.

Before the courtship, it is convenient for the adolescents to have frequently socialized with the opposite sex. This is a must, not only to know the other sex, but to know oneself, to study one’s own reactions and attitudes in the presence of the opposite sex. One of the most deep-rooted desires in a man’s heart is to find others, form a group, and collaborate together. Friendship has a great value. Loneliness is a sad experience.

Friendship is a pure feeling, uninterested and reciprocal which is born and strengthened with time. It is based on sincerity and on generosity. Simulation, trickery and treason, are the death of any friendship. Friendship is more giving than receiving. In a friendship they accept you as you are, and they value you for what you are, understanding and forgiving your faults and limitations. Friendship favors kindness, joviality, happiness, sincerity, generosity, cordiality, the desire to do good and worry for others. A friend is not selfish and possessive. He respects your freedom and is not jealous if you share your friendship with other people. This is the difference between friendship and love. Love is jealous of a third person who might interpose himself between the two of you. Friendship, like love, lasts a lifetime. A passing friendship is not a true friendship. The same with love, either it is eternal, or it isn’t love.

Whoever has a friend has a great treasure<sup>2043</sup>.

<sup>2038</sup> JOHN PAUL II: *vita Consecrata*. ABC Madrid, 29-III-96, pg. 7

<sup>2039</sup> Philippians, 2:8

<sup>2040</sup> BALDOMERO JIMÉNEZ DUQUE: *Volver a lo esencial XXIV*, Ed. Tau. Avila. 1985

<sup>2041</sup> Philippians, 2:8

<sup>2042</sup> BALDOMERO JIMÉNEZ DUQUE: *Volver a lo esencial, XXV, 3,4*. Ed. Tau. Avila. 1985

<sup>2043</sup> DR. BERNABÉ TIERNÓ. *Valores humanos, 1º, X*. Ed. Temas de hoy. Madrid. 1993

A normal human evolution demands therefore, that contact between boys and girls start from the age of sixteen, more or less. Normally, and especially at the beginning, this contact should be made in groups or bands. It is much more effective when these contacts, instead of merely motivated by the encounter and mutual understanding, have some other intermediate interest, as for example, cultural, fund raising, sport, etc. under these circumstances youngsters show many facets of their personality and they give more motives to know each other. If they are contacts “to be known”, they are more superficial, they may only be trying to “give a good impression” and, for such reason, they camouflage important elements of their way of being.

On the other hand **in the gangs**, in which boys and girls do things together, they will indubitably let innumerable aspects of their way of being show through. The other sex is not just in a showcase, in a studied pose and to be seen; it is in true life, with its small collaborations, responsibilities, circumstances and conflicts: he has to do more than be seen. And there is no worse way to know a person than when he is just there to be known.

Sooner or later a boy and a girl will start to **go out together**. Going out together is not going “steady”, but it can be the prelude.

Any way, all those that start to go out together must be convinced that it is no longer a game, but something that will be more serious.

We say that this stage can be very formative, as it presents a magnificent occasion to mutually exercise nobility, sincerity, generosity and delicateness. Given their special circumstances and occasions, they can also serve as a test of morality and of will power.

It is also a good occasion to **get to know each other**, as a prelude to a future long lasting relationship. It is very important in this sense that this not develop into a full courtship. And as you have started going out together, with nobility, to know each other, you should also have sincerity, loyalty and courage to separate if you see that you should not continue. Not only continuing, but breaking up, can be an act of true loyalty. That is why you should do it before the wound is greater. It is something that you owe to the other part. And to yourself as well.

In the case that you have not continued with these relations, it is not needed to emphasize that delicacy obliges you to a special discretion and secrecy about possible mutual confidences<sup>2044</sup>.

The damages caused by falling in love too early can be very serious. The boy has his “manhood” held up by pins, and she, also, her “femininity”. So if before they are well set, they become too infatuated with the other sex, if they deal excessively with the other sex, I fear that the habits, manners and mannerisms can be unconsciously imitated. And she must be similar, not equal; this is said in Genesis. And he the same. But I censure the excess, not the treatment. This is very beneficial, so long as we don't lose our heads<sup>2045</sup>.

One must **know how to wait**, as **Gigiola Cinquetti** says in the song which won the Eurovision Festival

I'm not of age  
I'm not of age to love you  
And it is not right that we go out together  
Maybe you'll want  
Maybe you'll want to wait for me  
That I be older, and can give you my love.

Not all boys who approach girls do so with pure intentions. Some, just for kicks; others, to take advantage of the girl. There are also those who arrive with the healthy intention of establishing a formal relationship.

<sup>2044</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación sexual y conyugal*, 3º, II, 7. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2045</sup> JOSE FORCADA, S. I. *Padres e hijos*, XV Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao. 1971

It is not hard to see the intentions of a boy when he goes out with a girl. There are girls that have themselves invited by boys to go to the movies, for dinner, etc., in exchange for certain concessions, which is a way of prostitution.

The girl who hopes to be a good wife, must get away from flirting. Many who are unsure in their studies and in sports take refuge in their sweetheart, where it is easier to triumph.

8. **Flirting** is playing at love. Ceding to the sensible and sentimental attractiveness, cultivating a superficial treatment, without depth, without the intention of getting married. And life cannot be burned up in the game of a love as a pastime.

Flirting is one of the names that is given to the falsehood of playing at love without any commitment, and without accepting its consequences. It is the behavior of a couple who engages in sexual maneuvers of more or less depth, with the aggravating circumstance that they exclude all intention of a complete commitment.

Definite commitments are a sign of maturity. Those who continuously change by whim, are children.

By its own nature, flirting **is a lie**. Loving for a while is not love. No one says: "I am going to love you for a week, but next week I will love someone else". This is called a whim and not love. True love says that it is forever "I will love you always"; "I will love you 'till I die". Flirtation is the negation of love and one of its saddest caricatures. And the evil that it carries for its protagonists is deep. Besides de moral damage which it causes, flirting usually leaves a deep psychological scar of frustration, disenchantment, bitterness. It does not produce people who are knowledgeable, but rather decrepit. It does not teach, but rather drains. It is a mutilation of love, and you do not play with love without being deeply scarred. This is the reason why love is the most intimate and most delicate thing to the human being. Flirtation destroys females much more than males. Because for women, love is much more profound, more total and more definite. When two love each other, they do not flirt; they respect and take care of each other mutually to be complete for the task which will last a lifetime. When two flirt, they think that they are going to have a good time, but in reality, they mutually deceive themselves and are damaged in the most sensitive fibers of the soul<sup>2046</sup>.

Before falling in love, think whether or not this person is the right one. If you fall in love, you will not be able to objectively judge. Do not start going out with the person who is not the right one. If you do start to go out, you may end up falling in love, and if you do, you will end up marrying, even though that marriage is sheer lunacy.

Flirting can take you to marriage, but this is rare. Where it does take you is to devalue the sentiment and to noticeably curtail the capacity to love. This is where many discover, after a short time of marriage, that they feel cheated or deceived, cold, insensitive to their couple, and it is because they abused that capacity to love during their youth, and now marriage tells them nothing.

Besides, whoever gets accustomed to flirting, after marriage gets tired of being tied down to a single person. What will become of this marriage now?

That is why courtship **is not a game**, nor a pleasure, but a prep school for marriage, which is one of the greatest and most serious missions that God has entrusted man and woman with. A personal commitment, responsible, mature and free requires preparation. That's why flirting is a dangerous game, which many times ends up with unwanted and dishonest slips, and always damages the heart, leaving it sad, disillusioned and deceived, maybe forever, or light, superficial and frivolous, unable to seriously love anyone.

God has placed love in the human heart so that in marriage it will be encouraging at the time of sadness, work and suffering. But youth has thrown itself to play at love, has made love a pleasure, and as a consequence, we have those marriages of tired hearts, unable to love, precisely at the time when it is most needed to sweeten the sacrifices of the home.

---

<sup>2046</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación sexual y conyugal*, 1º, III, 9. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

The heart needs a **break-in period**. If the motor in an automobile is over accelerated before it is broken in, you will surely be stuck with a "jalopy" for all your life. The break in is the life of the motor, and also of the heart. Novice bakers at a pastry shop are allowed to eat as many cakes as they want at the beginning. It is cheaper for the owner, because the memory of the first indigestion, it immunizes them for life. If you become indigested with premature love, you will later abhor love.

Love among adolescents **is imprudent**. Adolescents are still not mature, and premature loves can be deadly. It is like making trucks go over a cement bridge before the concrete has set. The result would be a set of ruins<sup>2047</sup>.

To many, matrimony is like tossing a coin in the air, and waiting to see if it falls heads or tails. That is a barbarity. Marriage is a very serious thing, like anything serious; it must be thought over and must be prepared so that everything comes out alright. It is logical that those who enter lightly into marriage, will later fail

Nowadays it is said that marriage is in crisis. What I think is in crisis is the courtship. Many young ones take courtship as a game, lightly and frivolously, they do not worry about preparing for it; they just look for enjoyment from each other. They become selfish. They don't have any idea of what true love is. Once married, they are egotistical and unable to love. It is logical that these marriages will be a failure.

At a gathering of young men, they said that although they like to flirt, when they find a headfast girl who refuses, even though they are miffed at the beginning, they appreciate her much more. At the same time, girls said that the boys take advantage of the girls that flirt, but they don't think more of them because of that. No matter what is said, they reject them. On the contrary, they may be enraged with the girl who does not let herself be touched, but in reality, she is admired more<sup>2048</sup>.

Many girls because of vanity, try to awaken the appetite of the boys. In them,, the instinct is aroused, and they try to get from them what the girls had not thought they wanted to give. The girl thinks that there is love in the boy, but what there is, is only a passing instinct. When the boy gets what he was after, and is satisfied, he leaves her, and she is left **brokenhearted**.

Women are very impressionable, and the scars of a failed romance will torment them for a long time. A man changes his love more easily, as there is more passion than sentiment in it. And passion is much more voluble. But the woman, when she loves, puts her whole heart in it, and if she does not succeed, she ends up with a broken heart.

Generally speaking, flirting ends with a lot of suffering for the girl. She is more attached, more emotive,. And after treating a boy that way, if he should leave her or not pay attention to her, the girl feels dejected, disillusioned and not corresponded. She believed herself to be interesting, to be loved, she dreamt illusions, and it all ended in a game.

That is why flirting causes so much damage to a woman: because of her sensibility- What begins being a game, interests her heart. When the game ends, the man will leave as if nothing had happened, but she, is easily **destroyed**. Some times will even be incapacitated for future love, which could be superior to what had just been an adventure. This is what can be deduced from the experience of life.

And if a girl has had several experiences like this in her life, she will have a bitter character, her humor will modify, and she will become sullen and wary.

Girls must know that there are things that have a deeper resonance in them, psychologically and spiritually, than in the boys. For that which for a boy can be an episode without importance, a pastime or even a joke, for a girl it is something that can affect her deeply<sup>2049</sup>.

Flirtation is not advisable for those reasons, but above all because it can tarnish purity. It is very difficult for a girl who accepts flirting, **to maintain her purity** without blemish. Do not let yourself be led immediately by the impulses of your heart. What characterizes a young woman is the longing

<sup>2047</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRAZ, S. I.; *Tres trampas en el noviazgo*, V. Ed. Paulinas. Caracas. 1987

<sup>2048</sup> QUOIST: *Diario de Ana Maria*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2049</sup> DR. RIESGO: *Hablando en familia*, III, 4 EAPSA. Madrid. 1973

of her sensibility and of her sentimentalism; the richness of her heart. Girls experiment in their heart a great need to love, to extend affection to others, and on the other hand, they feel how fragile they are in life; desirous to be loved and corresponded with affection. And carried away with that sentiment, they do not dare deny, sometimes, what their conscience does not allow them to concede. It is very rare that a young girl can get to the point of total delivery of her body through passionate desire. It is much more frequent that she does it invaded by a tenderness that impulses her to give what is asked of her, even though her conscience will reproach her.

If God gave that heart to women, it is because He destined them to a splendid mission, in the home and out of it.

It is all about maintaining the heart pure and fresh.

Your heart is a great treasure, but it can also be, if not watched carefully, the great ruin. Temptations will be presented through boys who would like to enjoy the pureness, who will perhaps offer an apparent tenderness, and who could drag you little by little to a dangerous and illegitimate love, apart from the road of duty.

You **must keep** the heart, defend that treasure against the thieves.

Sometimes it may be the head of the office who is interested in the young clerk, or an industrialist or lawyer for his secretary, or by one of the co-workers. Do not believe, that because that man who is interested in you, is already married, this offers a guaranty. Quite the contrary.

The current work of young girls in factories, establishments, offices, etc., puts them in continuous contact with men. The mutual attraction can surge at any moment; and also the word of praise, more or less significant. Sometimes they know how to make themselves pitied by the girls, making them confidants of their pitiful matrimonial life, of their loneliness. Pretty words and the call to feminine compassion are terrible weapons that can make the generous and naïve heart of a girl waver; and added to this, because of the qualities and activities that he carries out, the situation can end up in a mess, and, afterwards, in a disaster for the poor naïve girl, who will be the most hurt<sup>2050</sup>.

Listen up girl, here is a bit of advice for your safety:

No **sentimental conversations**, nor of intimacies, and confidences, no affection with a man whom you cannot marry later on. When in a girl, the affection for a man starts to emerge, a man who she cannot marry, she must break up with him immediately, at any cost, even if it means losing your job, appear to be somewhat of a scoundrel, etc. The longer it takes, the worse it will be. You are deceiving yourself by saying: What does it matter? We won't do anything bad! Why should I give up his friendship and the pleasure of his company? Many girls started with this deceit, and later on could not break the ties of affection and had to sever ties with the church.

Many girls, in their spontaneity or ingenuity have let their heart be stolen, **or something more**. A man pays her a compliment..... her vanity feels pleased, multiplies his attentions and courtesies... and naturally, she feels interest and gratitude awakening. He tells her that his wife does not understand him, that he is not happy at home. "I made a mistake by marrying her. If I had only known you before...." And if she cedes to her natural desire to please him, she is lost. She feels her compassion vibrate at the same time as her sentimentalism and her vanity. He gives her a present, a small object, anything. The girl does not refuse it, as she sees no harm in it. Later on, a tender stroke, stolen, to see how she reacts. Maybe a small and apparent withdrawal, to awaken the desire in her. **She is tied up**. Tied up by a feminine sentiment, respectable on the other hand, of the delicacy and the thankfulness. She is tied down....and docile. And does not dare bother or oppose to he who has shown such delicateness. Besides, he is so amiable and correct!

And the story continues without the slightest variant. Soon, the first kiss will come, of course, discrete and respectful, a stroking of the hair, and a stroke upon the cheeks. At first, the girl is surprised, she does not dare to oppose, later on she accepts and ends by liking it, and is carried away by the tenderness.

---

<sup>2050</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación sexual y conyugal*, 1º, III, 10 Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

That is how love develops its **psychological law**, it goes from the sentimental to the sensitive, and from the sensitive to the sensual, and from the sensual to the sexual.

The imprudent young girl will normally not cede at the first blow. She really doesn't want the physical elements of love. She had always dreamt of remaining on the sentimental and sensible plane. But... with insistence, in order not to be contrary, ends up in a **total surrender**. If she doesn't break away in time, painfully and courageously, the attitude of one day will convert itself into a habit and very soon into slavery.

On February 9, 1979, I heard on the "Protagonistas" radio program, the reading of a letter from a single mother aged 14, who issued a cry of warning to so many girls that play around with something so serious, as sex is. She, repented of what she had done, was lamenting what had happened through juvenile lack of reflection.

In New York, one of every three born, is the child of a single mother<sup>2051</sup>

I say it once again, **do not grow fond** of any other but of that boy with whom you can be married.

Some girls like to flirt and to play awakening the sexual appetite of boys. But then, the boys, are not content with petty things. They want it all. And when the time comes for them to try to get it all, the girls get scared and want to put on the brakes (frequently without success) and stop what they foolishly started. A woman may feel attracted by a more or less risky adventure. It could be vanity, curiosity or foolishness. But, at the time of temptation, she hardly realizes the danger that she is running, all that she is risking. Later on, when it is too late, she will shed tears of repentance, but the loss cannot be repaired

9. The election of your partner is **yours only**. But you must do it with great caution. Do not trust first impressions, they are beautiful and good for soap operas, but in real life, quite useless to make a home happy. Also, don't trust "love at first sight" as your sight may be blinded, and we know that love causes a certain blindness. Your **mother** could give you some excellent advice. She knows you better than anyone else, and she, above all wants your happiness; and her intuitive spirit can see if the friend you have presented is the right one, to make you happy. If you doubt your mother's wisdom, consult with another person who is serious, competent and unbiased. But don't wait to consult love bewitched, as you will run the danger of not listening to anyone. When you feel that your heart is interested, examine with serenity, before you lose lucidity.

Besides **seeking for advice**, you must ask God through prayer to help you choose correctly, as it is very important in such a serious and transcendental matter.

Don't forget the Russian proverb: "Before traveling by land, pray; if by sea, pray twice; and if you are getting married, three. Because in a marriage storms and floundering are very frequent".

You do not build a home by the grace of a smile, or by the beauty of a face, or the tenderness of an instant. A home is built on all that is the essence of the –"me" thoughts, wishes, dreams, deceptions, sorrows, hopes, joyfulness, sadness. Love is the conjoining of all of the above; that is why the relationships tending to consolidate love and to prepare an indestructible union, must be developed under this plan, and to exhibit to the other that secret depth of oneself, each of whose elements will favor or hinder the future union<sup>2052</sup>.

During the courtship stage the perceptive and deductive faculties are notably altered in all that pertains to the loved one. The defects that existed in said persons are no longer perceived, qualities are sublimated. The mind is no longer stable, but profoundly inclined towards the object of love. The lover idealizes the loved one and converts her into the center of his aspirations. The fascination that is exerted on you by the person idealized may confuse and hide reality. You may end up totally blind to the information and circumstances which may advise you to not continue on.

<sup>2051</sup> YA Newspaper. 20-VIII-84, pg. 15

<sup>2052</sup> B. CHARBONNEAU: *Noviazgo y felicidad*, VII, 5. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

Fascination **may be deceiving**. The love of a man and a woman is something very serious, and it must be built on solid foundations.

Fascination is beautiful, but it will soon pass. What will be left over is life. And that life, if you build it with your heart and with reason, can still be beautiful<sup>2053</sup>.

**To marry**, it is indispensable to love; to love, it is necessary to know each other; to know each other, socialize; and to socialize, you have to meet.

Young girl, where can you find the boy of your dreams? The husband who can make you happy?

Family gatherings in which friends of the sisters and friends of the brothers, can be a good occasion to know each other.

Let me warn you, do not **let yourself be seduced** by the soft tongue, you must establish the conditions that the other person must have to make you his wife. **Conditions** without which you will not accept a marriage proposal.

To orient you, I will list some:

What you must value above all is the **personal values** of the individual

After this other considerations follow: rank, fortune, fame, reputation, image, personal appearance, These characteristics are to be appreciated, but are not essential. The essential resides in the human and Christian values of the chap, that is to say, his personality.

First and foremost that he be a Christian; a convinced practical Christian,. And if he is pious, the better. Marriage with a non-believer will breed conflicts of conscience. Because later on it will raise problems with the children in regards to their faith, and the practice of piety. It is not sufficient therefore, that he be **baptized**. There are many baptized non believers in our jails, and they torment their spouses.

Some girls have deceived themselves on this essential aspect of their fiancés and later husbands. They are conscious of the non religiosity of their boyfriend, and they have entered into marriage with the naïve idea of **changing him**. In the majority of the cases, the result has been null, and when not a source of deep disgust for that young wife. Because later on, when that young wife belongs to the religiously cold husband, he wants to impose his criteria upon the woman, and then the impediments arise. Also, the difficulties for that young woman in fulfilling her obligations with God. In this matter, and during the building of the relationship, he can show himself to be tolerant and non-aggressive, but later on he will show his true colors, with his intolerance, his prohibitions, and his rejections.

It can be that the suitor you know to be a bit **non-religious**, may not be violent in his anti Christian manifestations. But he will adopt an insinuating tone, convincing and persuasive. And this one is no less dangerous: he will end up conquering you in that field. The sad experience is telling us, young and good pious women, who have entered into marriage with men who are not or a little bit religious, or non practicing, have ended up the same.

After this important and essential facet of the young man whom you admit as a future husband, you must have clear testimony of the **seriousness and sobriety** of the man. Be careful of the "Casanovas", as they will continue to be so, as I do not believe you to be so naïve, that you may think, that just because of you, this man will leave certain habits he has acquired over the long run, and long experience, womanizer, late-nighter, boozier, etc. The use of alcoholic beverages is one of the more influential factors in broken homes.

A girl is charmed by seeing herself desired sexually. This may make her tend to be a bit more provocative, but she must control herself. The provocative girl does harm to men, but also to herself.

Physical beauty is, without doubt, an important factor and, because of this, you must take care of it lovingly and continually, although without exaggerations, extravagance and being blatant. Sexuality attracts a certain part of a man, but you want the whole man as a husband. Do not forget

---

<sup>2053</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación Sexual y conyugal*, 3º, II, 4 Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

that men may search for a certain type of woman to have fun with, but look for another, quite different, to get married to.<sup>2054</sup>

More important than beauty is charm, sympathy, grace, style, elegance, treatment, the smile, gestures, the sweetness, the tenderness, the kindness, the delicateness, etc.

Feminine beauty attracts boys, but it is **not indispensable in order to get married**. Men look for whatever upgrades and gives a woman value: her charms, her femininity and her virtues.

Girls must be elegant in their way of dressing and making up, and be distinguished, joyful, discrete and sweet in their whole way of being. Do not be lax in your personal care. But do not try to conquer by just your physical beauty alone. Make them fall more in love with your spiritual virtues. A man may get tired of a beautiful woman, but of a virtuous woman, he will never tire.

To make yourself elected, it is not necessary to appear aloof nor wise. Man likes to dominate, to be superior. He is afraid of a woman who takes the lead ahead of him. Be smart, yes, but discreetly.

Men also do not choose those girls of an authoritarian character, the **domineering** ones. The ones with a dogmatic tone, those with a cold and icy stare. They look for charm, sweetness and kindness.

Listen to him, when he is telling you something about himself or about his things. Show attention and interest. A comment, a good question on this subject that he is talking about, and..... he is profoundly feeling that you understand him, and you are taking over his affection, his heart and his whole being<sup>2055</sup>.

A “conservative” guy does not like **capricious** gals, the spoiled, the empty headed ones, whose head is full of fantasies, whose mood changes with the wind: today, happy, exuberant; tomorrow depressed, pessimistic, sad.

And never forget about your preparation for the home. Your personal attractiveness serve to **awaken** the inclination and the love for you. But for this love to **last** there are many other things missing. A man will grow desperate with a spendthrift woman, one who does not know how to administer herself. He wants a woman who can stretch the money he earns with such a tremendous effort. He likes a clean house, clothes properly washed and folded, good food and on time, etc., etc. All of your physical attractiveness is incapable of keeping your husband happy if you do not comply with these things. That is why all girls must learn to keep a home, and have the adequate knowledge of a woman: cutting and sewing, cooking, pastry making, medicine, home economics, and all that implies the straightforward management and administration of the home. The art of being a mother is hard and complicated. It needs a long apprenticeship.

Everything that will contribute to make your husband happy will contribute to strengthen your love.

A woman’s **modesty** is one of the things that most influences falling in love. And the charm of a woman’s modesty will immunize against all other attractions. The woman’s modesty is an intimate sentiment through which a woman, when realizing the attractiveness and beauty of her body, and the power it has, will try to **reserve it**, for the day in which she can give herself completely. That is why a woman’s modesty is reflected in the way of dressing, in her manner, and in everything. A woman’s modesty knows how to find the equilibrium between dressing properly and elegantly rather than going flashy and provocative.

It is said that an intelligent woman knows how to show, without showing, because if she shows too much, what she shows becomes uninteresting. In her **behavior** she knows how to be delicate and attractive without being insinuating nor exciting. A woman’s modesty is the great wall that defends her chastity. A girl without modesty, starts off with unhealthy curiosity, nerve racking readings she allows herself to be touched in an impure way, she is prone to petting, kissing and

<sup>2054</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación Sexual y conyugal*, 3º, III, 5. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2055</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación Sexual y conyugal*, 3º, III, 5. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao



hugging with the boys, and when in the midst of the rapture, she loses notion of what she is doing, the fatal fall arrives, which she will bitterly cry over, and which will shame her for the rest of her life.

There are plenty of girls today that do not throw themselves into the arms of the first boy they like, and think that they should not accede to all their solicitations. Let's affirm it without deviations, in a straight-forward manner: maidens must remain pure until they marry. Those who do not accept this point of view, have a partial and limited view of life and of the human being. If a young man has as an ideal, to marry a virgin, he most surely will not remain indifferent when he finds out that he has been lied to<sup>2056</sup>.

A woman also has a right to the purity of man. Although it is true that the current opinion is completely different, but the justice of an opinion on matters of life must not be measured by the number of adepts<sup>2057</sup>. Things do not turn good because they are frequent.

Look here at what a girl who had immaculately saved her purity wrote: "I will ask that my future husband save himself as I have for our home" The best wedding present that a person can expect is the virginity of the person he is going to marry.

Facing the abuses of so many couples, one must turn back to **chivalry** towards the woman, seeing in her the future mother of your children, worthy of all kind of love and respect and not treating her like an old rag which soils and then is thrown away.

Be sure that the day you marry, you have nothing to be ashamed of your past.

Maybe one day you will hear from a friend, who in order to excuse his philandering tells you: "one must try everything" An absurdity! What if we were to do it with illnesses and poisons? Whoever tells you this, hand him rat poison, and ask him to take it! See what he does. You can also not taste what is forbidden. Besides, would you like the person who will belong to you for the rest of your life to have tried everything before knowing you. Absolutely not! You would say. It is very proper for you to think that way: a lusty woman would torment you with jealousy.

Remember your mother. Your girlfriend is to be the mother of your children. Remember your sisters and your future daughters. Treat your girlfriend today as you wish others to treat them. Do not demand from your girlfriend, with brutal instincts, what her virtue, her modesty and her conscience cannot give you now. A woman who cherishes her honor, will fiercely defend her purity in the smallest of details. Do not treat your girlfriend as you would treat those loose women who sell themselves in the houses of ill repute. Would you elect one among them to be the mother of your children? A man, a God fearing man, would be ashamed if his girlfriend were a prostitute.

A decent woman feels humiliated and ashamed if she is treated as such. Her illusion is a love, a superior love, one that culminates in a home and in children. What a woman expects from a man is: admiration, esteem, respect, veneration, protection. But manhandling her to make her zoological instincts emanate, is not proper of man, it is proper of a beast. And it is logical that a woman to fall in love with a man, not with a beast. That is why some brides become disenchanted of their groom and even feel repugnance for that man who said that he loved her so much that he had to seize her modesty. On the other hand they do feel a sincere love for the man who had nothing but admiration and respect for her.

**Respect your girlfriend** as you want your mother to be respected. The sacrifices that you may impose upon yourself are really worthwhile as a proof of your true love. If you really love your girlfriend, you must want her good before your pleasure. That is to love her. To subordinate her honor and her conscience to your passion, is not love, it is egoism.

There are caresses that lead to the sexual act. Those that start up the genital apparatus are to be avoided. It is evident that not all of us have the same temperament, nor do we react in the same manner. Even for us, not all moments are the same. What at another time, or to another person, can be indifferent, for me, now, can result dangerous.

<sup>2056</sup> EVA FIRKEL: *Mujer, vocación y destino, II, 2, a. c.* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2057</sup> EVA FIRKEL: *Mujer, vocación y destino, II, 2, C.* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

A lad who loves a girl, instead of sinking, lowering, profaning, degrading and tarnishing her with the desires of his instinct, will try above all of his appetites, to raise, dignify, sublimate her. He preoccupies himself that she be more pious, that she improve the formation of her character, her religiosity, character, will, etc., That is to say, he always seeks what will embellish her, never what will hinder her.

When your girlfriend refuses to accede to your **bestial petitions**, never torment her affection with phrases such as: "is it that you don't love me?" Quite the contrary. Because she loves you, she does not want for you to tarnish your soul with a sin. With her firm and resolute resistance she says: "I love you so and I so strongly desire to marry you that I do not want to commit any sin, so that God can bless us and we can someday unite our lives forever in front of an altar.

Be very careful with the women you deal with. If your girlfriend is of doubtful morality, even if you do not want to, she will make you fall.

That your girlfriend be not a source of sin for you. She must help you to be better. That her memory protect you from moral decay. Her purity and virtue must be an asset to improve yourself, to be worthy of her.

**Shamelessness** in some women has reached such an extreme that it is possible that your irreproachable attitude towards all this matter will extract snickers and giggles from them, together with bad taste jokes. It is a pity that they have fallen so low. Too bad for them. But for you? What do you care? "Those" are worth nothing to you. On the other hand, the proper conduct you show will grant you the esteem of the good ones, who are the only ones among which you will look to find the mother of your children.

If you see that your girlfriend is not bad, but that she is frivolous and light, who has been impressed by the movies, and one day is a bit too forward, tell her: "I did not expect that from you, you have disillusioned me. I had you for a proper girl, and I see that you are like all the others..... a girl from the street." These words have made many a girl shed tears and have changed her conduct radically.

**Respect your girlfriend**, even if she does not know how to make herself respected, nor defend with her modesty, the treasure of her purity.

It is easy to say, "I do not care what you have done in the past" What is hard, is to mean it. Someone said to me: "Many times I said that it did not matter to me if I married a slut, forgetting her past life. But I was saying it lying to myself. On the inside, I had my ideal of a woman. But I thought that there were no more, that this was an unreachable ideal. That is why, when I have found this girl, who is an angel, I have become so illusioned, that it seems to me that I have started a new life.

The statement: "I don't care what you have been in the past" is easy to say, but it must include this other one: "I don't care what you are going to be in the future". But this is more difficult, as no man finds it humorous that his wife cheat on him with another man. It is true that a woman may repent of her past and change. **Mary Magdalene**, was a prostitute and she later became a saint. But that is so extraordinarily exceptional, that to trust that it will happen is very risky.

If someone says that he doesn't care about the infidelity of the spouse, it is because there is no love between them. The difference between love and friendship is that a friend does not mind sharing his friend with others, but the lover wants the exclusivity of the loved one.

Well then, if you want a **decent girl** to marry, then help the girls to be decent. Why is it that a girl who wants to be decent has to fight off the boys who constantly accost her so that she gives in? A girl once told me: Father, what repugnance! All boys want the same thing, And if you do not let yourself go, you do not interest them! What a shame that the girls have that impression of the boys!

You must demonstrate through your conduct that you are not one of them. That you, because you respect a decent woman, want to help all women to be decent. If boys, with a becoming conduct show them that they prefer pure and decent girls, they will, without doubt change. But as many boys have preferred the libertines, so that they can abuse them, girls have now believed that in order to

get married they must be libertines, and now that you seek a nice and decent girl, it is an uphill battle.

However, while you do not find the right one, do not abuse a girlfriend.

**The future happiness of your home** does not depend on the face, nor the type of your girlfriend; but on her character, on her virtue, and her Christian spirit. In the same manner that an inexpressive and sullen beauty will eventually tire you, a beauty without virtue will end up being abhorred. Look for a girlfriend that you like. But don't let yourself be blinded by her "facade", which will pass, and if it is not supported by virtues of the spirit, she will soon tire you and will lose for you all attractiveness. Learn to fall in love with character and virtues of the soul, which are stable and are really the ones that make a person worthy of esteem. Learn to better appraise the values of the soul, than those of the body. You can marry a "star" of the silver screen and be disenchanted, as many divorced movie stars. On the other hand, if you marry a woman who is kind, docile, helpful, generous, sacrificing, clean, discrete, honest, virtuous, sweet, feminine, crafty, delicate, kind hearted, who can manage a home and is capable of raising and educating the children and above all, very Christian, I can foresee a happy marriage. On the other hand, if she is a woman without moral or conscience, you don't know how far she can go. Behind a very attractive exterior, beautiful face and splendid appearance, many times you will find a frivolous and coquettish spirit, which **is not precisely** the best guarantee for a happy marriage.

For this reason, it is of little value to fall in love with the body, which is sexual love. And on the other hand, there are so many guarantees of success in the love of the soul, which is spiritual.

If your girlfriend is frivolous and light, you will live bitterly through jealousy and suspicion.

Don't let the same thing happen to you that happened to the poor soul, who after two months after his marriage, was abandoned by his beautiful wife. She had found a better man than he!

When you go out with your girlfriend, take advantage of every opportunity to notice and study her character and way of being. Have you checked if she loves kids, if she caresses them, if she is happy in their presence; or on the contrary, they put her in a bad mood? Is she a good worker and sacrificing, or does she just think of having fun? Does she know how to cook and sew? Does she know how to manage a house, or is the only thing that she likes is to dance a lot and flirt with the first one who comes close? Does she like housework, or does she only like to go out to the street and display herself? If you don't look at all these things, it is possible that after you marry, a great disillusion will fall upon you.

Make sure that your girlfriend likes to keep house. If she doesn't take care of the house, be prepared to live in a sty. Unless you become the "housekeeper". If you want to help your wife a little, it will be good. But there is no doubt that the one who has to keep the house, must be the wife, who is specially gifted for that. We men, generally do those things very badly.

It is very important that the sweethearts **know each other well** before getting married. A girl can have a great physical attraction, be very outgoing and very much at ease in social circles, but however have defects that will make her husband suffer. That is why the courting must last one to two years. In less time it is very difficult to get to know each other and it is possible that after being married, unforeseen defects may arise, which will put the matrimonial happiness in danger.

Take into account that **after being married**, you will appreciate many things in a different manner that now draw your bachelor's eyes. And then you will want that your bride have virtues that in your courtship you did not miss. If you love your girlfriend just for her sensuality, that love will be fleeting. After a few years of marriage, you will not love each other, at the most, you will stand each other. In the lifetime of your wife, you will be a widower at heart.

When you elect your bride, think that you do not elect her for the honeymoon only, but for ten, twenty, thirty years.... For your whole life. In your girlfriend you seek, more than the woman, the "angel" who will make your home a bit of heaven.

I know a very happy couple who met by going to mass every morning. If you fall in love with a sincerely pious girl, you have covered a lot of ground. And I say sincerely pious, because there are

those who join some pious practices as a way of being, a way of dressing, etc., improper of a spiritual life, which they seem to have. Those girls of superficial piety, also do not offer sufficient guarantees. Christian principles and moral rectitude must be something very entrenched.

Many times I have heard complaints that these days the girls are getting spoiled, that a girl to have fun with is easily found, but a girl that is capable of making a happy home..... those you can't find.

And who is to blame for this? Certainly many girls, influenced by the movies, have lost their modesty, which is their greatest asset. But, don't we men have a share of guilt in this "descent" of feminine modesty?

Good girls also **complain** that the boys like the "easy" girls, the frivolous ones, the coquettes, they let themselves go downhill. If the boys were to clearly show that they prefer the good ones, the pious ones, the working ones, those who sacrifice, the ones who ooze purity, girls would better. The good you will do to the girls is enormous, and if they should see that you prefer the good ones you would harm them greatly if they see that you prefer the easy ones.

This would be an **excellent apostolate**: moralizing the girls, showing more esteem for those that are virtuous.

On the other hand, you must know that the girls have the same complaint about you. Some boys, influenced by the fresh girls, think that in order to appear more interesting and manly, they must show that they are very forward, and this makes the good girls – the ones you need for marriage—when seeing you act like that, do not trust you and become undecided.

So it seems, that the girls make themselves more available so that boys will like them more, and the boys show themselves a bit more daring to seem more interesting and the result is that the boys do not like the easy girls, nor do the good girls like the forward boys, What a role you are playing. Wouldn't it be a thousand times better that we all recognize that what is the most worthy of esteem is virtue, and you should act that way?

When **you have found** a virtuous girl who can be the mother of your children, take courtship with all possible seriousness, as God commands. God wants that he who does not hear His calling to a higher and grander state, such as of being consecrated to God, and is going to be married, in due time – as un-ripened fruit will cause indigestion—seek out a girlfriend, as future spouses must know each other very well before going into marriage.

The psychology of the boy is different from that of the girl. A man is captivated by the beauty, delicateness and tenderness of the woman. She, the strength, the courage and the decisiveness of the man. In him, the attraction towards the other sex is more carnal, in her it is more sentimental. It is not rare that a boy feels sexual attraction without love, and a girl feels love without having sexual desires. The contrary is less frequent. Women generally prefer men who are interesting rather than good looking.

10. The movies have made headless youth idolize physical beauty, and as a result, that girls of "sensational" attributes, after being married, become capricious, unbearable; and also, that boy, who enamored the girls crazy, just because he resembled a certain movie star, after being married, develops an unbearable character. Both are wonderful to see on the screen. But marriage is not a picture, but a life that lasts many years, with a lot of suffering, bad times, sorrows and bitterness. It also has times of happiness. But unfortunately not all is happiness. If youth were to prepare itself for marriage as God wants, we would have many more happy marriages.

The time of courtship is to **mutually know** each other, to love straightforwardly. Courtship is loved by God, as God has made marriage to be indissoluble, and that person to whom you are going to be joined for the rest of your life, you must know well before marrying. Therefore it is natural -- and God wants it so – that during a certain time you have more trust in each other and a more intimate relationship to know each other better.

But you must be discreet in your manifestations of love, if you don't want to soil your relationship. You cannot allow your loved one many of the things he asks for in a forceful manner. It

is necessary that you learn to carry your courtship with the austerity that the Gospel demands. It is very important that you firmly decide to carry out your matrimonial relationships in the grace of God. That will be to treasure the blessings of God for the marriage. On the other hand, if you should sow the road to marriage with sins, can you trust that God will pour his blessing upon your marriage? How many marriages decry the sins of bachelorhood!

If courtship is mutual knowledge, another imperious need is sincerity. There should be no withdrawals nor mental restrictions. There should be a lot of talk about all matters and there should be mutual trust on problems, so that a solution can be sought together.

Unfortunately, with too much frequency, it happens that one of the couple will show the other a totally false position. And it is sad, that sometimes, that falsehood will ruin the intimate comprehension that must rule marriage. The sweethearts, many times, will go to the altar, deceived. They do not know each other. Deception is always bad. Sweethearts **must be frank**, transparent to one another.

Love requires admiration. To find out if you have admiration, ask yourself: would I like to have a son like this? It is not a matter of more or less nose, but a matter of the way of being, qualities, etc.

Sweethearts must help each other to have **mutual knowledge** of each other's virtues and defects. Each one must try to correct himself in his defects, and to acquire the virtues that the other would like to see in him. They must see if they harmonize in their character, likes, dislikes, points of view, way of being, education, and habits; if they have the same ideas as to religion, life of piety, frequency of sacraments, etc. They must be in agreement in all of the fundamental problems. If there are discrepancies during the courtship, in the marriage there will be very serious arguments. **Saint-Exupery** has said: "Love is not to see each other, but for both to look in the same direction", in other words, for both to have the same ideals.

And of course, **the lack of harmony** and defects of character need to be compensated with a spirit of modification and tolerance on the one hand – as long as they are not things that are offensive to God – and the true desire to correct oneself on the other. No one is perfect in this world, but we must have desires of betterment. The mutual effort of adaptation is one of the greatest joys of conjugal life.

**It is evident** that there are degrees of this harmony, but the greater the harmony, the greater probability of a happy marriage. The ideal would be for this harmony to reach the smallest details, such as: likes, hobbies, amusement, life habits, education, cleanliness, order, mannerisms, language, etc., etc. It would be ideal that both have the same family atmosphere and similar cultural background. Not for class discrimination, but for harmony. Should there be an **unevenness in education**, hygiene, customs, etc., there will be in due time, some friction that will cool the love. There are a number of imponderables of education, hygiene, etc. that can turn into very disagreeable thorns, and with time, truly unbearable. There are people who cannot lower their social level.

Generally speaking, differences in formation and in social standing, are obstacles which will impede a matrimony from reaching a complete union. The parity of customs, resulting from having been formed in a similar background, will constitute the solid foundation of a harmonious life in day to day living, while the disparity in customs and a divergence in the cultural degree level can act as dismembering forces. When the lifestyle differs, as the spouses come from very different social standings, the solidity of the marriage will be mined bit by bit. We do not deny that the spouses could be happy if the heart is what rules, but with time it is not strange that it would even be disagreeable to have a meal with a person whose education is discordant with your own. Small, but numerous differences will test the nerves of the most sane person. For the home to be pleasant, it is necessary to have a certain degree of education. But if one of the two does not have it, it is best that the other not have it either<sup>2058</sup>. Love can conquer death, but a small disagreeable defect can, in the long run, defeat love<sup>2059</sup>. What good is it for a person to have a beautiful body, if that person is

<sup>2058</sup> EVA FIRKEL.: *mujer, vocación y destino*, II, 22, b.Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2059</sup> FOERSTER *Temas capitales de educación*, III Ed. Herder. Barcelona

selfish, a gold-digger, aloof, irascible, grungy, vengeful, aggressive, cruel, feisty, gossipy, full of intrigue, schemer, disagreeable, contemptuous, hypocritical, false, cynical, astute, possessive, ambitious, dominant, absorbing, authoritarian, imposing, bossy, insolent, eternal nagger, complainer, vain, capricious, stubborn, bitchy, immature, unbalanced, frivolous, superficial, lackadaisical, lusty, alcoholic, etc, etc. Any of these defects will nullify a beauty. On the other hand it is easy to find attractiveness in a virtuous person.

The ideal character is a communicative and kind personality, a jovial temperament, a contagious happiness, a kind and sincere way of being, generous, friendly, and cordial with a desire to do good to his brethren. With such a person, life is delicious.

There is another matter which could not be really decisive, nor principal, but it is something that you should be concerned with. From the early days of courtship: that you do not only marry each other, but you also marry the families. I repeat that this should not be a fundamental reason for your decision, but you should know from the start that you will have to confront this circumstance.

The less surprises one carries into marriage, the better<sup>2060</sup>.

11. It would be desirable that the **prenuptial medical exam** were a general practice<sup>2061</sup>. In many countries it is already obligatory, to the point that the marriage license is not granted unless the medical certificate is presented. Everyone should have on their Identification Card, their blood group and the **Rh factor** Every marriage must know the blood group that they have and investigate the Rh factor that each one has. It is estimated that over half a million of the handicapped in Spain are due to the ignorance of the Rh factor incompatibility and the subsequent lack of treatment during the pregnancy<sup>2062</sup>. The problem exists if the father is Rh positive and the mother is Rh negative. There is a chance of one in a thousand.

It is very important that girls know the Rh factor of their blood, as if they have a negative factor, it is dangerous to mix their blood with an Rh positive: she could deliver a stillborn or a handicapped child. If the son is Rh positive, during the pregnancy, the blood of the mother will destroy the red cells of the child's blood, and this produces a deep anemia which could lead him to a severe abnormality or even death. This happens after the second child. In 1960 a globulin was discovered which has been a good solution. It is an intramuscular injection of only 5cc.

You must abstain from getting pregnant for the next six months. The procedure must be repeated after every son which is born with Rh positive factor, or after an abortion<sup>2063</sup>.

12. In this day and age there is a **feminist current** which is defending the rights of the woman. The defense of women's rights began when **Paul** ordered husbands to love their wives. This was something unheard of in a world where the woman was nothing. Even some philosophers of those days doubted that the woman had a soul.

In the pagan era, the woman did not have the same rights as a man. It was Christianity that elevated the woman from the state of ignominy; making her queen, feasted, admired and loved; as the mission of motherhood is the most glorious one in life.

One thing is the equality of rights under the law of man and of woman, which is fair and just; and another thing is for the woman to start imitating man in everyway, losing her feminine characteristic which enriched her so much. To pretend to make a woman into a man is an error. A woman has her specific qualities which she must not lose, and which must be for her of great value. The family is the foundation of society, and without true women, a family is not possible.

<sup>2060</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación Sexual y conyugal*, 3º, II, 3. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2061</sup> BLESS *Pastoral siquiátrica*, II, A, 2, 3. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>2062</sup> DR. GARRIDO-LESTACHE: YA Newspaper, 14-XII-73, pg. 22

<sup>2063</sup> Dr. MIGUEL AGUILAR MERLO: *El factor Rh*, Ed. Santaolalla. Madrid. 1981

Feminists want to make a society dominated by women. But that society would have the same defects, or greater, than the society dominated by men. As any man who is well born feels respect for a woman, while feminists, frequently, despise men.

The feminism that wants to recover the same rights for women as for men under the law, is normal and healthy, as man and woman have the same dignity as human beings<sup>2064</sup>. There is no distinction between man and woman before God<sup>2065</sup>. But there is another vengeful feminism which results ridiculous. There are women who want to occupy mans place in everything. And some lesbians even in the use of sex. Lesbians usually are vengeful feminists. A woman must be a woman. Wanting to be like a man is a mistake, as this would be that you are considering yourself to be inferior to a man. And a woman is not inferior to a man, she is different, which is not the same. Man and woman are different in their bodies and in their psychology. The Bible says that God "created man and woman"<sup>2066</sup>. Not "unisex".

Femininity is a great value for a woman.

As **John Paul II** says in his document of August 88, *Mulieris Dignitatem*<sup>2067</sup>, a woman cannot convert herself into an object of pleasure and exploitation, but she must also not invade man's territory, growing manly and appropriating herself of the masculine characteristic and becoming a tomboy. The equality of rights of woman and man must not consist in her masculinization, and the downfall of authentic feminine values. A woman's identity must not consist in being a copy of man, as she is gifted with qualities and prerogatives of her own, which confer her with an autonomous personality, which should always be promoted and cheered.<sup>2068</sup> A woman must be feminine and a man must be masculine. Each one has his place in life, in human reproduction and in service to the church, etc.

The equality of rights in man and woman has very reasonable aspects. There is no reason why if a woman does the same job as a man, and with the same perfection, she should not get the same wages. Fortunately, this discrimination is disappearing. But there are things that are different between a man and a woman. The human body itself shows the different specific mission of each. The man has broader shoulders than the woman, as he is built for strength. On the other hand the woman has wider hips than man, as she is built for maternity. The equality of rights is logical under the law. In theory, all human beings, man or woman, can be judges, doctors or cab drivers. But only women can give birth to a child. And this, because of biology and nature. Because God has made it so. That is why woman is different from man in psychology and build.

It has been said that the sexual differentiation of the "characters" would not be natural, but cultural, etc. This objection will not resist the smallest exam of the data obtained by cultural anthropology. It is certain that an education expressly directed to that end can lead to the masculinization of a woman and to feminize the man. But if you let nature run its course, sexual differences are immediate and clear. That is why, in thousands of cultures studied, man and woman have the psychology that corresponds to the primary and secondary sexual characters. Historically and anthropologically this conclusion is demonstrated by the facts. Amazons are a myth, and it is significant that there is no equivalent myth for men. The feminist myth of the "amazons" corresponds to the feminine utopias of today.

Never has the word utopia been used in a better way: something that doesn't exist, nor can it exist anywhere. Truly, radical feminism desires a total equality between man and woman, biological equality, physiological, complete. As this equality is not possible, notwithstanding all of the feminists efforts, they seek a cultural equality: they try to dress as men (or that there be no major differences

<sup>2064</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et spes*: Constitution of the church in the actual world, n° 49

<sup>2065</sup> Galatians, 3:28

<sup>2066</sup> Genesis, 1:27

<sup>2067</sup> JOHN PAUL II: *Mulieris Dignitatem*, nn. 10, 14, 26, 27.

<sup>2068</sup> JOHN PAUL II: ABC Newspaper, Madrid 7-XII-95. pg. 64

between male and female clothes), and to talk like men: if it were a social custom that men sometimes use foulmouthed language – slang – feminists would imitate it in a servile manner.

Radical feminism does not depend only on the culture, as feminism has already happened in other eras. It is a pathologically psychological behavior, that does not accept the different biological constitution of man. The man-woman sexual inequality seems to be an injustice of nature that is in need of correction. But, as this is not possible, the radical feminist movements try to compensate it with exalted vindications, typically feminine for further irony.

We are missing women-mothers  
 Politics can be hand led by men alone  
 Technical work can be done by men alone  
 Information services can be done by men alone, etc., etc., etc.  
 But humanity can not subsist without women-mothers

The male-female differentiation is not an obstacle, in the absolute, for the most complete defense of the equality of the rights of man and woman, as the male and the woman completely fulfill the biological and ethical content of the human being. The same differentiation is not inconvenient so that at certain times the women can carry out functions and labors which until then were entrusted to the men<sup>2069</sup>.

Men and women can be lawyers, doctors or cab drivers. But only the woman can give birth to a baby. And this is because of biology. Because God has made it so. That is why man and woman are different in psychology and in body. To deny this is a complete lack of knowledge of human psychology.

Feminists want to be like men in everything. This is a mistake. And besides, with this, they demonstrate their inferiority complex. That is why they want to be like men.

Woman is not inferior to man, just different.

It is evident that there are more things that are more proper to man, and others for which woman is more able. To ignore the differences between man and woman, shows a complete lack of knowledge of psychology.

**It seems to me that it is a mistake** that some women consider that taking care of the home is like slavery, which they want to shed. What is done for love cannot be called slavery. The same work can be done for a wage or for love, and it will have a totally different value.

Those things that are done as an obligation can become tedious, but those done with love are joyful. A sweetheart will joyfully traverse the distance needed to see a loved one. A mile for love will feel like a foot, and a foot without love, will seem endless. That is why this bit of advice is worthwhile. "if you cannot do what you love, try to love what you have to do!"

Many women are anxious to be successful in a profession outside the home, but nothing in the world can make them feel better than maternity. Statistics show that a great number of women who avoid having children when young, they later on heatedly desire them when they are mature. Today, the ages in which there are more maternity cases is in women between thirty and forty years of age. They are "mature" mothers, as they are classified in medical journals.<sup>2070</sup>

Psychiatrists know of a type of depression which is proper of mothers who have given birth when considered "mature".

<sup>2069</sup> RAFAEL GÓMEZ PÉREZ: *Problemas morales de la existencia humana, IV, III, 2*. Ed. Magisterio Español. Madrid 1981.

<sup>2070</sup> EL PAIS Newspaper, Sunday, 10-XI-89. pg. 6



In the United States, women are returning home. According to a report of the –Department of Labor, American women do not want to work outside of their home. They abandon their paying job for that of “housewife”<sup>2071</sup>.

God wanted the Redeemer come to this world by means of a woman: **Mary**. After **Jesus Christ**, **Mary** is the first person of humanity. But he did not make **Mary** a priest. And this was not to be because he was conditioned through the mentality of his time. To think that **Christ** would allow himself to be influenced by it, would be offensive to Him. He also demonstrated His independence of the “gossip” in his dealings with the “sinner” and the adulterer<sup>2072</sup>.

**Jesus Christ** only made priests of men. He did not do it to his mother. That is why the church does not ordain women as priests.

There recently has been a movement within Anglicanism in favor of the **ordination of women to the priesthood**. But in his apostolic letter *Ordinatio sacerdotalis* of May, 1994, **John Paul II** has affirmed that it cannot be done, as **Jesus Christ** only ordained men as priests, and the church cannot make important changes in the sacraments instituted by **Jesus Christ**. The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has affirmed that this statement by his Holiness concerning priestly ordination of women is a definitive declaration approaching dogma<sup>2073</sup>.

**Elizabeth Schüssler**, a well known German feminist, university professor in the USA, who for a long time has defended the ordination of women to the priesthood, has reached the conclusion that it has been an erroneous objective. The experience of female priesthood in the Anglican Church has resulted in “it is not a solution”, “it is not what we were looking for”<sup>2074</sup>.

Women have a great mission in the life of the church, as history shows; but not that of priesthood. The church has always defended the dignity of the woman following the example of **Christ** who in his preaching and in the treatment of women, was a clear novelty as opposed to the dominating customs of the time, which belittled woman.

In this treatment of **Christ** towards women, concupiscence of which Christ had none, was absent. Today, it is fashionable to talk about **Christ’s** sexuality. However the Bible says that **Christ**: “made himself equal to all men, except in sin”<sup>2075</sup>.

13. To marry a pure woman has a **special meaning** for a man.. Matrimony after pure relations has a special happiness . The same thing happens to a woman.

The best wedding present that a person can hope for is the virginity of its spouse.

Take this precious saying: “Faithful unto death and pure up to the altar”. Convince yourself that the purer and more respectful your conduct is at the time of courtship, the greater will be the guarantees that you will take to the altar, of an indissoluble, quiet and loving matrimony.

The Bible says that **Amon** desired **Tamar**, and at the same moment of raping her, he abhorred her in his heart.<sup>2076</sup>

Sometimes girls will cede under the immoral demands of the man they love, they dare not resist him, or just not to be contrary, they go past the point where their Christian conscience allows them. And the result is, that everything goes sour, her conscience is soiled, God is offended and the boyfriend is disillusioned.

<sup>2071</sup> EL MUNDO Newspaper, 1-VIII-94, pg. 19

<sup>2072</sup> SANTIAGO MARTÍN. ABC Newspaper, 22-XI-95. pg. 69

<sup>2073</sup> ABC Newspaper, Seville, 19-XI-95. pg. 48

<sup>2074</sup> JOSE RATZINGER: *La sal de la tierra, II*, 15. Ed. Palabra. Madrid. 1997

<sup>2075</sup> Hebrews, 4:15

<sup>2076</sup> II Samuel, 13:1-19

I know several concrete cases in which relationships were broken because the men lost all illusion with a girl who had ceded to their sinful solicitations. A woman will interest a man as long as it is charm, ideal illusion; but if lowered to being a thing, she disillusions.

I remember an occasion in which I wanted to defend a girl, and was blaming the boy. He responded: "very well Father, I plead guilty, but I have lost my trust in her. I cannot marry her"

That is why it isn't rare that a boy will lose the illusion, and even abandon a girl who has lost her purity, even if he is the author of the stain. That is how things are. He may, perhaps, feel guilty. But also feel disillusioned. And this is superior to his will.

The boy wants you pure, fragrant like a flower. If you wither, you lose your attractiveness. My priestly experience has let me know of several cases in which they chose a girl instead of another, attracted by, precisely, the intransigence in the purity that they had observed in her. And the boys, when looking for a **pushover** to have fun and take advantage of, they want her brazen; but when they are looking for a serious girlfriend, they want unblemished purity.

No one likes to eat another person's leftover crumbs. That is why one of the greatest treasures of a girl is her purity. A man, a true man, is ashamed of the fact that his woman **has been a slut**.

The easy and condescending girl on moral grounds results vulgar. You can find girls like that all over the place. When a man who values himself falls in love, he falls for an exceptional woman, who is out of the ordinary, with authentic values, especially spiritual ones; not with just anybody. Vulgarity, does not enamor anyone who has good taste.

A boy who loves a girl, instead of sinking, lowering, humiliating, degrading and tarnishing her with his instinctive desires, tries to overcome his appetites, to elevate, dignify and embellish her. He worries that she be more pious, improve her religious formation, as well as her character, will, etc. In other words, he looks for what will make her better, not what will demean her.

Look at what a guy wrote to me: "How would I like my future wife to be? With a soul that is prettier than her exterior, although she should not be careless about the latter. More pious than prayerful. With more religious culture than any other, but she should not disdain general culture". I have not edited a single word. This is how formal boys think when they are serious.

Do you want a recap of the feminine qualities that captivate the boys? Simplicity, charm, smiles, delicateness, kindness, helpfulness, sweetness, and candor, all tied together to a solid piety and to an unblemished purity.

It is true that at **the moment of temptation** they are out of reason, and ask for things that they would never ask for otherwise. When the whirlwind passes, they, themselves are ashamed of having been that way. If resisting and denying yourself you put up a defense from the beast that he has within him, he will be thankful. Your intransigence will increase the illusion he feels for you. Should you condescend at this point, don't doubt, it will lower you, make you feel dirty, and will soil you. And if on your part not only did you condescend, but had guilt, you are left at the level of the devil. How horrible! Think about it! The boy wants you to be an angel. That is what he thinks of you, his caring increases. When you stop being an angel, he loses the illusion and the caring converts into something worse. Do you think that by agreeing he would love you more? You are wrong! He loves you less. His true feelings of love have turned to a bestial instinct. And as he loses his illusion about you and the caring, he also loses respect. Whoever violated your body will not find difficulty in violating your reputation. What he did with you, he will tell his friends! Can you imagine the comments that will be made about you? What a shame! And this happens very often, believe me!.

A man will ask for improper liberties from a woman before the wedding, he can do it because he desires it with violence, with unbridled passion, but be certain that he does not love her enough to protect her against the animal that exists in the male human nature. If your sweetheart wants things from you that your conscience does not admit, reject him and the sooner the better. He will not make you happy. What he feels is not love for you, but to himself, to his concupiscence and to his selfishness. If he did love you, he would seek your good above his disoriented appetite, how are we to believe that he loves you? Whoever loves you will only be blinded in a moment of passion, but

when faced with your intransigent rectitude, recognizes his fault, asks your forgiveness and feels proud of your virtue.

Don't forget it. Impure sins with your sweetheart, sink you and they sink him. That is why it is a lie when he tells you in order for you to give in "I think you do not love me", "I don't interest you" or "you are cold towards me". He attacks your feelings and sentiments in order for you to surrender. But this is **an old trick**, and should you fall in the trap, you will repent. And if he really loves you, he will repent of having you fall, I repeat, boys do not want to marry the brazen girls. This always happens among the boys who have high moral values. And if a boy wants to marry a brazen girl, just because she is pretty or cute, he is making a MISTAKE. To think that the beauty of his wife will make him happy in his matrimony above all other things, is to be a knucklehead. An unfortunate one marries a fool! But after all, he is a fool and so is she. Tit for tat.

I know a girl who when she dug her heels in and said NO, her boyfriend retorted: "if you don't love me, it is best that we leave well enough alone". And she answered: "if to convince you that I love you, you need that, must be God's will that we leave it alone". Shortly he calls her and says: "Forgive me, I did not know what I was saying. You have behaved very well by being firm. I am proud of you. Now I love you more" Soon thereafter they were married.

On the other hand I know of sweethearts who after succeeding in obtaining from their girlfriends what they should not have gotten, they lost all illusion in such a way that they were never able to recover it. Besides, at this time you do not know if you will marry this person. If you grant him what you shouldn't, who will later on want a second hand wife? I am not inventing! I know boys who when finding out of the intimacies of their girlfriends in past relationships, decided to leave them. They did not want a second hand wife. If God asks purity of the girls, it is not capriciously, but rather because it is necessary for the happiness of their marriage. That is why brash girls should not be surprised that after they have stepped all over their honor, granting to another what they shouldn't have, they will later on **hopelessly** wait for someone to love them. What happens to them is a consequence of their mistaken conduct.

Don't tell me that you give in for love of him. Quite the contrary. If you love him, **you can't cede**, by sinning you cause him the greatest of harms: you condemn him to hell. If you love him, save him. Even though this demands sacrifices. Letting him sin is not loving him, it is killing him.

With your firm and complete resistance you tell him: "I love you so, and I am so anxious to marry you, that I don't want to commit any sin, so that God may bless us and some day we can become one forever at the altar."

The sexual instinct must be controlled and reined in. The bachelor must keep pure. The married man must, at some times maintain abstinence. And in all cases, instinct must serve love. You do not break in the young mustang letting him run wild on the prairie. He must be saddled and bridled and the reins held firm. Only by doing this will he be useful. The same thing happens with the sexual instinct. The youngster who during his relationships has not learned to control his impulses, cannot know if after he is married, he will be able to control them. What's more, when they know that when being sweethearts, they were unable to dominate their sexual urges, after being married, they can have doubts that the other party can jeopardize that fidelity at the times that abstinence is necessary (illnesses, trips, etc.) On the other hand, if both have given proof that they know how to dominate that point, it will give them enormous security to trust the self control of the other when being forced to sexual abstinence.

**The sex test** previous to love is the absolute negation of love, which is essentially the total, irrevocable and unconditional giving of oneself to the partner. He says: "let me try with you, to see if I should love you" is saying that he doesn't love. The language of love is all the contrary: "because I love you, I want to live with you just like you are".

Listen to the words of **Pius XI**:

It cannot be denied that both the solid foundation of a happy marriage, and the ruin of the wretched, is prepared and based on the young of both sexes during their days in infancy and in their youth. And therefore one must fear those who before marriage only looked out for themselves and

their possessions, and who condescended with their desires even though they were impure, to be in marriage as they were before contracting marriage, that is to say, that they should harvest what they sowed: that is to say, sadness at home, tears, mutual rejection, discordance, aversion, tedium in every day life, and what is worse, to find themselves full of unbridled passions<sup>2077</sup>.

**Tenderness and delicateness**, are two of the more important components of marriage. If they are missing before marriage, it is not likely that they will appear afterwards, and without them, the marriage could end in disaster.

When sexual appetite is the only thing present, it is a passing thing, like a tantrum. While it lasts, it seems that everything is going well. But frequently, after some time, things change and it ends badly. Especially when the conscience has been stepped on, it is very frequent for the situation to become untenable.

It is not the same thing to “make love” than to “have sex”. Such an error is very extended and broadcast in these times, it is to reduce love to sex. Those who traverse this road are going to have a difficult time when establishing a solid, firm, stable and lasting relationship<sup>2078</sup>.

Today, we say “to make love”. This is to degrade love, to make it a “thing”. Things are made, not love. Love you have. Love flourishes spontaneously out of admiration and esteem for a person. When there is no love “to make love” is just plain lust. Today they are trying to identify lust with love, but they are two different things. The difference between love and lust is that in love I value the person for his qualities, and this leads me to sacrifice myself for her sake; on the other hand, in lust I seek the person for the gratification that she gives me. That is to say, I make her an object of my egotistical satisfactions. “Eroticism starts from egoism. Love starts from generosity<sup>2079</sup>”.

14. The sensuous man confuses pleasure with happiness. His anxiety of pleasure obliterates true love and as he reduces his concept of women, he has killed the happiness of his marriage<sup>2080</sup>.

It is true that love **includes sex**, but there can be sex without love: as an example: the one who goes with a prostitute. **Ortega & Gasset** in their essay *Ensayos sobre el amor* analyze the difference between love and sexual appetite. They say it is not the same to desire than to love; the drug addict desires the drug and at the same times hates it because he knows it is his ruin. Desire is selfish. Love is generous. When I desire, I look for something that satisfies me. When I love, I try to satisfy someone<sup>2081</sup>.

Desire is not the same as love. When desiring, I seek for myself, when loving, I want well being for the loved one. The thirsty desires water to quench his thirst, and a man can desire a woman to satiate his lust. But the thirsty does not love the water nor does that man love that woman. That is why when the thirsty stops being thirsty, he loses interest for the water, and when that man finds another woman who is more desirous, he will easily change partners. Love is stable.

Sometimes films expose tragedies, not rare in real life, of two loves that are crossed. A person who loves another who does not correspond that love, and who at the same time is loved by another to whom he is indifferent. If one of those loves is impossible because one of them is married, it is clear that the solution is to center oneself on the only possible love, to see if it is also reasonable. But if both loves are equally possible, sometimes the solution is not easy. It is hard to succeed. Besides the inclination of the heart, one must examine other things to connect the heart with the head.

There is a song that says that the whole world likes to change their food, their job and their love, as having an entire life the same is unbearable. But love is not a food, nor a job. He who needs to change his love if is because he has the misfortune of never having loved, and therefore is totally

<sup>2077</sup> PIUS XI: Encyclical *Casti connubii*, n° 43

<sup>2078</sup> ENRIQUE ROJAS: *El amor inteligente*, II Ed. Temas de Hoy. Madrid. 1997

<sup>2079</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, III, 6 EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2080</sup> Dr. CARNOT: *El libro del joven*, 1ª, I, 2. Ed. Studium. Madrid.

<sup>2081</sup> JOSE ORTEGA Y GASSET: *Estudio sobre el amor*, III, IV. Ed. Revista de Occidente. Madrid

ignorant of what love is. He who truly loves is happy living with the person he loves for his whole life. That is why loving phrases as: "I will love you always", "I will love you till I die". But whoever says: "I will love you for a week, but next week, I will love someone else", he, doesn't love. What he has is a whim, a passing lust, or whatever you want to call it, but it is not love. Love is forever, or it is not love. A conditioned love, is a rotten love. A love "to see how it works" is a brutal deceit for both. A love without conditions may fail, but a love with conditions, is not only stillborn, maybe it isn't even born.<sup>2082</sup>

There are people for whom the only value is the present moment of love. They are not worried as to what will happen day after tomorrow. These people do not know what it is to love. The one in love wants his love to last a lifetime. He wishes that it should never end. Love, is either forever, or it ceases to be love, and converts itself into a passing adventure.

The addict continuously needs to change to new experiences; but **authentic love** will never find as routine what a sincere expression of tenderness is.

And naturally those who have a sexual life by reason of appetite, so satisfy a desire, where each one looks for the pleasure that the other one will give him, that evidently has to end badly. Love is not the pleasure that both felt when together. That could be a coincidence of egoism. One begins to love when one is capable of sacrifices to make the loved one happy. Egoism is the death of love, while sacrifice is the absolute proof of love. When sweethearts have tempered themselves in sacrifice for the other's good, matrimony will be bliss. But if the sweethearts have fomented their egoism, it is logical that their marriage will fail.

**Love is never selfish.** Everything that is instrumental in search of self satisfaction, is not love. And this instrumentalism can be simultaneous to both parties, even in the true manifestations of caring one must be careful not to trespass into the fields that are the exclusive realm of married folks.

There cannot be a happy marriage without love and without virtue. Many marriages fail, because their courtship was a calamity. These marriages necessarily had to fail. It is normal that out of a bad courtship a bad marriage will develop, and that out of a good courtship, a good marriage will arise. There will be exceptions, but they are the least. The number of happy marriages is proportional to the couples who marry because of love, and not because of lust. When a boy and a girl unite in matrimony just because they have a mutual sexual appetite, it is logical that the marriage will be a failure. The stable living of two people is impossible to be pleasant if among them there is no true love. Many think that they love each other and it is only desire. Un the united States, about 50% of marriages of couples under the age of twenty, divorce before two years of marriage.<sup>2083</sup>

Life experience demonstrates that the casual sexual encounter is much less satisfactory than the one of a stable couple who love each other. Sexual freedom, the casual sexual encounter, at the beginning can seem to be gratifying, but in the long run, leaves a sad soul. That is why it is logical for those that go from body to body seeking that type of satisfaction, to end fed up with everything, with no illusion about anything, tired of living, incapable of loving and resigned to not finding that lasting happiness that any normal person dreams about.

**Sexual adventures**, may last a long or short time, but because they lack love, they usually end badly. Only true love can give durable happiness. What they do is to animalize the people and make them indisposed to true happiness which is found in spiritual love. The happiness of the human person cannot be reduced to corporal satisfactions, which do not surpass the animal level. It is a human experience that the purely sexual level, does not give man lasting happiness nor is it capable of satisfying the deepest hopes of the heart<sup>2084</sup> Many people who have had various adventures latter on, recognize that they have lost their time, as they have not found true love and now they dream of forming a stable family, but it is now too late.

<sup>2082</sup> JOSE LUIS MARTÍN DESCALZO: *Razones Desde la otra orilla, XLVI*. Ed. Atenas. Madrid. 1991

<sup>2083</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRA, S.I.: *Cristianos en busca de respuestas, XXIV*, 2. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>2084</sup> HERMAN van der SPIJKER: *Homotropia, I, 1, h*. Ed. Atenas. Madrid

Love enriches sex. That is why sweethearts must not fear that their sexual life will not go well in their marriage. If they truly love each other, their sexual love will go well. That is why it is an error to say that the sweethearts must know each other sexually before matrimony. **Eduardo Lopez Azpitarte**, professor at Granada, says that he doesn't know of any marriage full of love that has failed in their sexual life. Failures in sexual life normally occur when there is a lack of harmony in the psychic area, as this influences the sexual area.

Some say that if a boy and a girl want to live matrimonially, they don't need any **bureaucratic red tape**.

This is very comfortable, but it is not serious.

In life, all serious matters are formalized with a document.

If you loan a friend ten thousand dollars, his word is not enough, no matter how good a friend he is. You are much more at ease if he gives you an IOU with his signature on it.

Well, marriage is a very serious thing, one in which you place in jeopardy the education of some children who need a home, and that cannot be at the mercy of a couple who do not want to document their living together, and therefore, at any difficult given moment, those which necessarily all couples go through, either one of them could leave the other at the drop of a hat, and at an age in which it would be very difficult to find a new couple, and loneliness will torment the other the rest of his life.

This is besides the fact that children are entitled to a stable home, which is indispensable for their education.

But besides that, children can be traumatized when they realize the rejection of society because of their irregular situation.

And should they get married after having a child, the trauma could be that one of them would consider that the birth has caused them to get married against their will.

That is why the Church is not in agreement with those couples who want to live matrimonially, but without formalizing the marriage.<sup>2085</sup>

The same act (coitus), changes its moral value, if circumstances change (matrimony), which can grant a right which was not there before.

The foundation of matrimonial happiness is in the **spiritual love** between partners.

This is lasting, the one which never bores.

And the more carnal your love is, the less spiritual it will be.

In a relationship where there are concessions to concupiscence, they will be reduced, they lose spirituality and height, that is to say, they lose strength in their fundamental link.

On the other hand, when instinct is held back by virtue, an areola of elevation illuminates that loving, and a self dominance and mutual respect strengthen the virtue that is going to join them for the rest of their lives.

When one gives that spiritual love, the courtship is a time of mutual education: he becomes more pure, leaves certain friends, etc., to please her; and she dresses more conservatively, dominates her temper and her whims, etc., to please him.

But when the love of the courtship is based on carnality and instinct, that love is selfish, looking for its own satisfaction.

Egoism will reach unsuspected proportions in the marriage.

“Love cannot limit itself to a pleasing benefit who seeks its own benefit”<sup>2086</sup>

Joy is the satisfaction of having reached a desire. It is to taste something that we had waited for.

<sup>2085</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2390s

<sup>2086</sup> ENRIQUE ROJAS: *Remedios para el desamor*, VII, 4. Ed. Temas de Hoy. Madrid. 1991

Joy is above pleasure- Pleasure is in the senses, and joy is in the soul.  
 Joy is the road to happiness. Joy is the cause of optimism, satisfaction and rejoicing..  
 Joy enriches you inside and makes life worth living.

Joy is carried in the soul. **Frankl** says in his work: "*El hombre en busca de sentido*", "Joy can never be sought directly. It can only come as a consequence of having given the best of oneself for a noble cause"

As **Dr. Rodriguez Delgado**, said: pleasure is not the same as happiness. Pleasure is in the senses. Happiness is in the soul.

Love has two currents, the caring, which is love from the soul, and desire, which is love of the body.

Caring is made up of tenderness, admiration, respect, etc.

Desire tries to possess the body of the other, culminating in the sexual encounter. The difference between love and desire is that in love you feel attracted by the virtues of the person, and in desire, it is by corporal beauty.<sup>2087</sup>

Love is more spiritual, it is more directed to the beauty of the soul.

It blooms slowly, through the daily contact with the other person.

The desire gushes more explosively.

It is directed to bodily attractiveness.

It is more violent, it seeks to express itself in frenetic kissing and hugging, which are ways of trying to possess the partner's body. They are endeavors of the sexual encounter.

Desire is born of the body. It is felt in the body, it is addressed to the body of the partner. Love is less explosive and violent.

It is deeper, more satisfactory. More comforting.

It is made of tenderness, admiration, respect and identification with the loved one<sup>2088</sup>.

Sometimes there are bachelors, albeit not young ones, who have found a couple with whom to have a sexual life, and they do not want to be tied down in a marriage.

They are a selfish bunch, who are only looking for their own satisfaction, unable to love anyone, and therefore incapable of making anyone happy.

They only love themselves, and in the long run, it is impossible to live with them.

Those who as bachelors always wanted to satisfy their whims and as sweethearts had no inconvenience in ceding to their passions, will arrive at marriage with a totally egotistical soul and a body avid of pleasures. As is natural, marriage cannot give them all they want, and their lack of Christian sense makes them unhappy, even in this life.

This results in all the failed marriages we see everywhere.

Many complain about their marriage when there is no remedy, because there is an inviolate bond that ties them for life.

But few realize that their failed marriage is a consequence of their taking the courtship as an enjoyment, and went into marriage lightly, with frivolity and sensuality.

Many **failed marriages**, many unhappy marriages, are due to having had a false sense of love.

Movies, novels, songs on the radio and serials are full of pagan ideas about love. For whoever drinks from these fountains, it is natural that he should feel the effect of the venom.

<sup>2087</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRAZ. S.I.: *Tres trampas en el noviazgo, II*. Ed. Paulinas. Caracas. 1989

<sup>2088</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRAZ. S.I.: *Tres trampas en el noviazgo, II*. Ed. Paulinas. Caracas. 1989

Marriage is a very serious thing, and as all serious things, requires adequate preparation. Frivolity, passion and love playing have killed true love.

Girls and boys are attracted physically, sexually and through the satisfaction that the other creates in one.

And this is egoism, it is not love. And egoism is capricious, voluble, temporary.

These passionate and egotistical loves cannot give a stable happiness.

They soon tire and are anxious to change the object of love.

**Objects do not love each other.** One uses them and then discards them, or puts them away.

And a girl who does not make herself respected, is a toy.

And toys more or less last, but they end put away and forgotten.

A girl wrote to me: "Father, it is obnoxious. All the boys come for the same thing. If you do not let them, you do not interest them.

To let yourself be instrumentalized for the fear of abandonment, is folly, as who instrumentalizes does not love, and who does not love will end up abandoned. For some boys, girls are like those objects that carry a label that says: "Discard after use."

Love is another thing

Love is giving. It is enriching, ennobling the loved one. Never enjoy her for oneself.

That is egoism<sup>2089</sup>.

**And egoism** is the death of love, while sacrifice is the true test of love.

When sweethearts have tempered themselves in the sacrifice for the good of the other, marriage will be bliss.

But if what has been done is to foment their egoism, it is logical that their marriage will be a failure.

**Aristotle** has said: "love is to seek the good of the loved one"<sup>2090</sup>; **Saint Thomas Aquino** said: "love is to wish the good of someone"<sup>2091</sup>, and **Socrates** said: "love is giving oneself"<sup>2092</sup>.

**Jean Guilton** learned these verses as a child, they express the same idea:

For your happiness, I would give mine  
Even if you never had to know it  
Just to sometime hear in the distance  
The laughter of joy, born of my sacrifice<sup>2093</sup>

Love,  
As opposite to money,  
The more you give, the more you have,  
The more generous, it is larger and more beautiful.

Love,  
Does not look to be understood, but to understand,  
Does not look to be forgiven, but to forgive.  
Does not look to be made happy, but to give happiness  
Does not look to be loved, but to love.

<sup>2089</sup> FRANCISCO DE LA VEGA, S. I.: *El amor no se improvisa, II*, 3. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2090</sup> ARISTOTLE *Rhetoric, II*

<sup>2091</sup> Saint Thomas: *Suma Teológica, 1-2, 26,4*

<sup>2092</sup> Plato: *Dialogo sobre el banquete*. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona, 1982

<sup>2093</sup> JEAN GUITTON: *Lo que yo creo, V*. Ed. Acervo. Barcelona. 1973



To love  
Is to sacrifice, till your heart is wrenched  
For the happiness of the one loved

If you do not want to suffer, don't love  
But, if you don't love, what do you want to live for?<sup>2094</sup>

A human being is a person, not a thing  
Love integrates respect into the person, or it is not love, even if there are erotic manifestations,  
as love doesn't consist in the excitement of the senses.  
Authentic love is not directed to the body only, it is directed to the whole person.<sup>2095</sup>  
Love is a gift unto itself and it is not possible to give it partially. Love is total or it is no longer  
love<sup>2096</sup>

Conjugal love is total love.  
Being total love it has to be definite.  
A total love that has reserves in time, cannot be a total love. Totality of love is indivisible.  
Through its own essence it is faithful and exclusive.  
A total love cannot be shared with several people.<sup>2097</sup>  
In a more general sense, the active character of love can be described by affirming that to  
love is fundamentally to give, not to receive.  
Giving is more satisfactory, more pleasing than receiving, to love is more important than to be  
loved.

When loving, you feel the power of producing love, before the dependency received of feeling  
loved..

Infant love follows the principle: "I love because I am loved"  
Mature love obeys the principle: "I am loved because I love".  
Immature love says: "I love you because I need you"<sup>2098</sup>.  
Concupiscence says: "I love you because you are mine"  
True love says: "I love you because I wish what is good for you"  
Reciprocal love is: "not the glut of concupiscence of each other, which is a coincidence of  
egoisms"  
True reciprocity cannot be born of two egoisms, but necessarily must suppose the altruism of  
each.

Loving is to give oneself, and giving oneself means to limit one's freedom to the benefit of the  
other.

The limitation of freedom could by itself be something negative and disagreeable, but love  
does on the other hand make it positive, happy and creative.

Liberty is made for love.

Man desires love more than liberty, liberty is a means, love is an end<sup>2099</sup>

The only durable love, the one which gives a growing happiness throughout time, the only  
love which gives maximum happiness in this world, is the love which above self satisfaction, seeks  
the good of the loved one, even if to do that, he would have to resign to his own appetites.

<sup>2094</sup> Dr. J DOMÍNGUEZ: *Felicidad sexual*. Ed. Plus Ultra. New York. 1971

<sup>2095</sup> KAROL WOJTYLA: Cardinal of Krakow, today Pope JOHN PAUL II: *Amor y responsabilidad, II, 12s*. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>2096</sup> PABLO TOURNIER: *La mujer soltera, 1ª, VIII*. Ed. Estela. Barcelona

<sup>2097</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *Moral de la sexualidad; II, B, 2*. Ed. Tau. Avila. 1988

<sup>2098</sup> FROMM: *El arte de amar, II*. Ed. Paidós. Buenos Aires.

<sup>2099</sup> KAROL WOJTYLA: Cardinal of Krakow, today Pope JOHN PAUL II: *Amor y responsabilidad, 2º, I, 3s, II, 15*. Ed. FAX. Madrid

Love which searches itself is doomed to failure,  
 Love sublimates; passion defiles.  
 Love that seeks the good for the other person, will find true happiness.  
 Life experience has confirmed the truth in all of this. That is why it is of little value to fall in love with the body, which is sexual love.  
 And on the other hand, there are so many guarantees of success in the love of the soul, which is spiritual.  
 If what you search for, in what you call love, is to quench your thirst, you do not love, don't fool yourself.  
 If what you are looking for is to serve, ennoble, perfect the loved one, congratulate yourself; you have found the way to true love.  
 And the more you do it, the greater happiness this love will bring.  
 Think of these ideas slowly:  
 If you find yourself in ecstasy in her presence, that alone is not love; it is admiration.  
 If you feel your heart palpitate in her presence; that alone is not love, it is sensibility.  
 If you desire a caress, a kiss, a hug, to in some way possess her body, that is not love, that is sensuality.  
 But if what you desire is her well-being, even if you need to sacrifice, congratulations, you have found your true love<sup>2100</sup>.  
 It is not the same to love a person to make her happy, than to love her so that she with her love, makes us happy. The latter is egoism.  
 All in all, one must take into account that one can sacrifice oneself not only for love, but also for desire. Great sacrifices can be made to obtain things: an automobile, a fancy dress, etc.; and things are not loved. They are only desired. And when you manage to get one, then they are changed for another one, better or more modern<sup>2101</sup>.  
 Under the name of love, there is a merchandise circulating which is its negation and caricature.  
 The gravity of this situation is that true love is being vilified by all of these falsities of human sexuality-  
 Also grave is that by continuously presenting a deformed image of sexuality, it compromises its value as a human being<sup>2102</sup>.  
 Normal sex no longer attracts; perversions and extravagances are what is taking hold.  
 Sadism and masochism are up for sale, and, right up there with them, homosexuality, both masculine and feminine, and everything else.  
 There are new forms of cohabitation of men and women, such as group sex, swingers, etc.  
 But the consumer will also soon tire of these novelties.  
 The hedonistic atmosphere that invades nowadays, laughs at the uninterested love.  
 It is only interested in seeking pleasant gratifications. It has no further horizon than to satiate instincts. It admits no other value than the pleasing.  
 This is the narrow, choking circle of egoism. Although, fortunately, there are many examples of generous love, free from the tyranny of egoism<sup>2103</sup>.  
 Eroticism is the separation of sexuality from the conjugal love with the purpose of procuring oneself a series of pleasant gratifications<sup>2104</sup>.  
 The mere explanation of how you can obtain pleasing sensations constitutes, in fact, an incitation to eroticism. Does not form for love, it deforms. It takes off on a route contrary to real

<sup>2100</sup> QUOIST. *Triunfo*, III, 6. Ed. Estela. Barcelona

<sup>2101</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRAZ, S. I. *Las tres trampas en el noviazgo*, II, 7. Ed. Paulinas. Caracas. 1987

<sup>2102</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine: 1529 (13-II-71) 15 Joint declaration of Belgian Bishops.

<sup>2103</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, X. 8. EDIBESA. Madrid.

<sup>2104</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, IX. 3. EDIBESA. Madrid

love<sup>2105</sup>. The erotic caress, touches the body, the loving caress touches the soul. Man, by being sensitive, is attracted by gratifying stimulus. And this for him, has a value. But as at the same time it is spiritual, it cannot have as its goal the enjoyment of the pleasurable sensitive stimulus. For him, superior are: the truth and the good. Orienting his life according to a true hierarchy of values makes him mature as a human being and grants him peace and happiness<sup>2106</sup>.

A man cannot be happy when he performs half way. When he is left on the road, captured by spurious attractions. The human being is fully realized when he puts all of his senses in service of the realization of the most valuable possibilities<sup>2107</sup>.

Man must elect at every moment, not what is more appreciable, but what is most convenient for his personal development<sup>2108</sup>.

What is pleasant is a value. But to place the pleasant at the cusp of the scale of values is hedonism, which has as an ideal of life to accumulate easy gratifications and pleasant sensations<sup>2109</sup>.

To lose the sense of sacrifice must be qualified as one of the greater calamities of the twentieth century. Since two centuries ago, all sacrifices are being interpreted as a form of repression, and an amputation of the true being of man. This error can destroy our personal life from the roots. Grant primacy to the most elevated values constitutes the nucleus of the responsibility of human virtue. The will to serve a valuable ideal acquires an unbridled energy. The greatest endeavor of our existence must be to fulfill ourselves as human beings<sup>2110</sup>.

15. There are those who say that **sexual experiences before marriage** are convenient. They say it is convenient to train oneself before the wedding. This is false. Premarital sexual relations are forbidden by God, therefore, they are not necessary, nor convenient, nor licit.

**Dr. Lopez Ibor**, said: "Premarital sexual relations are not needed for future matrimonial harmony<sup>2111</sup>.

If these experiences were good, God would not forbid them. If He forbids them, it is because they are not necessary. It is normal for married couples to learn about sexual life after the wedding. Little by little. It is not necessary to dash into it. Nor is it convenient. There is nothing in particular if things do not work out in the beginning to perfection. What is more, whoever shows a lot of sexual experience can cause a bad impression on the other.

Some say:

We love each other and we are going to get married. If we are not already married, it is not our fault, but due to circumstances. Why shouldn't we be able to do what is asked of our love?

Because we are missing the sacrament that gives us that right.

Before I was ordained as a priest, I also wished to say mass, but I couldn't do it until I received the sacrament that gave me the faculties to do so. And had I done it before, it would have been illicit and invalid.

If coitus is not licit among singles, also illicit are the acts that lead to it. Bachelors should avoid all acts that are to start up the genital apparatus. It is absurd to pretend to stop a string of Chinese fire-crackers. It is much easier not to light it.

<sup>2105</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, X, 7. EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2106</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, VIII, 2 EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2107</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, VIII, 3 EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2108</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, VIII, 7 EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2109</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, IV, 5 EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2110</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, V, 4 EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2111</sup> Protagonistas nosotros: Radio Nacional de España. 13-II-81.

**The erotic ambience** that we are having to live and the mashing repetition of the fact that sexual liberation is necessary, has sent many young men to a libertine sexuality of dear consequences to themselves.

Some say that one should not sexually suppress oneself, giving a depreciatory sense to self control. However, being able to dominate the instincts is what is specific to man. The more we dominate ourselves, the more man we are, and the less, animal. And converting man into an animal is degrading.

These days some want to present **as natural** all kinds of sexual excesses. Sometimes a label of "sexual repression" is placed on the control of sex, saying that it's anti-natural and that it causes health problems. However the truth is all the contrary. History confirms that sexual degeneration has been the preamble to an organized social degeneration together with grave attempts against justice and freedom<sup>2112</sup>.

Others say that good and evil depend on the conscience of each. This is false, as we all have the obligation of adjusting our conscience to the objective truth. In moral as in everything else: the value of pi, the formula for water, the distance from earth to the moon, etc., is not what it seems to be. It is what it objectively is. It is not enough to be sincere to be in the truth. One can be sincerely wrong. The subjective thought must be in agreement with the objective truth.

This thing that **sexual liberty** makes young people more mature is a lie. It makes them more animals and absolute slaves to lust. **Tony Anatrella** psychoanalyst and professor of clinical Psychology says: Sexual experiences do not facilitate maturity. On the contrary, frequently they retard it<sup>2113</sup>.

Libertine sexuality is a symptom of personal immaturity and sexual unbalance<sup>2114</sup>.

Premarital sexual experiences cause psychological frustrations. A young person may be mature in his genitalia, but not psychologically. And sex requires the psychological complement in order to exercise it in a natural manner, in natural conditions. Premature sexual activity delays affective maturity and this remain for the future. Precocious sexual experiences impede true virility and femininity by jeopardizing the sexual conscience and love. To reduce sex and love to the genitalia is to impoverish it<sup>2115</sup>.

Famous Spanish sexologist **Dr. Gregorio Marañón** affirmed that the womanizer was a feminoid. Sexual masculine maturity makes a man monogamous: man of a single woman. The womanizer has not reached the cusp of virility. And if he is a *playboy*, he is a "toy boy" to women, says **Dr. Jose Botella**<sup>2116</sup>.

Besides, premarital sexual relations are useless, they do not guarantee success in marriage. Because marriage is much more than sexual harmony. Proof of this is that the majority of failed marriages that go to the psychiatrist have had sexual relations before their marriage. I heard a psychiatrist say that on the radio program *Protagonistas Nosotros*. And on the 9<sup>th</sup> of March, 1978 at ten thirty in the morning I heard the same thing on the same program being said by **D., Carlos Soler**, a member of the Tribunal for the Matrimonial Cause of Barcelona, that the great majority of failed marriages that go to the courts to end their marriages (some before one year of marriage) had had sexual relations before being married. After that, nothing served them. A study carried out by University of Wisconsin sociologists with a sample of 13 thousand individuals of either sex, has shown that the couples who had sexual relations before marriage failed as spouses in greater numbers than those who had not had sex<sup>2117</sup>.

<sup>2112</sup> RAFAEL GOMEZ PEREZ: *Problemas morales de la existencia humana*, 4<sup>a</sup>, VII, 4. Ed. Magisterio Español. Madrid

<sup>2113</sup> TONY ANATRELLA: *El sexo olvidado*, III, 5. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1994

<sup>2114</sup> EDMUNDO ELBERT: *Problemas actuales de psicología*, 2<sup>a</sup>, XI. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander.

<sup>2115</sup> MANUEL VIERA: *Vida sexual y psicología moderna*, V. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2116</sup> ABC Madrid, 6-XII-92. pg. 80

<sup>2117</sup> YA Newspaper, 16-VII-89, pg. 15

Although in films we continuously see couples that have sex and nothing happens, that is a film story, but in true life, it is bound to happen. If you do not want the pregnancy, don't have sex. To believe that nothing is going to happen is sheer foolishness. Whosoever enjoys advancing in the reasons of life thinking that nothing will happen, will end up in the cemetery. Nothing ever happens in films, but they do in real life.

Besides, those pre-matrimonial sexual experiences are totally inhibiting. The fear of pregnancy and the remorse encountered logically produce an inhibition that converts that act into something totally different from the complete giving which is done by love inside the marriage, with full rights, and inclusive as an act of virtue. The joy of the peace of mind of the conscience sublimates the happiness of human acts.

Psycho-pedagogue **Bernabe Tierno** says: "Many couples think that because they have made love in a manner that is more or less satisfactory, they are prepared for marriage, and that is a manifest error; the internal and external conditions before marriage are very different from the ones inside marriage<sup>2118</sup>."

Catholic moral has traditionally recognized the "courtship stage" as a special condition in which certain behaviors are legitimized which would normally be considered to be a disorder outside of a matrimonial perspective. In any case the genital use of sex will be considered always as an exclusive right of the spouses: it is a "matrimonial use". The deliberate use of the generative faculty is **forbidden** to all bachelors<sup>2119</sup>. "The use of the sexual function, has its moral rectitude only through legitimate matrimony", this was said at the Second Vatican Council. The New Catechism of the Catholic Church says: The sexual act must take place exclusively in marriage, outside of it, it will always constitute a grave sin, and will exclude people from sacramental communion<sup>2120</sup>. The use of the genital apparatus is **an exclusive right** of those who are married<sup>2121</sup>, as only they can respond to the responsibilities that their use carries. To engender children is the greatest thing that one can do in life. That is why converting sexuality into a game, is a crime. It is degrading the most sublime mission of man.

What fills man's heart is love. What a great abyss between the feeling you get from a prostitute to that of a loving wife. Sexuality without love cannot be satisfactory. The experience in life clearly demonstrates that the casual sexual union is much less satisfactory than the union of a stable couple who love each other. Sexual freedom, the casual sexual episode, at the beginning can be gratifying, but it will leave a sad soul in the long run. That is why those who go from body to body looking for that type of satisfactions logically end up fed up with everything, without an illusion, tired of living, unable to love, and resigned to not finding that lasting happiness with which all people dream.

Continence during the courtship is a **splendid pathway** to maturity. It is absolutely necessary for the happiness of the matrimony that the persons demonstrate in practice that the need of mutually possessing each other is subordinate to the presence of love. Because if you love a person, it is impossible to do away with the corporal gift, there are motives to ask oneself if the dominance belongs to the caring of to the sex., There is no reason to believe that he who is not able to love in continence, could do it in the matrimonial encounter. To say, as it sometimes happens: "you must give your body to me" is a subtle way of blackmail. Sexual solicitation is not love. If a couple wants to use the sexual act to see if they love each other, one must tell them: "to need this proof of love signifies a lack of love"<sup>2122</sup>.

<sup>2118</sup> YA Newspaper, 16-VII-89, pg. 11s

<sup>2119</sup> MARCELINO ZALBA, S. I...*Compendio de Teología moral*, pg. 761

<sup>2120</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2390

<sup>2121</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: Statement about certain questions on sexual Ethics, n° 5

<sup>2122</sup> WALTER TROBISH: Yo me case contigo, pg. 108. Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca

The human being is a person, not a thing. Love integrates respect into the person, or it is not love, even if there are erotic manifestations. As love does not consist in the arousal of the senses. Authentic love is not addressed only to the body, but to the whole person<sup>2123</sup>.

To be carried away by uncontrollable instinctive impulses is animalistic behavior, as said by **Julian Marias**: many sexologists are content to be zoologists<sup>2124</sup>

To reduce love to the level of genital pleasure is **to degrade it**. Love is, above all, the union of hearts and souls. Sex can enter into love, but it is not essential, nor the most important. Erotic avidness is not the same as personal love, to satisfy an instinct is not the same as to fulfill one's love to another person. To desire to satiate an instinctive impulse with a person is to instrumentalize her, not love her<sup>2125</sup>.

Whoever allows himself to be enslaved by sexual appetite **degrades himself**, he defiles himself, by being incapable of loving. Through instrumentalizing the other part, seeking his egotistical satisfaction, ends up not being able to love anyone. Not even an extraordinary person of whom he would love to be enamored with his complete soul, but it can't be, as his heart has dried up. Sexual adventures which he has unbridled enjoyed have incapacitated him to receive the greatest natural happiness that there is in the world, which is the love in a marriage, and of the children who give the person a goal for the rest of his life. The thirst of sexual pleasure has left him defrauded. This deception will undermine his psychology, producing a loathing of life, which may lead him to lose the joy of living.

Some, in trying to justify their conduct, repeat that coitus is a natural thing, that all couples that love each other do it. That is a lie. Couples that love each other and respect themselves and Catholic moral, do not do it. And on the other hand, many couples who do not love each other do it, they just do it to satisfy their hunger and vice. And man's happiness cannot reduce itself to pleasant corporal sensations, which are of the animal order. The spiritual is specific to man. That is why man delights and suffers more with the spiritual than with the material. If you are slapped in the middle of the street, the humiliation is more painful than the physical pain in the face. Thus, spiritual love makes you much more happy than the enjoyment of corporal pleasures.

Pleasure is not the same as happiness **Dr. Rodriguez Delgado**, Neurobiologist, for 22 years a professor at Yale, and since 1972 head of the Department of Investigation at the Ramón y Cajal Hospital, where he directs the Center for Neurobiological Studies, says that pleasure is not the same as happiness. Pleasure is in the senses. It is something common in animals. Happiness is something quite different<sup>2126</sup> Pleasure is a sensitive enjoyment, and happiness is a spiritual enjoyment. Pleasure is at the animal level. Happiness is at the human level. Man does not suffice with the animal. One can be very happy without the physical enjoyment, and you can have a lot of physical enjoyments and feel a void in your soul.

The human being cannot rescind from the spirit of being happy. True love elevates man. Sexuality without love degrades him. All who have no interest in pornography agree on this.

**Erich Fromm** who has scientifically analyzed, perhaps as no one in our time, the problematic of sex, affirms: "Obvious clinical facts show that men and women who dedicate their life to sexual satisfaction without restrictions, are not happy, and quite often suffer grave neurotic symptoms and conflicts."

Obsessed by the pornographic propaganda, there are cases of authentic **sexual maniacs**, who in their desire to experiment new and greater pleasant sensations, go to aberrations such as: three at a time, which is the total absence of love, substituting it for epidermal sensations. Love is not in the skin. It is impossible that he who degrades man's essence in this manner can find himself fully

<sup>2123</sup> KAROL WOJTYLA: Cardinal of Krakow, now Pope JOHN PAUL II: Amor y responsabilidad, II, 12s. Ed. FAX. Madrid.

<sup>2124</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid 25-IV-96. Pg. 73

<sup>2125</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS. El amor humano, XI. 2. EDIBESA. Madrid.

<sup>2126</sup> YA Newspaper, Sunday Edition, 9-IV-89, pg. 8

realized in life. Man does not realize himself by degradation. There are adults, who being lustful and evil, enjoy perverting adolescents, showing them and edging them on to lustful practices. Those who allow themselves to be duped, will possibly cry one day for seeing themselves enslaved by a vice that obsesses them. Just think how much happier are those who are free of this obsession!

It is frequent to find young men who have lived life so fast that they have burned their lives, and have become old before leaving their youth. They live without illusion about anything, they have tried everything and everything bores them, it tires them; they have a sad life, consuming alcohol, drugs, and dedicating themselves to doing nothing. Fed up with everything, they are now dry, as they lack spirit.

Illegitimate and precocious sexual experiences impede the adolescent to mature in his normal psychological personality, ethical and social, corrupting him through skeptic materialism and irresponsible self indulgence<sup>2127</sup>. **Freud** himself recognizes that libertine sex is the death of love: "Unlimited sexual freedom does not lead to better results. It will cost nothing to determine that the psychic value of sexual needs will go down as soon as obtaining satisfaction becomes easy. So that the libido grows, one must place obstacles in front of it. In the times that the amorous satisfaction has not encountered difficulties, love has lost all its value, life has become empty, and strong reactions have been needed to reestablish the indispensable affective values. From this point of view, it is possible to affirm that Christian asceticism has created, for love, a group of psychic values, which old paganism had not been able to confer upon it."<sup>2128</sup>

Unfortunately psychoanalysis was not well assimilated and carried many to sexual disorder. Self dominance and chastity were confused with repression. Wanting to avoid the dangers of this and to be free of old taboos, modern man fell into greater libertinism<sup>2129</sup>.

Don't be impressed with those that confuse virility with bestiality. Man's value is measured by its character and will power; but not by the sexual instinct, as the studs on a farm.

Celebrated Spanish physician, **Dr. Gregorio Marañón**, a specialist in these matters, speaks of "the need to tell the young people, and be it by the doctors, and not the priests that say it, that chastity not only isn't bad for your health, but it is a savings of future vitality; and that the condition of man is not measured by the form with which the sexual act is performed. On the contrary, if there is a specific virtue of that condition of man, it is the virtue of renunciation<sup>2130</sup>. Self dominion, willpower, self control, is a characteristic of man.

Not being able to dominate oneself is a characteristic of an animal. The animal invariably follows the strongest of the stimulus that arouses his instincts. Man can dominate his instinct with his willpower. The one who only does what is pleasant to him lives like an animal. Whoever does what he has to do, or likes or not, behaves like a man. The more man, the more he controls himself. The less he controls himself, the more animal he is.

That is why **Alexis Carrel**, Nobel prize in Medicine, adds: "saints are men who have been strongly sexed<sup>2131</sup>. You require much more virility to defeat the instinct than to be carried away by it.

Doctor **Marañón** adds, that the womanizer is a feminoid. His quest to conquer women is only to brag about his virility as he has an inferior male complex. He wants to compensate his autoconscience of a deficient masculinity with feminine conquests to demonstrate to himself and to others that he is truly a man. That is why he loses interest in the conquered woman. He wants new conquests, which suppose new successes.

And the same thing happens to some women who become frivolous, flirty, seductive to self convince themselves that they do awaken an attraction in men, and when one, seduced, wants to go

<sup>2127</sup> DR. NICOLAS PENDE: *La anarquía sexual de los jóvenes*. Folia Humanística (XI-67)829

<sup>2128</sup> SIGMUND FREUD: *La vie sexuelle*, pg. 63. Paris. 1969

<sup>2129</sup> MANUEL VIERA: *Vida sexual y psicología moderna, I*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2130</sup> GREGORIO MARAÑÓN: *Vocación y ética*. Pg. 173 Madrid. 1936

<sup>2131</sup> ALEXIS CARREL: *La incógnita del hombre, IV, 7*. Ed. Iberia. Barcelona. 1952

further, she will cut him off. "What do you think I am, a slut? I am a decent woman!, etc. etc. It was sufficient to self indulge herself into the fact that she is still desirable. She wanted to go no further.

In both cases, they use another person to self affirm themselves.

It is **senseless** and an affront to God to say that man cannot dominate his passion and therefore must pour it out whenever he pleases. If God orders us to repress lust, it is because it is possible; if not, God would be cruel by ordering an impossible. **Saint Augustine** says: God does not send impossibles, but orders you to do what you can do and ask Him for what you cannot do, that He will help you so that you can<sup>2132</sup>. Besides this, important international medical congresses have manifested that chastity, not only is possible, but also very good for the health. Some say that masturbation and sexual freedom are good. But this can only be said by those for whom sex is a consumer good, considering the hedonist view of life, totally at the margin of the law of God. But God cannot forbid what is good, nor send what is bad. That is why psychologists, in the most part, affirm that self control, motivated by an ideal, is beneficial for the maturation of the human being. No one gets sick because of being chaste. On the other hand there are many illnesses produced by lust. Proof of this is, that no doctor hangs a shingle on his door saying "Specialist in Chastity illnesses". But on the other hand, many doctors do put up a shingle that says "Specialist in sexually transmitted venereal diseases". This is because there are no sicknesses caused by chastity.

That is why **Dr. Surbled** says: "The evil of the ills of lust are known beyond discussion; while the illnesses of chastity are imaginary or supposed". The proof of this is that innumerable voluminous scientific works have dedicated themselves to expose the evils of lust, while on the other hand, there has never been an investigation to expose the evils of chastity<sup>2133</sup>.

**Dr. Juan José López Ibor**, Dean of the School of Psychiatry of the Faculty of Medicine in Madrid, also member of the Royal National Academy of Medicine and President of the World Federation of Psychiatry, says: "After thirty years of medical experience, I will tell you that I do not know of any case of neurosis whose cause is sexual repression"<sup>2134</sup>.

**Krafft-Ebing** says in his book *Sicopatología sexual*: "Many men, in good health and in good physical condition, can withhold their own passion, without hurting themselves in the least for having this continence"<sup>2135</sup>.

What has to be done is to accept chastity voluntarily and to live it with naturality. **Voluntary chastity** accepted due to an ideal is not repressive, but self control. is necessary in order to educate the will.

"My personal opinion, fruit of a long experience, is that from a continence, freely accepted, no consequential damage can occur, so young men, should have no fear. Sports and intense exercise are the best derivatives", **Professor Assmann**<sup>2136</sup>.

At a reunion of French doctors celebrated in 1970, it was said that it is false that having sex is indispensable for health and equilibrium<sup>2137</sup>.

What is missing is that the psychological mechanisms function with normality, harmonically integrating the sexual instinct in the whole person.

Therefore, the tale that the control of sexuality can produce neurotics is a fable originated by the pornographers whose main business is to exploit the sexual appetite of the people. Proof of this is that thousands and thousands of men and women who have consecrated their virginity to God, live with immense peace, happiness and health of body and mind.

The fact that at sometime there have been many chaste neurotics does not mean that chastity causes neurosis. A chaste man may be run over by a car, and we would not be able to say that the

<sup>2132</sup> SAINT AGUSTÍN: *De natura et gratia*, C, XLIII, n° 50 MIGNE. Patrología Latina, 44, 271

<sup>2133</sup> DR. CARNOT: *El libro del joven*, 1ª, I, 2. Ed. Studium. Madrid

<sup>2134</sup> SALVADOR PANIKER: *Conversaciones en Madrid*, IV. Ed. KAIROS. Barcelona. 1969

<sup>2135</sup> EDUARDO ARCUSA, S. I.: *Eternas preguntas*, IV, 6. Ed. Balmes, Barcelona

<sup>2136</sup> Dr. LUIS SCREMANN: *El vicio solitario. Appendix V*. Ed. Paulinas, Madrid

<sup>2137</sup> Celibat et sexualité: Coloquio des médecins Français. Pg. 129. Paris. 1970



chastity was the cause. What is not good, is to be exciting the sexual instinct with imaginations, desires, touching, etc., and then later on want to stop the physiological process. To start a string of Chinese firecrackers is easy, the hard thing is to put them out. If from the beginning you have the means to avoid this tension, to dominate sexual instinct, it can be a natural thing that doesn't present problems. That is why Catholic moral wants the dangers of sexual excitement to be distanced. When there is a control of sexual instincts sublimated by the ideal of service to God, and to fulfill His will in the purpose of sex, then, not only is there nothing damaging, but an enrichment of the human being. Proof lies in the immense number of persons who are physically and psychically extremely healthy having held their chastity in keeping with the Christian ideal.

A person is realized through love. But not necessarily through sexual love. The sacrificing of the sexual stream of human love does not have to result in being repressive when it is sublimated with the illusion of living a great ideal. To realize oneself as a person, sex is not the most important thing. The human being has spiritual values, ideals and illusions which are very superior to sexual satisfactions.

**Pornographers**, who make great amounts of money with pornography, have launched a campaign to ridicule Catholic moral, putting on it a label of "repressed" to all who are able to control their sexual appetite. But doctors do recommend the control of sexuality.

In the Second General Congress of the International Conference of Sanitary Prophylaxis, held in Brussels, Belgium, the one hundred and two doctors who are specialists on the subject, from all over the world, unanimously voted the following declaration: "We must, above all, teach young males that chastity and continence not only are not damaging, but that these virtues are the most recommendable from a purely medical point of view<sup>2138</sup>.

Therefore, one must consider as erroneous the opinion broadcast among the profane and sometimes among doctors, that says that the lack of sexual activity will lead to a gradual weakening of the capacity to create life. Even from the neuro-psychic point of view, sexual continence does not harm the healthy person in any way, especially if it is derived from an ideological orientation which translates into the practice with chastity of life and of thought<sup>2139</sup>

In the man who practices chastity, the hormones of those glandular secretions are reabsorbed by the organism, for which they are highly beneficial. And when the organism does not need them, they come out to the exterior, in a natural and physiological manner, free of all sin, in the **wet dreams** of semen produced during dreams more or less erotic, but that are never sin, as they are involuntary. What happens when dreaming is never a sin. These periodic nocturnal wet dreams have nothing wrong with them, they are an escape valve that appears when the body needs it, and they are normal among men who live in continence habitually or temporarily<sup>2140</sup>. Whoever wakes during a nocturnal ejaculation, must make no effort to repress it, as it is a simple physiological act<sup>2141</sup>. The best thing to do is to ignore, whenever possible, such a phenomenon. If you do not voluntarily accept this delight, there is no sin whatsoever.

Bachelors cannot engender children, as they need a family home for their education. That is why premarital sexual relations are forbidden by God. **Armando Palacio Valdes** says, that when the heart wants something, reason invents a theory. When we want something, it is easy to find reasons to justify it. But facing all the reasons of those who want to justify premarital sexual relations, is the word of God in the Bible that says: "The body is not for fornication<sup>2142</sup>", "Flee fornication<sup>2143</sup>", "Abstain from fornication<sup>2144</sup>", This is the will of God, that ye abstain from fornication<sup>2145</sup>", "fornicators shall not

<sup>2138</sup> JOSE BULNES, S. I.: *La Filosofía del deber*, VI. Ed. Fax. Madrid.

<sup>2139</sup> GIACOMO SANTORI, *Compendi di Sexologia*, I<sup>a</sup>, X. Ed. FAX. Madrid.

<sup>2140</sup> Dr. J. Domínguez: *Felicidad Sexual*, VII, 2. Ed. Plus Ultra. New York. 1971

<sup>2141</sup> B. HARING *La Ley de Cristo*, 2<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup>, V. 2 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2142</sup> I Corinthians, 6:13

<sup>2143</sup> I Corinthians, 6:18

<sup>2144</sup> Acts, 15:29

<sup>2145</sup> I Thessalonians, 4:3

inherit the kingdom of God<sup>2146</sup>, “God will judge whoremongers and fornicators<sup>2147</sup>”, “Fornicators will go to hell<sup>2148</sup>”.

Fornication is the carnal union between a man and a woman outside marriage<sup>2149</sup>.

**16. Lust’s worst punishment** is in the next life, but God has wanted that nature itself be vengeful of those who abuse her in illicit pleasures with sexually transmitted venereal diseases. These sicknesses are extremely dangerous and hereditary.

Lately, in Spain, they have reached alarming proportions. **Dr. Luis Olmos**, president of E.T.S., states that since 1982 the cases of sexually transmitted diseases have duplicated in Spain.<sup>2150</sup>

The magazine *Tribuna Medica* of Madrid, says that *syphilis* has taken over the common colds as the most prevalent illness in Spain<sup>2151</sup>.

Prostitution is a social blemish<sup>2152</sup>.

Never set foot in a **house of ill repute**, as it is an offense to God and a sin that kills your soul and condemns you to hell. But, also, because you will contract venereal diseases, which are hereditary, that frequently produce complications in the nervous system, acute problems in the heart, paralysis, dementia, etc. And this is not only for you, it is also for your wife and for your children. And it is a crime, that for a moment of pleasure, you should bring lifelong disgrace to your children, whom you are to love for life. The children of the syphilitic can be born paralyzed, blind, deaf-mute, imbecile, etc. “The syphilitic children are normally fodder for the insane asylum”. (**Doctor Corominas**). In the psychiatry books there is a special type of madness of the syphilitic called “syphilitic psychosis”. “Paralytic Dementia ordinarily presents itself about 10 to 15 years after the infection” There is no paralytic dementia that has not been caused by syphilis<sup>2153</sup>.

Syphilis can remain in a latent state, that is, to not manifest itself as it goes draining the organism, and causing damages, which are non-repairable, even if the best treatment is applied, if it is applied late<sup>2154</sup>.

Renowned syphilis specialist, professor **Fournier**. Says that syphilis causes destructive and disorganizing damages of organic tissues. Skin, bones, eyes, larynx, lungs, liver, stomach, intestines, nervous system, any organ can be attacked. And these lesions are always grave. The devastation caused by syphilis is generally aimed at the brain and the bone marrow. Nervous pains, paralysis, epilepsy, apoplexy, etc. are the almost inevitable patrimony of the syphilitic in its third stage<sup>2155</sup>.

**Do not trust** those who tell you that venereal diseases are cured today. It is true that sometimes they are cured, but not always. Some who thought themselves to be cured, married, and later had to suffer, with horror, the tragic consequences of their illness<sup>2156</sup>. The study conducted by the World Health Organization(WHO) in Geneve, Switzerland, on the evolution of syphilis during the years 1950-1963 demonstrates in an impressive manner how the number of cases have increased<sup>2157</sup>.

<sup>2146</sup> I Corinthians, 6:9s

<sup>2147</sup> Hebrews, 13:4

<sup>2148</sup> Apocalipsis, 2:8

<sup>2149</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2353

<sup>2150</sup> YA Newspaper, 7-VI-86, pg. 40

<sup>2151</sup> TRIBUNA MEDICA Magazine, 26-XII-75

<sup>2152</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2355

<sup>2153</sup> BLESS: *Pastoral Psiquiatrica, V, B, II, 5*. Ed. FAX. Madrid.

<sup>2154</sup> Dr. COROMINAS: *Vida sexual, 2ª, I, 10*. Ed. Gasso. Barcelona

<sup>2155</sup> P. HONAERT, S. I.: *El combate de la pureza, VI, 16* Ed. Sal Terrae, Santander. 7th edition

<sup>2156</sup> DR. CARNOT: *El libro del joven. 1ª, I, 1 and all of chapter IV of the 4th part*.

<sup>2157</sup> IBERCA de Actualidad Científica Magazine, 32(II-65)76

Syphilis, which seems to be eradicated, once again lifts up its ugly head and in a very troubling way<sup>2158</sup>.

**Lord Stonham**, Laborite sub secretary of the Ministry of the Interior in England, delivered a speech at the Assembly of British Physicians, about the increase of venereal diseases, notwithstanding medical advances<sup>2159</sup>.

According to recent statements by **Dr. Fernandez Turégano**, Head of the Medical services of the province of Madrid, venereal illnesses have shot up<sup>2160</sup>. Official statistics of the Spanish Health department confirm that there are over a thousand new cases each month<sup>2161</sup>.

Fifty million Americans are infected with genital herpes, which causes intense pain and is terribly uncomfortable<sup>2162</sup>.

**Dr. Martinez Torres**, dermovenerologist, delivered a brilliant conference in which he quoted a statistic from the World Health Organization in reference to the United States of America, where in 1971 there were two million cases of venereal illnesses which affected one in five of the population under twenty years old. There were five thousand cases in youngsters under fourteen years of age. Two thousand cases of minors under nine. The probability of an individual contracting a venereal illness before reaching the age of twenty five is nowadays about 50%<sup>2163</sup>.

In case of doubt, a lab test should be taken to determine the presence of syphilis.

For the love of your soul, for love of your body, for love of your future wife and your children, **do not allow yourself to be enslaved** by impure vice.

AIDS, which today is called the plague of the twentieth century because of the thousands of deaths which it has caused<sup>2164</sup>, does not have a cure as of today<sup>2165</sup>.

According to the World Health Organization during 1966 there were over 1,500,000 deaths due to AIDS<sup>2166</sup>. According to the same organization, there are about 5 to 10 million people who are affected with this syndrome<sup>2167</sup>. And the worse thing is that one can be an AIDS carrier without knowing it, as the AIDS virus has an incubation period of somewhere between five and ten years.

Spain is the country in Europe where AIDS is most rampant<sup>2168</sup>. Spain has three times more patients of AIDS than the mean of AIDS patients in the rest of the European nations<sup>2169</sup>. Spain is the European country which has more AIDS patients per inhabitant. Twice as many as France, who is in second place. This is stated by **D. Jose Torres Ibañez**, president of the Anti-AIDS foundation of Spain (FASE)<sup>2170</sup>

The Ministry of Health of Spain affirms that each week there are 25 new cases of AIDS<sup>2171</sup>. There are already 2,723 deaths of AIDS in Spain<sup>2172</sup>. According to **Francisco Parras**, Secretary to the National Plan on AIDS, this sickness is the first cause of death in the Spanish population in the

<sup>2158</sup> JUAN ROF CARBALLO: *El futuro del hombre, II*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2159</sup> ROCA VIVA Magazine, 336 (VIII,IX-96) 338

<sup>2160</sup> INFORMACIONES de Madrid Newspaper. Weekly Supplement n°323 (19-I-77) pg. 1

<sup>2161</sup> LA VERDAD; Newspaper of Murcia, 9-XII-77, pg. 5

<sup>2162</sup> ABC, Cultural. 192(7-VII-95) 53

<sup>2163</sup> YA of Madrid: Chronicle of Dr. Francisco Martino, 27-XII-93

<sup>2164</sup> ABC of Madrid Newspaper, 6-VIII-86. pg. 36

<sup>2165</sup> YA Newspaper, 14-VI-86. pg. 28

<sup>2166</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 27-I-97, pg. 68

<sup>2167</sup> YA Newspaper, 24\_VI-86, pg. 41

<sup>2168</sup> YA Newspaper, 8-VI-88, pg. 18

<sup>2169</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 23-II-95, pg. 41

<sup>2170</sup> CADIZ Daily, 1-VII-97, pg. 28

<sup>2171</sup> EL CORREO ESPAÑOL-EL PUEBLO VASCO, 15-VII-88, pg.53

<sup>2172</sup> YA Newspaper, 22-II-90, pg. 58

age group of 25 to 39 years of age<sup>2173</sup>. There are more deaths from AIDS than on the highway in Spain for young people<sup>2174</sup>.

**Dr. Damaso Diego Lopez**, Chief microbiologist at the Puerta de Hierro Clinic, and Head Professor of Microbiology at the Autonomous University of Madrid, during the symposium celebrated at the Century XXI Club, on the problematic of AIDS, stated: AIDS can turn into being a form of "mortal flu"<sup>2175</sup>.

According to the World Health Organization there are over 250 million cases of sexually transmitted diseases every year, that is about one in twenty people<sup>2176</sup>.

**Montagnier**, discoverer of AIDS in 1983, considers that the fight against AIDS is lost, as the speed of propagation of the virus has surpassed the speed with which scientists are working on the search of a solution<sup>2177</sup>.

A team of investigators of the University of Frankfurt have published in the Medical Investigation magazine "*Nature*", that AIDS is deadly for 75% of the bearers of this illness<sup>2178</sup>.

**Dr. Adamson** and his collaborators of Hopkins University have published in the North American Scientific Magazine "*Science*" that the AIDS virus penetrates the central nervous system and is the cause of severe dementia in 20% of the AIDS cases<sup>2179</sup>.

It is curious that today, not only priests and moralists. But also doctors recommend to youngsters to maintain their purity. As one of the main causes of the transmission of AIDS has been sexual promiscuity, **Dr. Jonathan Mann**, Director of the Program on AIDS of the WHO, affirms that the best way to combat AIDS is sexual abstinence<sup>2180</sup>.

**Dr. Justo Aznar**, Chief of the department of Clinical Biopathology of the Hospital of the Faith in Valencia, says that "the only sure way to avoid AIDS is the stable and healthy couple, monogamy and happiness"<sup>2181</sup>. And **Dr. Gomez Lavon**, psychiatrist says: "the only effective means of prevention against AIDS and other venereal diseases is chastity in youth and conjugal fidelity"<sup>2182</sup>.

**Dr. Alfonso Delgado Rubio**, speaking on National Radio, in January 1991, said: the only sure way to avoid AIDS is the fidelity of the couple, and that the AIDS virus can lay dormant for many years.

In the Japanese campaign against AIDS, it is said: "Do you know that every time you go to bed with your friend, you are also going to bed with his last girlfriend, with a friend that she had before, and with the friends of this friend? Maybe one had AIDS?"<sup>2183</sup>

As happened to that girl—a historic case—who found out one day that she had AIDS, and later on found out that sometime ago a boy who she had gone to bed with, had died of AIDS.

**Harvey Finenberg**, dean of the School of Public Health, Harvard University, says: "Anyone who has sex outside of marriage has an exposure to contract AIDS"<sup>2184</sup>.

The AIDS virus corrupts the vital fluids transforming blood and semen from fountains of life to instruments of death. And during the latency period, which can last eight years or more, the patient appears to be healthy, but can transmit the virus to another person<sup>2185</sup>.

<sup>2173</sup> CADIZ DAILY, 19-X-95, pg.27

<sup>2174</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 2-III-97, pg. 88

<sup>2175</sup> YA Newspaper, 13-II-86, pg. 36

<sup>2176</sup> CADIZ DAILY, 26-X-94, pg. 30

<sup>2177</sup> YA Newspaper, 15-VII-91. pg. 49

<sup>2178</sup> YA Newspaper, 5-XII-86, pg. 39

<sup>2179</sup> ABC Cultural, 267, (13-XII-96) 54

<sup>2180</sup> YA Newspaper, 19-II-88, pg. 9

<sup>2181</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 4-II-93, pg. 69

<sup>2182</sup> YA Newspaper, 26-XII-92, pg. 16

<sup>2183</sup> YA Newspaper, 11-XI-92, pg. 6

<sup>2184</sup> HARVEY FINENBERG: Investigación y Ciencia Magazine, XII, (1988) 122

<sup>2185</sup> HARVEY FINENBERG: Investigación y Ciencia Magazine, XII, (1988) 122

Recently, Spanish Television and National Radio of Spain have been insistently broadcasting the use of condoms in sexual relations in order to avoid AIDS, as if this remedy were foolproof. However, American sexologists, **Masters, Johnson & Kolodny**, affirm that they know of cases of transmission of AIDS via sexual contact even though they had used a prophylactic<sup>2186</sup>. **Carlos Domat**, Italian Minister of –health, in a letter to twenty million families, recommends chastity against AIDS, as the prophylactic is not a sure remedy against the disease<sup>2187</sup>.

The National Assembly in a sentence passed in 1993, cancelled the campaign “PÓNTELO, PÓNSELO” (put it on you, put in on your partner) because it hid the risks associated with the use of a prophylactic, due to the high percentage of failures in the prevention of AIDS<sup>2188</sup>.

**Dr. Jeronimo Lejeune**, Professor of Fundamental Genetics at Paris University, has affirmed that: “all of those responsible for health, know perfectly well that prophylactics cannot stop the AIDS epidemic”<sup>2189</sup>. It has been proven that in 10% of the cases, the use of a condom does not prevent AIDS<sup>2190</sup>. 10% of those who have contracted AIDS, were using a prophylactic<sup>2191</sup>. A study published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* indicates that the failure rate of the condom to avoid the transmission of AIDS, can reach up to 17%<sup>2192</sup>. The very Ministry of Health recognizes in their epidemiological bulletin (nº2802, dated Jan, 1988) that the use of a condom does not eliminate the risk of acquiring AIDS<sup>2193</sup>. In the magazine *Farmacéuticos* a journal of the General Council of the Official Colleges of said profession, **D. Rafael Muñoz**, President of the Official College of Jaén, says that the prophylactic does not avoid AIDS; that is why Spain being the country of the European Community where more condoms are sold, is also the one that has more AIDS patients.

Professor **Polaino**, Professor of Psychopathology at the Complutense University of Madrid, has said: “It is an error to combat the proliferation of AIDS through the use of condoms. I have treated many patients with AIDS who had used condoms. Probably, if they had not used them, they wouldn’t have had sexual relations, and now, they wouldn’t have AIDS”<sup>2194</sup>.

**Andre Frossard**, renowned communist, later a convert to Catholicism, author of the book titled *God exists, I found him*, when referring to the campaign that recommends the use of a prophylactic to combat AIDS, says: “Can a lie help combat AIDS”<sup>2195?</sup>”

**Alfonso Lopez Quintas**, professor at the Complutense University of Madrid, stated in the ABC newspaper “It is incomprehensible that the use of condoms be considered as a decisive remedy against AIDS. Specialists affirm that condoms, even though they be of good quality and used properly, sometimes fail. And he ends with these words: “I would like to know until when this farce of affirming that they are against AIDS, and they continue to promote the business of selling prophylactics”<sup>2196</sup>.

“A prophylactic only protects about 70%, and therefore the official campaigns that promote the use of these prophylactics, are in error, as to the prevention of AIDS”, was said by the President of the Federation of Family Planning of Denmark, **Dr. Mogens Osler**. Texas University has demonstrated that in 32% of the cases, the condom does not prevent the transmission of AIDS<sup>2197</sup>.

There are pores in the material of which condoms are made, which allow the passage of the HIV (the AIDS virus), as demonstrated, through electronic microscopy, by the scientist **Cecil H. Fox**,

<sup>2186</sup> YA Magazine, 22-V-88, pg. 11

<sup>2187</sup> YA Newspaper, 6-1-89, pg.13

<sup>2188</sup> FAMILIA CRISTIANA Magazine 3 (III-95)11

<sup>2189</sup> CADIZ DAILY, 4-XII-90, pg. 32

<sup>2190</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2502 (17-XI-90)9

<sup>2191</sup> YA Newspaper, 1-XI-88, pg. 13

<sup>2192</sup> ABC of Madrid Newspaper, 4-II-93, pg 69

<sup>2193</sup> YA Newspaper, 15-IV-93, pg. 16

<sup>2194</sup> CADIZ Daily, 15-IX-90, pg. 27

<sup>2195</sup> PROYECCIÓN MUNDIAL Magazine, 38(1995) 50s. México, D.F.

<sup>2196</sup> ABC of Madrid Newspaper, 6-XII-94, pg. 14

<sup>2197</sup> ABC of Madrid Newspaper,, 15-VIII-94 pg. 56

of the National Health Institute of Maryland. The AIDS virus is much smaller than the pores of the material of the condom, and, according to **Hopkins** in *Population report n° 8*. The diameter of the pores in the latex material is about 5 microns, while the size of the lethal AIDS virus is about 0.1 microns<sup>2198</sup>, in other words, the virus is fifty times smaller than the pores of the latex.

“The prevention of AIDS through the use of a condom is a fairy tale”, this categorically affirmed by **Professor Hansjürgen Raetting**, Director of the Health Office of the Federal German Republic.

At the International AIDS Symposium, held in Valencia, it was said that: “the prophylactic is not sufficient to avoid AIDS<sup>2199</sup>. There was not a single voice raised to claim that the condom is the best solution to prevent AIDS.

Transmission of AIDS is almost always related to sexual relations. And these are fomented through the false propaganda that condoms give you an absolute security<sup>2200</sup>. That is why the World Health Organization recognizes that the evolution of sexual behavior is of capital importance<sup>2201</sup>.

The Swiss Information Office on AIDS says: “The most recent studies on the prevention of AIDS demonstrate that the supposal that condoms offer a trustworthy protection against AIDS is a dangerous illusion<sup>2202</sup>. Educators have experimentally proven that the teachings on chastity not only favor the maturity of the character, but also diminish the number of pregnancies among adolescents in a more effective way than the teachings of birth control methods<sup>2203</sup>.

Wouldn't it be better and more effective to teach the youngsters about purity? Wouldn't it be more reasonable to say that the true solution is to respect the use of the procreative capacity within marriage, which is the natural use of sex? This is the only dignified way to keep away from AIDS.

While in the United States, the Secretariat of Health has broadcast in *Colleges* a document recommending continence to the youth in order to avoid AIDS<sup>2204</sup>, our Socialist Ministry of Education, sent to the Bachelor Centers a document advising on the use of condoms to avoid AIDS<sup>2205</sup>. The socialist Ministry of Social Matters, has given away a million condoms to adolescents<sup>2206</sup>. On the other hand, the **Clinton** administration has granted three hundred million dollars for the education of chastity among the young<sup>2207</sup>.

Because of their worry over AIDS, this has made Americans be more careful in their sexual encounters. There are signs that conjugal fidelity is on the rise<sup>2208</sup>. Couples are valuing fidelity and respect more and more each day, according to a study published by the Ministry of Social Matters<sup>2209</sup>.

According to some sociological studies carried out by the press agency EFE, the majority of Spanish youngsters opt for the religious wedding and matrimonial fidelity and reject the out of wedlock sexual relationships<sup>2210</sup>.

It is good to know, even if it seems to be contrary, that there are more pure young men. “A recent survey in six American universities has demonstrated that four fifths of the students have not had sexual relations”<sup>2211</sup>.

<sup>2198</sup> MIR Magazine. 2 (IX-95) 7

<sup>2199</sup> ABC of Madrid Newspaper, 15-IV-93, pg. 73

<sup>2200</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS *El amor humano. I. I.* EDIBESA. Madrid. 1991

<sup>2201</sup> DIARO DE CADIZ Newspaper, 30-XI-91, pg. 30

<sup>2202</sup> YA Newspaper, 24-I-92, pg. 20

<sup>2203</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 13-VI-94. pg. 96

<sup>2204</sup> YA Newspaper, 10-VI-90, pg. 15

<sup>2205</sup> YA Newspaper, 10-VI-90, pg. 15

<sup>2206</sup> DIARIO 16 Newspaper, Crónica del siglo XX, n° 124, pg. 1483

<sup>2207</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 15-VIII-94, pg. 57

<sup>2208</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 31-I-86

<sup>2209</sup> CADIZ DAILY, Newspaper, 14-II-94, pg. 48

<sup>2210</sup> YA Newspaper, 14-II-94, pg. 48.

<sup>2211</sup> BLANCA VERASTEGUI, Psychologist. DIALOGO Magazine, 1979

Precisely, it is in the United States where the “virginity clubs” are now in fashion, where young persons of both sexes form support groups to encourage each other in their moral covenant to remain pure until marriage.<sup>2212</sup> Today one can see American girls sporting shirts that say “I am a virgin, and proud of it”. About 40% of United States adolescents maintain their virginity<sup>2213</sup>.

There was a manifestation in Washington where 200 thousand young people proclaimed their desire to remain virgin until marriage<sup>2214</sup>.

**The excess of sexuality** has provoked a reaction at the birthplace of the sexual revolution. A professor of Psychology of Berkley University, **Gabrielle Brown**, has written a book that has become a “best seller”, and it is a catechism of the anti-sex, the apology of voluntary continence. It is titled “*Why abstinence is a pleasure*”. It deals with the frustrations and neurosis caused by sexual libertinism.

Opposite to sexual libertinism which today in Spain some proclaim to the four corners of the earth, it is curious that in California, which is the birthplace of sexual libertinism, the pendulum has swung back, and what is now in vogue is sexual continence. Magazines publish full pages of “Down with Sex. Tenderness lives”<sup>2215</sup>, “The Sexual Revolution is Over”, as is read in TIME Magazine issue of the first week of April of 1984, the most widely read magazine in the world. As of page 48 you can read these phrases: “Obsession for sex dwindles”, “Young people prefer love to the flesh”. “Half the young people say that sex without love is unacceptable.. “Divorce is down and marriages are up”. “The majority of Americans relate to the family, to marriage and to the traditional idea that sex without love makes no sense”<sup>2216</sup>. Also, in Italy, it has become fashionable among the young to be chaste<sup>2217</sup>.

In Sweden they are also back from sexual libertinism. “With the same speed with which several decades ago the thoughtlessness of customs started, it is now in reverse and morality is back in fashion. Young people are married by the church, abortions are diminishing and the birth index is rising. It is frequent to have three or four children, something unimaginable a few years ago. It is a return to traditionalism<sup>2218</sup>.

The incurable character of AIDS and the fact that there are over half a million new cases every year, has been a determining factor for many North Americans to think of the convenience of returning to the old fashioned sexual canons, in which the couple must remain monogamous, and happiness is a recognized value. Many opinions, like that of therapist **Dominik Riccio** of New York, underline this change in the sexual habits of Americans. “They are disillusioned with free sex and are scared stiff in front of the danger of contracting herpes, and to have it forever”, says this specialist. Genital herpes has destroyed many a couple and has caused deep psychological problems in its victims, sinking them into depression and isolation.<sup>2219</sup>

**Genital herpes** is a venereal disease which is transmitted through sexual contact and whose virus goes to the nervous system and in women will produce cervical cancer and in the newborn will produce cerebral lesions which will jeopardize his mental development<sup>2220</sup>

**Dr. Juan Rey Calero**, professor of preventive medicine at the Autonomous University of Madrid, has said that the fact that sexual relations between adolescents have increased between the years 1980 and 1990, has produced an extraordinary increase among them of sexually transmitted diseases. A third of these patients are adolescents<sup>2221</sup>.

<sup>2212</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 7-II-94, pg. 48

<sup>2213</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 15-VIII-94, pg. 48

<sup>2214</sup> MIR Magazine, 4(1995)8 Tijuana. México

<sup>2215</sup> YA Newspaper, 3-X-85, pg. 8

<sup>2216</sup> YA Newspaper, 6-V-84, pg. 8

<sup>2217</sup> YA Newspaper, 14-IV-89, pg. 14

<sup>2218</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid, 1-IV-86, pg. 54

<sup>2219</sup> RIDCARDO GOMEZ ALONSO, YA Newspaper, 16-IX-87, pg. 14

<sup>2220</sup> YA Newspaper, 22-IV-85, pg. 5

<sup>2221</sup> YA Newspaper, 16-VII-92, pg. 24

**Roberto Gallo**, an American Scientist, has discovered that virus HPLV-III, agent for AIDS, has manifested that this virus can remain in the individual's body for his life. Besides, AIDS, it seems, degenerates into cancer.

The Japanese Government has approved a decree by which the entry into Japan by HIV positive foreigners is forbidden<sup>2222</sup>.

AIDS can also be transmitted through sexual relations between lesbians. According to the British Medical Journal, *The Lancet*, a lesbian woman, having AIDS, testified that she did not do drugs, nor did she receive a blood transfusion, nor did she have sexual relations with any man: only with lesbians<sup>2223</sup>.

According to British doctor **John Seall**, in the *British Medical Journal* this illness can be contracted through a kiss, as saliva is a medium for the transmission of AIDS<sup>2224</sup>.

During the World Conference on AIDS, held in Florence in June of 1991, the team of investigators from the Oncology Institute of Boston, informed that AIDS can also be transmitted through the mucous in the mouth. In other words, a "wet" kiss could transmit AIDS<sup>2225</sup>. **Williams Roger**, responsible for the Infection Control Centers in the United States, had the same opinion, as published in *The Lancet*. That is why the Actor's Guild of the USA have adopted a stance that actors and actress' must be informed before accepting a role, what type of kiss they will have to perform, and with who<sup>2226</sup>. Many experts on AIDS are convinced that this virus is present in all bodily fluids, saliva included<sup>2227</sup>. EPITONE, an American company is marketing a method to diagnose AIDS by analyzing saliva<sup>2228</sup>.

17. It is frequent these days to hear biased and corrupt ideas about sexuality, which tend to "brainwash" people to take them to sexual libertine action, which is the main business of pornographers. The Dictionary of the Royal Academy of the Spanish Language, defines pornography as. "the commercialization of sex".

We don't say that sex is sinful, if it is used correctly; what is not licit is the consumption of sex that pornographers have promoted, in order to sell their magazines, books and films in which sex is turned into a vice. By seeing it in the movies many young people play at love, like children play cowboys and Indians. But sexuality is a very serious matter, not a plaything.

The disordered enjoyment of sex pleasure is called **lust**.

To proclaim absolute sexual freedom may seem to be progressive, but it really opposes the results of the best contemporary investigation. And whoever confronts investigation is not a realist, he is a dreamer who really is trying to seduce, but not to convince<sup>2229</sup>, and much less help!

**Saint Augustine** says: "Love and do whatever you want". Some have taken this to mean sexual liberty, as if what is done in love is never a sin. But what **Saint Augustine** wanted to say was that the one who truly loves will do good without having to consult the law<sup>2230</sup>.

Today it is lavish to **have coitus on a friendship basis**. Much is being said about "making love", but this phrase is false; love is not made, love is given. Things are made. Love is had. Love flows from the mutual esteem between two people. The failure of love in free sex communes is quite notable..

<sup>2222</sup> YA Newspaper, 25-II-87, pg. 42

<sup>2223</sup> YA Newspaper, 14-I-89, pg. 19

<sup>2224</sup> YA Newspaper, 12-VII-87, pg. 16

<sup>2225</sup> LA VANGUARDIA Newspaper, Barcelona, 20-VI-91, pg. 38

<sup>2226</sup> YA Newspaper,, 1-XI-85, pg. 36

<sup>2227</sup> CADIZ DAILY, Newspaper, 3-XII-91, pg. 56

<sup>2228</sup> ABC Cultural, 120(18-II-94) 57, 218 (5-I-96) 56

<sup>2229</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS *El amor humano*. XI. 11. EDIBESA. Madrid. 1991

<sup>2230</sup> RENE LAURENTIN: *Creo en Dios*, IV. Ed. San Pablo. Madrid. 1996



While wanting to enjoy life, what is really done is to incapacitate oneself for love, which is the only happiness of life. Prostitutes, who live from sex but without love, are a clear example that happiness is not possible without love. They are called “*XX century slaves*” *The slavery of the woman*. Are titles of books on prostitution.

A nymphomaniac writes: With all the men I have known, I have allowed myself to go to bed with them. I have one adventure after another. That is the story of my life and I hate it with all my soul<sup>2231</sup>.

To reduce love to pleasant sensations is to degrade it. Love has a spiritual feeling that is superior to all organ manipulation techniques. Love is a fountain of tenderness, while the most a body can give is the shuddering of an orgasm. Surveys carried out by a doctor demonstrate that many young people perform the coitus to demonstrate their masculinity, and the girls, because others do it. In other words, today many are ashamed of their purity and brag about their sexual freedom.

There are even those who call a person, civilized and mature, when they break moral codes, in order to live as they please. This to me, is a fallacy. A person is much more mature when he has self control, and knows how to behave within common morals. To call moral rectitude repressive atavism is to want to put a dunning label on values he does not want to recognize. But jewels that have a value, do not lose their value because the person does not know how to appreciate them. Maturity is fully shown when we do not choose that which satisfies our temporary appetite, but allows us to gain the ideal which we seek as a goal in life.<sup>2232</sup>

We live in an erotic society. Sex has been converted into a consumer good. We live sex without love. As a result, there is a loathing, which causes a special feeling of emptiness<sup>2233</sup>.

**The erotic environment**, in which we are living,, makes us assume that having sex is the greatest happiness in the world, and then it turns out that it is not so; as the physical carnal sensations give less than spiritual happiness. Sexologists say: “sexual activity is not the most important thing in life”<sup>2234</sup>. No matter how much sex a woman has, when she finds another who lives love, she feels a great envy, as she misses what sex alone cannot give her.

It was **V. Franki**, who has come forth to explain, against what his teacher **Freud** said, that the most important dimension of man is not sex, but the religious sense, transcendent, the possibility of possessing an ultimate sense which would give reason to everything that we do. When man lacks this sense, which makes him capable of overcoming pain and be above death, he falls sick. And that is how the typical illness of our time comes to be: anguish; anguish that comes forth from the loss of transcendent sense. And what **V. Franki** affirms about happiness is very profound: “**Happiness** can never be sought directly, It can only come as a consequence of having given the best of ourselves to a noble cause, able to surpass the limitation, the lack of glee and death to a transcendent cause”

This is the problem of today’s man, who now more than ever lives without roots, without values which will take him to a higher plane. It is true that every human action has to have the prerogative of liberty, but today’s man, has made of freedom, which is an instrument, an end in itself, and thus, is already experimenting something known from all times: that freedom does not liberate, truth liberates<sup>2235</sup>.

There are those **who in the name of liberty** want to get rid of all types of holds. To them it is a lesson to see the inscription under a drawing in the Pannonhalma Abbey, representing a wine barrel without its retaining rings, and the wine escaping through the cracks. The sign says: “It was lost through freedom”<sup>2236</sup>.

<sup>2231</sup> EDMUNDO ELBERT: *Problemas actuales de psicología*, 2ª, XI. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>2232</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS *El amor humano*. X. 14. EDIBESA. Madrid. 1991

<sup>2233</sup> Dr. ENRIQUE ROJAS: *Remedios para el desamor*, VII, 4. Ed. Temas de Hoy. Madrid. 1991

<sup>2234</sup> Dr. GAUDEFROY: *Estudios de sexología*, III, 2, B, 2. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2235</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *YA Newspaper*, 24-IX-87. pg. 17

<sup>2236</sup> TIHAMER TOTH: *Creo en Jesucristo el Mesías*, XXVI, 2. A. B. Ed Atenas. Madrid.

National and foreign press are lately being an echo of the erotic atmosphere and the sexualized environment which modern civilization is forcing us to breathe, who boasts of having buried myths, and who promised to free man of the neurosis and obsessions of certain blind repressions, which wanted to make man an angelic being.

But instead of liberating man, his fragility has been subject to the omnipresent harassment of anything related to sex and is leaving him defenseless in the battle to integrate sexual instinct and give it in service to life and authentic love. The sexual initiation that our youngsters need, has nothing to do with the encyclopedic illustration of all the sexual abuses and perversions, together with the wave of erotic themes, the intimate bedroom scenes, nor with the supermarkets of love.<sup>2237</sup>

With the hypocrite banner of "taboo liberation", there is now, on a world scale, a disconcerting exaltation of nudism, naturalism and obscenity, which permeates all, originating a scandalous breach of public and private morals. Well, if no remedy is put on in time, we will go to the degrading of human nature in a pansexual world. And the worst thing is that there is barely a social reaction against the moral aggressions that are made everywhere against clean habits, as if a general abdication of the natural and Christian sense of what is proper and licit were to prevail among persons and institutions who should actively watch over public moral. The passivity maintained facing the progression of erotic and pornographic initiatives, shows a general reduction of the rights and duties in the face of a state of matters each time more and more depressing<sup>2238</sup>.

Resulting out of all of this, is the case of the young girl who ended up being pregnant, and did not know who the father of the baby was, as in the month previous, she had gone to bed with three different boys. A sad situation, but a logical consequence for a girl who did not have "old fashioned scruples", and who did not deny herself any pleasure that enticed her. These things happen when morals are not respected. Or that other case, of a young man who went to initiate his sexual life with a "lady", and then found out that she was the mother of his best friend, of that other case in which two lovers find out that they cannot be married, because, not knowing it, they are brother and sister, the result was that her father had gone to bed with her boyfriend's mother. Or that of the boy who would go to bed with all his girlfriends, and the day he fell in love, he received a moral hammer blow, which destroyed him, upon finding out that his father had gone to bed, before him, with the girl he was now in love with. This is what happens when sexual libertinism jumps over the barriers of Catholic morality. If God sends chastity to the young and fidelity to marriages, it is not for the pleasure of bothering them, but because it is necessary for the happiness of the home. How can a man go to his marriage, knowing full well that the one who is to be his wife, has belonged to as many men as had wished her? It is logical that those marriages end up in divorce. How can a man love his children, if he cannot know if those children are his or of any of the men who "have had" her. Neither love of wife, nor love of children. In a society in which youth is not chaste, and marriages are not faithful, love at home has been killed, which is the supreme of all happiness that God has given us in this life.

Sexual freedom in the young is atrophying their sexuality. So much sexuality is diminishing the capacity of sexual response and the sexual impulse requires more and more stimulus, as **impotence** increases. This is affirmed by **Dr. Lopez Ibor**<sup>2239</sup>.

That is why more young men seek a doctor, as they are having problems of **sexual impotence**, as was said in an interview on Spanish National Radio<sup>2240</sup>. It is because God has made sexuality a service in marriage. But those who convert sexuality into a vice, logically will destroy it. In the medical journal FANO, it is stated that many sexual dysfunctions and male impotence are due to early and premarital sexual experiences<sup>2241</sup>

<sup>2237</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1434 (29-III-69)4

<sup>2238</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1506(29-VIII-70)

<sup>2239</sup> Dr. López Ibor: *Libro de la vida sexual*, pg. 156

<sup>2240</sup> Dr. MERELO: sexologist. May 8, 1978

<sup>2241</sup> JANO Magazine, 308 (26-I-78)28

Some reduce love to the “mechanics” of the genitalia. This is an aberration. The physiological satisfaction of some organs has nothing to do with love, which is of the whole person, including his spiritual soul. Trivialization of sexuality amongst youth is causing many youngsters to enter into marriages when they become bored of genital activity, precisely at a time when logic dictates that they be living the apex of their lovingness. Sexual libertinism of the young is giving origin to an increase in impotence and frigidity.

There are sexology “teachers” that conclude that the total success of the couple is centered on the fact that sex “functions” well. They have a single dimensional view of the couple. They reduce everything to the zoological-biological. Man is much more than an animal. Man can love, can communicate ideas and ideals, can feel a spiritual harmony; and all this takes him to a gratifying wholeness. Human happiness is much more than a mere sensitive pleasure. To extend sexuality without love, simply as a “basic instinct” is to animalize man.

Libertine sexuality is the way that many have tried to overcome what they call taboos and archaic repressions, and they have only been able to animalize human sexuality, separating it from love and therefore, negating happiness. Sexologists affirm that sexuality without love fills the soul with a vacuum, and sometimes requires the pleasure of aggressiveness (rapes), tied together with the most diverse forms of sexual impotence and frigidity. That is why today, many modern sexologists are of the opinion that we must go back to the reestablishment of the so called “sexual taboos”<sup>2242</sup>.

There are those who **laugh at the cautions** of sexual morality and boast of being very “modern”, defending more sexual liberty. The consequences are already scaring conscientious persons. **Libertine sexuality** has troubling consequences, such as rape and adolescent pregnancies. In 1983, in New York, one of every three births was extra-matrimonial. In the US, there are over a million teenage pregnancies<sup>2243</sup>.

**John Hamilton**, considered one of the most prestigious sociologists in the US, in a study of the sexual problems of youth, says that in 1976, there were some 750 thousand pregnancies of girls under the age of 17. The majority did not know who the father was. Very few marry afterwards. Adolescent marriages almost always fail<sup>2244</sup>.

This is the result of sexual liberation and the forgetting of the moral norms of the Church. Sex is a very serious thing. It is not a toy. So many unwanted pregnancies are food for thought. To bring a child into this world is not a plaything. To take “precautions” is not enough. The proof is in so many unwanted pregnancies. The only solution is the morality of the church.

“A person has a right to receive information and an education which respects moral and spiritual dimensions of human life”<sup>2245</sup>.

Today the philosophy of the no risk pleasure is fashionable: no risk of AIDS, no pregnancy risk. This, besides downgrading sex, which is not only for pleasure, is the cause of many failings, as AIDS patients who used condoms, and unwanted pregnancies, even though they did use condoms.

Authorities in Puerto Rico are alarmed and are looking for a solution to the number of adolescent mothers. According to the statistics given by the Department of Health, in 1986 there were one thousand mothers between the ages of 12 to 15, that, in a population of three million people<sup>2246</sup>

<sup>2242</sup> DR. JUAN ROLF CARBALLO: Sábado Grafico 941 (14-VI-75)

<sup>2243</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2642 (10-II-90)13

<sup>2244</sup> CADIZ Daily, 18-VI-78, pg. 6

<sup>2245</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2344

<sup>2246</sup> EL DIA Newspaper of San Juan de Puerto Rico, 8-II-89, pg. 8

In Spain, there are 20,000 pregnancies amongst adolescents each year<sup>2247</sup>.

In Spain, each year, the number of adolescent pregnancies is growing. This was affirmed at the XIX National Congress of the Spanish Gynecological Association. In the last ten years, in Spain, there has been a 500% increase in the number of single adolescents who got pregnant<sup>2248</sup>. Lately, in Spain, there is a growing number of adolescents affected by sexually transmitted venereal diseases<sup>2249</sup>. Today in Spain, the number of sexually transmitted diseases has doubled<sup>2250</sup>. Lately, there is some worry of a type of cancer that is sexually transmitted called HPV<sup>2251</sup>.

This sexual degradation of the Spanish youth is due to the campaign carried out by the socialist government promoting sexual freedom to pervert youth and drive them away from the church. "The way of treating the sexual problem within the state communications media and in certain writings published by the Socialist Administration, is indicative that they are not only trying to inform on sexuality, but to incite the practice of erotic relations."<sup>2252</sup> In flyers on sexual information published by certain states, also including the ministry of Health, orientation is given to children and young adults of a sexuality that has as its objective to be able to have sensible enjoyment. And this is presented as a liberation from previous generations which were repressed by moral norms. These flyers include phrases such as: "nothing is abnormal if you like it!", "you have the right to enjoy your body", "to accept that you like people of your sex is not a felony, it is a right that you have". It is hard to believe that this is being done by people who are responsible for governing the country<sup>2253</sup>

Famous psycho-pedagogue **Dr. Bernabe Tierno**, commenting on the publication by the socialist Ministry of Social Matters on sexual information, says the following: "After a careful reading of the text, the first impression is that what apparently is presented as information, seems more like a clear incitation. Therefore my criticism is fundamentally directed to the superficiality with which they explain a series of techniques and methods to avoid the unwanted consequences of a sexual relation, to which, in a gleeful manner, they entice the youngsters, more or less, directly. The ease, tranquility and brashness with which they pretend to help adolescents by exposing diverse warnings, methods and techniques, constitutes a double edged sword: the knowledge and use of them will convert into an additional incentive so that sexual relations continue to increase, and with them, the increase in adolescent mothers. My long experience in education tells me, that it is of little or no sense to use extrinsic techniques if the individual's internal motivation is missing. While pleasure is the predominant value in society and the subjacent value in all of this informative campaign, whose message is "enjoy sex", avoiding its dangers, I believe we shan't complain that the negative consequences increase, while the sexual activity of adolescents increases. Sexual impulses are not governed by techniques, but by the decision of the will. Therefore all of this informational avalanche will be useless if it is not accompanied by an internal formation of moral values, a training of the will so that the individual knows how to give his sexuality the moral horizon that it should have. Here, more than in any other area of the personality, it is of utmost need that we do not separate the informative aspect of the educative dimension. Without this educational complement on sexuality, as a human value which must be placed at the service of the highest values, all information we pretend to give adolescents would have no meaning. I leave a question to the organizers of this campaign. Where is the educational dimension of the same? I have not found it anywhere?"<sup>2254</sup>

**Victor Frankl**, a famous contemporary psychiatrist, has said: "with sex as with money, after inflation, comes devaluation". "after idolizing sex, comes boredom and the sexual deviations". One

<sup>2247</sup> Un mundo para ellos, TVE, 9-XI-82

<sup>2248</sup> YA Newspaper, 4-XII-84, pg. 24

<sup>2249</sup> YA Newspaper, 1-X-87, pg. 20

<sup>2250</sup> YA Newspaper, 7-VI-86, pg. 40

<sup>2251</sup> BLANCO Y NEGRO Magazine, 20-XI-88, pg. 99

<sup>2252</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, I, 3 EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2253</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, I, 4 EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2254</sup> DR. BERNABÉ TIERNO. FAMILIA CRISTIANA Magazine. (XII-1992)66

does not play with sex. This game can result catastrophically, as can become uncontrollable. It can become a great tyrant, accosting the individual and poisoning all of his human relationships<sup>2255</sup>.

Unrestrained eroticism is a sign of a decadent civilization<sup>2256</sup>.

“Premarital relations are perturbing and not advisable. When they realize that erotic love gives little in itself, this discovery will cause, in both parties, first, disillusion and apathy, then boredom, and, perhaps, at the end, a breakage. They will say -- as is frequent these days-- that love ended and that one must look for new horizons. The sad part is that they do not realize that love never existed. It was supplanted by mere eroticism. They will have moments of euphoria, which will pass like a flame that burns but does not build, it only leaves ashes. Love is not like hunger, which will be satiated when food is ingested. A sexual relation, on the other hand, does not satisfy the need of creating a true loving relationship. It is insufficient<sup>2257</sup>.

If we want youth to order their sexual conduct, it is necessary to create a socio-cultural environment that will make that possible. A permissive society that has an erotic atmosphere to the point of an obsessive fixation on the sexual, cannot later on maintain, without falling into contradiction, a norm of premarital chastity<sup>2258</sup>.

Each day there is more diffusion among adolescents and young adults, certain manifestations of a sexual type, which on their own, predispose to the full relationship. These genital manifestations are a moral disorder, as they are performed outside the matrimonial context<sup>2259</sup>.

In a society in which the youth is not “chaste”, and marriage does not keep fidelity, the love at home has been killed, and this love is the supreme of all of the natural happiness’s that God has placed in this life. Man is something more than an animal. Sexual instinct is sufficient for animals, but man also needs love . To satiate the instinct, anyone will do. That is why the dog will go indistinctly with any one of the bitches in the neighborhood. Love demands exclusivity. This is the root of jealousy that does not permit the intromission of a third party in the relationship. “There is no love without jealousy” says **Proust**. Psychologist **Dr. Alfonso Maria Ruiz-Mateos,, C.SS.R.**, at a conference he delivered in Cadiz, on the 20<sup>th</sup> of December, 1979, said: “Jealousy is always pathological. It is a proof of love” Where there is jealousy there is love. A lack of jealousy is a sign of a complete trust in the other person, or to a total indifference originated by loving the other person.

Although excessive jealousy is counterproductive, as they can provoke that what they fear – because love is gained, it is not imposed by force, and fidelity is a demand of the one who loves, not of the loved one—however, jealousy shows that that the one who loves need to posses the loved one exclusively. This same exclusivity in love, makes the loved one to become irreplaceable. A grieving mother is not consoled by replacing a child who has died with a perfect “double”.

Even the “pimp” who exploits a prostitute and does not care that she goes to bed with others for money, will not tolerate that she do it for love. An enamored person wants the love of the other person on an exclusive basis, and forever. Whosoever changes love easily, what he has is a sentimental and sexual caprice , but not love. It is like someone who fancies a toy and then will change it for another. Love is something else. Authentic love wants to be eternal: “I’ll love you always”, “I’ll love you till death do us part”.

18. **To examine** your love, in light of your future marriage, the following questionnaire can help you.

<sup>2255</sup> DR. SHEED: *Sociedad y sensatez*. Pg. 104 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2256</sup> GUZMÁN CARRIQUIRY: *Algunas cuestiones de ética sexual, VII, 4*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2257</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano, I, 5* EDIBESA. Madrid 1991

<sup>2258</sup> PAOLO SARDI: *Algunas cuestiones de la ética sexual, VIII, 2*, Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2259</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. Rulings for sexual education. Nº 96.

1. Do you think that you will never feel for anyone else, a love as great as the one you now feel?
2. Do you think that the strength of the love you now feel will not diminish with time, as you get to know the loved person better, but on the contrary, it will grow more every day, as you get to know him/her better
3. Is it your illusion to make this person, whom you love, happy, or are you going towards marriage looking only for your happiness?
4. Do you think, that even if this person were to suffer an accident or illness, which were to leave a disfigurement or handicap, your love would not diminish?
5. Are you willing to renounce your pleasures to make her happy?
6. Although beauty is not essential towards love, do you find in this person some special "charm" which fills you with illusion?
7. Even though sexuality is not the most important factor in marriage, do you feel an attraction for the manifestations of love of this person (even if, as you know, you must contain yourself before marriage) or is what you feel for this person repugnancy?
8. Do you have common interests, or are your tastes 180° opposite to each other and you get bored with those things that interest the other?
9. Do you suspect that after marriage you will need the presence of friends so not to get bored or do you expect not to need anyone to find yourself happy?
10. Do you have enough patience to overcome the possible defects of your future partner?
11. Can you foresee that the marriage to this person will lay obstacles in your professional career, or in your hobbies, which matter to you so much?
12. Can you trust that the matrimony with this person will not be an obstacle to a life in the grace of God, which is the supreme aspiration you must have?

The assertiveness of the answers to these twelve questions may orient you as to how your love in matrimony with this person will be.

Examine now the following questions which can orient you on the probabilities of marital success with your intended.

Do you think that if your marriage were to go through some tribulation (poverty, illness, etc.) this person will help you to go forth with Christian resignation? Do you find Christian virtues and qualities in this person which produce admiration in you, and encourage you to be better? Does this person have illnesses or vices that will convert you into a perpetual nurse? Drinks too much? Proactive in work? Is his education to your taste? Is he of your religious level? Do you have similar tastes, habits and customs? Does he have expressions or behaviors that irritate your nerves? Do you like his family? Do they like you? When and if you have a problem, do you prefer to disclose it or hide it from him? Do you tolerate his faults? Does he recognize them and show a will to correct them? Does he accept your errors, or does he always try to get his way? Is he always on the lookout for any error of yours and then rubs it in your face? Does he understand the problems of the brethren or does he choose to brag about his merits?

A boy wrote the following:

Hey girl, listen to me

I do not know you, But others like me do

We want you to know our opinion

Girls have a great power of attraction

And this influence is independent of your will

It can be for good or bad

It is a serious problem

Many things that for you are unimportant, do impact us,

Your psychology is very different from ours  
 If you want, I will see you with clean eyes  
 God has made you the most beautiful in humanity  
 Your beauty radiates attractiveness  
 I like you elegant, but modest  
 I like you sympathetic, but prudish  
 I like you modern, but feminine  
 I like you pure, enough to be noticed  
 I like being with you, but to be better  
 You can help me  
 Help!

I read this in a youth magazine, it was from a survey:

We like boys like this: Educated and not crass. Sympathetic, but not daring, Gentlemanly, and not a bum. Elegant, but not extravagant. Manly, not womanly. A worker, and not a louse. But above all, very Christian.

We like girls to be: Elegant, but decent. Coquettish, but not provocative. Modern, but not libertine. Sweet, but not gushy. Feminine and delicate, not easy.

Please, do not disillusion me! I need you to be better.

In a survey conducted among a hundred or so girls, the qualities of the “boys” that were most quoted by the girls were: educated, attentive, gentlemanly, delicate, with a personality, very masculine, who would protect her and dominate her, not to be a pansy; but also that he not be a despot or crass. And above all that he be a good Christian.

A group of young men from Granada have formed the first **Chastity Club** of the European Continent. It is similar to others that already exist in the United States. Members of this club agree to live in chastity, to avoid sexual relations until their marriage, and to be faithful after marriage.

In the words of the club president **Marcos Gutierrez**, “chastity is the best remedy against sexually transmitted diseases such as AIDS”.

But the intention of the association, which has already spread to Cadiz, Seville, Madrid and Barcelona, goes further: “It is all about creating an alternative to the ideology that promotes promiscuity, triviality of sex and the dispersion of condoms<sup>2260</sup>”.

19. And of course, that the person you marry be a Catholic.

**Mixed marriages** are not advisable<sup>2261</sup>. Mixed marriages are those in which the couple are from different religions. The ideal is that both be from the same religion. That the Catholic marry a Catholic, the protestant with a protestant, and the Muslim with a Muslim, etc. Discrepancy in something as serious as religious ideas, may cause grave conflicts. Besides, the children are hurt the most, because, when they realize that their parents are not in agreement as to faith, it is easy for them to take the road of religious indifference<sup>2262</sup>.

**Pope Paul VI**, said on May 31, 1970, on the subject of mixed marriages: “In reality, there are many inherent difficulties in a mixed marriage. That is why, the church, conscious of its responsibility, advises against mixed marriages”. Later on he says: all Catholics should be warned that if they want to celebrate a mixed marriage, they must ask for the Bishop’s permission. To obtain from the Bishop, the dispensation of the impediment, the Catholic part must declare itself in agreement to shy away

<sup>2260</sup> FAMILIA CRISTIANA Magazine, 9(X-94) 10

<sup>2261</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, II, nº 305. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2262</sup> SCHNEIDER: *Educación Católica de la familia*, III, 1. Ed. Labor. Barcelona

from the danger of losing the faith. Besides having the grave obligation of making a sincere promise that he will do everything possible so that all of the children be baptized and educated in the Catholic church. Of these promises, to which the Catholic part is obligated, the non Catholic must be informed<sup>2263</sup>.

**Jehovah's witnesses** will refuse to agree to bring up their children in the Catholic faith, as this is their norm. For this reason, it is not licit that a Catholic marry a **Jehovah's witness**<sup>2264</sup>. Islam forbids that a Muslim woman marry a non Muslim man<sup>2265</sup>.

20 Sweethearts must know each other intimately, But in this intimate knowledge and trust, there are certain "intimacies" that are not to be allowed. What's more, they must be very discreet in certain "**manifestations of love**", if they do not want to tarnish their relations with sins. You must not allow your dearest one many a thing that he may forcefully ask for. It is necessary that you learn to enjoy your courtship with the austerity that is demanded by the Gospel. It is very important that you firmly condition yourself to carry out your premarital relations in the grace of God. This will be akin to treasure heaven's blessings for your marriage. On the other hand, if you sow sin on the road to matrimony; can you really count on God to bless you afterwards?

In the many cases of failed marriages, with severe problems, I have had the curiosity to ask them about their times of courtship. Up to now, not a single one has failed to accept that they had a courtship with a great lack of morality and enormous voids in their preparation<sup>2266</sup>.

Let your relationship be loving, **but chaste**. That your manifestations of tenderness be clean. All you condescend to in your courtship, with impure passion, will result, sooner or later, in a harm to your true and lasting happiness.

When sweethearts have had sexual romps in the hay, they have a dirty and defiled love, which will later on turn acerbic. On the other hand, sweethearts who have fought temptation and have kept themselves pure, have an illusion, a happiness and a much greater love. This is unequivocally confirmed in life's experience.

All efforts carried out – alone or together – to respect the demands of chastity before marriage, will powerfully help you later on to respect all demands of chastity in marriage. You harvest what you sow. All efforts to his end will have their reward someday<sup>2267</sup>.

I have often seen sweethearts who were very happy with each other, they would continuously give each other long hugs..... and at the time of their marriage, they were already tired. We caress every once in a while, and many times we only hold hands. Maybe some will take us for fools, but I believe that this way we are happier. Everything is fresh among us. Nothing is stale. Our possibility of happiness is not jeopardized, nor will it ever be. I am sure that respect is the guardian of happiness between spouses. One doesn't like what hasn't been wished for during a long time. A home will last in inverse proportion to the passionate times preceding it. Anything that is used without control or measure, will end up tiring<sup>2268</sup>.

Everything in the courtship is bright and beautiful, and it is necessary to know that the Sun will set every day. Matrimonial life is not the same as life in courtship times, the same as courtship time cannot be the same as the matrimonial time.

That is why you must be **very careful** with your manifestations of love. Sweethearts are still not spouses. Many things that among spouses are perfectly licit, are a sin among sweethearts, or at the very least a danger of sin. The showing of love must avoid sexual stimulation. Excitement will

<sup>2263</sup> New Canonic Code Law n° 1125

<sup>2264</sup> G. HERBERT, S. I.: *Los Testigos de Jehová, su historia y su doctrina, VI, 2. d.* Ed. PPC. Madrid. 1973

<sup>2265</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 24-IX-94 pg. 18

<sup>2266</sup> FRANCISCO DE LA VEGA, S. I.: *El amor no se improvisa, II, 1.* Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao. 1972

<sup>2267</sup> DANTEC. *Noviazgo cristiano Iª, V.* Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2268</sup> JOVENROUX: *Cuando se descubre el amor, VI, 8.* Ed. Nova Terra. Barcelona



tend to complete satisfaction. It is very difficult for sweethearts that are not prudent in their manifestations of love, to remain in the limit of illicit intimacy. A caress will lead to a longer or larger caress, and it is preferable to renounce to the licit caress before falling prey to the illicit one. For caresses to be truly inoffensive, be happy that they are brief, delicate and only “from the shoulders upwards, only going down the arms”. Sweethearts, as all other bachelors or spinsters, will gravely sin if with their mutual caresses they voluntarily provoke a carnal delight; or they place themselves, voluntarily and without need, in close danger to provoking it. And in the case of involuntary sexual stimulations, they have the obligation of resisting and not consenting to them.

**Love is insatiable**, it always asks for more. Sometimes, moral barriers will cut its way, but it wants to jump over everything. That is why reason is necessary to control love, to maintain yourself in line with morality.

Sweethearts are not yet married. Their love takes them to the desire of total giving, but they still do not have that right. The New Catechism of the Catholic Church says: “Sweethearts are enjoined to live in the chastity of continence. In this trial, they are to see a discovery of mutual respect and a teaching of faithfulness. They shall reserve for their marriage those manifestations of special tenderness which are specific to conjugal love. They must help each other to grow in chastity”<sup>2269</sup>. This is attained with the help of **Jesus Christ**. If lacking the grace of God, it is impossible. Therefore, that is why the need of a sacramental life during courtship.

I recommend that you always be in very visible places. Not in solitary and dark places. Darkness and solitude are dangerous.

One of the best moral defenses for the behavior of the sweethearts, is a pair of foreign eyes looking at them. The behavior of the sweethearts must be such, that at all moments, they can be observed by their parents, or a responsible adult.

Chastity, although sometimes difficult and demanding, is, however, still possible during courtship, but with certain conditions. Whoever wants to keep it, must pay the price. Those who do not have the will to make the effort required to grab hold of the supernatural powers needed through prayer and sacraments, should not be surprised of their failing and falling. Experience, thank God, testifies that many Christian sweethearts have lived and or are living an unblemished courtship<sup>2270</sup>.

On the other hand, if she was an “easy woman” for him, it will not be odd, that after being married, he will develop an insecurity or jealousy that she may also be “easy” for others. Such a woman offers no guarantees of matrimonial fidelity. Unfortunate is the man who marries a lustful woman. He will have horrible doubts as to whether the children that his wife has had are really his or if they were engendered by some other man. I know of dramatic cases.

Besides, the concessions to lust are sure to be revolting. You are sure to be much happier if your love were to unite you with **Christ** in communion, and not lower you in the degradation of sin. I know of sweethearts who lived a time of unbridled passion, and when they reoriented their life to a straight and pure life, they confessed to me, that this second form of love had made them happier.

Some boys tell girls that they prefer those who have tried everything. But this is a trick so that they give in to their desires with greater ease, and then they abandon them with the same ease, as one who throws away a dirty dish rag. It is logical! A sensible guy does not marry a girl who tomorrow will become a “slut”. If she has not respected her purity as a spinster, what guarantees does he have that she will not become an adulteress after being married?

Some girls try to retain a guy by giving into illicit concessions. But when there is no love, this can retard the breakup, but does not avoid it. If the rupture is to happen, it is better that it happens before the wedding.

<sup>2269</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2350

<sup>2270</sup> DANTEC: *Noviazgo cristiano*, 3º, III, C. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao0

To the woman, ordinarily, sex is not interesting unless it is preceded by love and tenderness. Man is more impulsive and passionate, and can separate sex from love<sup>2271</sup>.

Women have great natural powers to love, but because of their great sensibility they let themselves be influenced by external impressions, and are therefore, exposed to great problems in their affective life. They must be vigilant to dominate their affectivity.

And look, those guys and gals who during their courtship committed grave faults towards their purity, are accruing, without wanting to, a great quantity of sufferings. At the least, they will suspect each other constantly. They will always remember their previous escapades. **They will suspect** that their spouse may fall again, and that is natural. Because if someone does not respect the law of God before marriage, what guarantee does that person offer that it will be respected after marriage. If today you yield to temptation, your husband, may one day, with reason doubt your fidelity. On the other hand, if today you are stern and intransigent, should he have a doubt, he will think "impossible, I couldn't get to first base with her as her boyfriend!"

And I warn you of one thing: of all the faults against purity that you may commit during the courtship, the one to **blame** is you! That the guy has moments in which he loses his head, and wants from you what he should not get, is natural. But if you don't want, nothing will happen. And on these occasions, you are much more serene. You must therefore impose yourself. And don't think that because of this you will lose him. Even if he gets upset, it will only be temporary. If he loves you, he will be back. And if he doesn't come back, it is because he didn't love you, he only wanted to use you to satiate his animal instincts. And whoever belittles you in this fashion, is unworthy of you. It is better that he be gone. Should you marry him, you will not be a queen, but a slave. And before becoming a slave, it is better to remain free.

It is not a disgrace to remain a spinster; but a failed marriage is. And of the worst kind. The single woman only is shamed when she does not know how to fill her life with an ideal of service to her brethren, which will make her feel accomplished. She who can do it, will probably be happier than a married woman.

Listen also to what **Jesus Christ firmly** says:

If your eye, hand or foot, are a cause of scandal, that is to say, of sin, cast them far away from you, because it is better to enter into heaven with one eye, one hand or one foot, than with both eyes, both hands and both feet and thrown into hell. Apply this to your current relationship, it is better to enter into heaven without a boyfriend, than go to hell with a boyfriend.

That never before your conscience should you, **be ashamed** of your premarital relationship. Be a dignified, pure and clean bride.

Don't forget, that your boyfriend, is only your boyfriend, that he may not get to be your husband. Love him, yes, with illusion and tenderness, but without soiling yourself. The more Christian and delicate that you are in your relationship, the happier you will be on your wedding day. You will be more beautiful before God and him on that day! Don't give in! Pure to the altar!

Defend your chastity **with integrity**, and in your love, web the most interesting story that you can later on tell your children, with nothing to hide, nor anything to be ashamed of. That your daughters, when telling them about your loves, can tell you with envy and pride: "how beautiful a love like that! We also want to be brides as good and pure as you!" Will you have the courage to tell them to be pure, if you were not?

Think also, of your future sons. For them, it is not easy to find out how the relationships between his parents developed, but they will see in you, their mother, with your defects and virtues. And these are not improvised. If you were a spotless bride, you will, without doubt, be an exemplary mother. Think of the great consolation you will have, if one day your son tells you that his greatest illusion is to find a bride like you are.

Do not forget that the charm of a woman, comes from her purity, prudent when young, and being a mother when older.

---

<sup>2271</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *Moral de la sexualidad; II, B, 2*. Ed. Tau. Avila. 1988

Both things have merged in Mary. She, Virgin and Mother. She, immaculate.

Legions of teenagers have put their eyes on Mary, they have kept the integrity of their greatest treasure, their purity. The example of **Saint Mary Goretti**, admirable and charming, who allows herself to be killed before losing her chastity. Thank God that there are many "Goretis".

21. Today a lot is said about sexual liberation, but in fact we are suffering a manipulation of sex by the pornographers whose business is to exploit the sexual instinct, trivializing one of the greatest potentials of man: the procreation of a child.

**Pornography** is the exhibition of sexual acts.

Pleasure is not an end in itself. Pornography can become a permanent attempt against the right that every person has to be duly respected as to the decency with which one wants to cover his manifestations of sexuality. Far from being ridiculous, decency is a quality that tries to tell the human body about the possibility of making the soul, which dwells in him, transparent. That is why, imposing limits on pornography is something that is totally reasonable, even necessary. Not as a concession to prudishness, but as an affirmation of a sense that we have the right to conserve in protection of human sexuality. "Pornography is a grave fault. Civil authorities must impede the production and distribution of pornographic material"<sup>2272</sup>.

The Vatican warns about the increase of sex and violence in the means of communication. The Pontifical Council for Social Communications has published a document where it is stated, among other things: The social communication means have had and continue having a very important role in each process of individual and social transformation. Be it true that these means – as affirmed by the Second Vatican Council – provide great services to humanity, they can also be used against the purposes of the Creator, convert them into instruments of evil. One of the alarming phenomenons of these years has been the growing diffusion of pornography and the generalization of violence in the means of social communication. Books and magazines, movies and theatre, television and videocassettes, advertising space and telecommunications itself, frequently show violent behavior or permissive sexuality, which reach the threshold of pornography, and which are morally unacceptable. It is evident that one of the effects of pornography is sin. The voluntary participation in the production and diffusion of these pernicious products has to be considered as a serious moral malady. Besides, there would not be any production and diffusion, if there were no demand. Therefore, those who use these products not only harm themselves, but they also contribute to the growth of a nefarious market. Also, the so called "soft porn" may ultimately paralyze the sensibility, slowly drowning the moral sense of the individual to the point of making them morally and personally indifferent to the rights and dignity of others. Pornography, like a drug, can create a dependency and push you towards seeking material more and more exciting and perverse. The probability of adopting antisocial behaviors will grow dramatically as this process takes place. One of the basic motives for the diffusion of pornography and sadistic violence in the means of communication seems to be the popularization of a permissive moral, based on the seeking of individual satisfaction at all costs. A moral negation will end up making pleasure the only happiness accessible to the human being. Propagation of pornography and of violence through the means of social communication is an offense to individuals and society, and puts forth an urgent problem that demands quick and realistic answers by the people and groups. The legitimate right to the freedom of expression and to the free interchange of information must be protected, but at the same time one must defend the rights of individuals, families and society, private life, public decency and protection of the essential values of life. The education to family life, and the responsible inclusion into society demands the formation of chastity and self discipline. Generalized pornography and violence will

---

<sup>2272</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2354

tend to blind the divine image in each human being, weaken marriage and family life, and gravely damage individuals and society<sup>2273</sup>.

Pornographers, who make a business out of exploiting pornography, broadcast through the means of communication, that, up to now, there has not been a scientific interpretation on the importance of sex, and that at last the prejudice which has been created through many centuries of sexual repression has ceased, that any form of physically expressing love is valid, that this should be considered normal between two people that love each other, and that the feeling of guilt is caused by moral and religious prejudices. There is much falsehood in all of this. It is ridiculous to say that we have just now discovered sex. Religion and morality do not repress sex. They dominate it, which is not the same. Repressing has a shameful sense, dominating, doesn't. Sex must be dominated. In life we cannot do everything that we like. We must do what we must do, and when we have to. You must go to work, get up early, etc., even if you don't like to. And sometimes you cannot do what you like to do. Appetite is not the supreme norm of conduct. Our sexual instinct has an appetite for many things we cannot do. Appetite must be subordinated to a superior order. It is not to put a straight jacket on the appetite, but to channel the sexual appetite so that it fulfills God's objective. Things that are channeled are useful, but if they go overboard, they will enslave man, will animalize him and will take him to the most monstrous sexual perversions. The man who only seeks pleasant sensations, to calm his desire of satisfactions, will turn into an obsessive to accumulate pleasures in an egotistical way<sup>2274</sup>.

Influenced by the erotic environment that surrounds us, youth has made a **game** of sexuality. This is very grave. By unlinking sexuality from authentic love, it becomes impersonal and it is downgraded to a merely animal plane. That both are in agreement on the game, doesn't change the tragedy. Animalizing sex produces in the human being: emptiness, boredom, saturation, disenchantment. The sexual experience is incessantly repeated to the point of total frustration. From this comes the need to look for new stimulations in the sexual perversions, abnormal, which are increasing in the countries with a greater sexual liberty, as statistics confirm.

Sex causes addiction, the same as drugs. We proved this in the airspace called TELE-5, *La Vida alrededor*, broadcast on October 17, 1994, from 4 to 6 in the afternoon: **Paul** went to a group dynamic at Palma de Mallorca to detoxify himself of his sex-addiction. Also on screen, was **Elena** who had had sex with more than three thousand men, and never for money. Doctor **Olga Jimenez**, sexologist, spoke of the relation between sex, drugs and alcohol. Dr. **Elena Ochoa** also spoke of sex-addiction, as an illness that annuls the will, this on the program *Luz roja*, October 20, 1994.

Disordered sexuality is **insatiable**, it wants more and more each time, each time it wants to try out new things, till it gets to the most indignant aberrations, like that house of prostitution where there are seven year old girls<sup>2275</sup> for the clients who prefer them very tender. In Germany there are about 100,000 cases of sexual abuse against children every year.<sup>2276</sup>

At the XVI Conference of European Council of Justice Ministers, which took place in Lisbon, in June 1988, the subject of sexual abuse against children at "Jardines de Infancia" was brought up, and that infantile prostitution forms a part of the tourism decoration of some cities like Rio de Janeiro, Dakar, Istanbul, etc.<sup>2277</sup>

In March, 1996, a bit after midnight, we saw on the Primera Cadena de Television Española, a program on infantile prostitution in Manila, Philippines. And in September of that same year, all of the communications media informed on the Stockholm Congress on infantile prostitution, as it has become an international problem.

<sup>2273</sup> YA Newspaper, 17-V-89, pg. 19

<sup>2274</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, VII, 7 EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2275</sup> INTERVIÚ Magazine, 17-II-77

<sup>2276</sup> YA Newspaper, 6-VII-76 pg. 17

<sup>2277</sup> YA Newspaper, 23-VI-88, pg. 14

The pornography wave is turning many into absolute sexual maniacs, avid of all kinds of abnormalities and sexual perversions.

In August 1996, Belgian citizen **Marc Dutroux** was condemned as the organizer of a network of child pornography<sup>2278</sup>.

And in Barcelona the police discovered a web of infantile prostitution<sup>2279</sup>.

It is not a rare occurrence that newspapers publish items about nine and ten year old girls raped by sex maniacs, and then murdered<sup>2280</sup>.

**Rape** is defined as sexual aggression by another person.

All of Spain was in commotion at the murder, after being raped, of three adolescents from Alcácer (Valencia). But they were not the only ones. Preceding them were: **Sonia** in Plasencia, **Laura** in Burgos, **Olga** in Villalón, **Ana** in Huelva, **Leticia** in Viana, **Mari Carmen** in Villalba, etc. <sup>2281</sup>. In five years twelve adolescents were raped and murdered<sup>2282</sup>. This is horrible, but it is the consequence of the libertine sex campaign, sponsored by the socialist government, with indecent television, and some flyers distributed in public schools demonstrating how to enjoy sex. We are making sexual maniacs. We should not be surprised of the sad consequences.

This degradation of man, animalizing sex is engendering absolute sexual psychopaths, always thinking of sex, forever looking for better and newer sensations, dedicated to the most sophisticated sexual practices and to the most depraved sexual perversions.

In room 541 of the Miguel Angel Hotel in Madrid, **David B. Noyes**, cut the breasts off a prostitute called **Rufina Sanz**, and flushed them down the toilet. He then cut her open, from the vagina to the belly button, and threw the body out the window<sup>2283</sup>.

An authentic "Blue Beard" he would find girls in Discos and Bars, take them home and there he would rape them, murder and dismember them. The police found several body parts in his freezer<sup>2284</sup>.

It is now in fashion to talk about female **sexual liberation**; but unfortunately the result is that she is defiled, she is degraded and she is instrumentalized, placing herself in service of irresponsible men who seduce and trick her. The rape cases are increasing. In the USA, there is a rape every minute. And rapes are not normally carried out by sexual psychopaths. The majority, are by young men who maintain sexual relations somewhere else. Almost half of rapes are committed by a person known to the woman, or at least who has seen her previously<sup>2285</sup>.

But not all rapes are done with physical force. You also rape her by deceit, promising her a thousand things, and when she is pregnant, the culprit just leaves. And this is woman's liberation? Quite the contrary! It is her degradation.

Many girls cede their virginity for the love a boy, and then they are defrauded, empty, disillusioned and even maybe with a trauma of rejection for sexual life.

Catholic sexual morality is that which liberates the woman from the instrumentalization of the man and dignifies her. Demanding for her the highest respect.

---

<sup>2278</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 27-VIII-96. pg. 60

<sup>2279</sup> CADIZ Daily, 12-X-96, pg. 28

<sup>2280</sup> YA Newspaper, 20-IX-92, pg. 28

<sup>2281</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 29-I-93, pg. 17

<sup>2282</sup> CADIZ Daily, 29-I-93, pg. 38.

<sup>2283</sup> YA Newspaper, 27-III-87, pg. 44

<sup>2284</sup> YA Newspaper, 28-III-87, pg. 46

<sup>2285</sup> YA Newspaper, 9-IV-78, pg. 15

The church wants the sexual act to be joined with love and not with violence. That is why a woman who is in danger of being raped, can, in self defense<sup>2286</sup>, use birth control methods that will not be abortive. Maintaining her firm will of not consenting in the act that is being violently thrust upon her. It is a generalized opinion among moralists, and this was when questioned, given by three eminent Roman moralists: **Palazzini**, **Hürth** and **Lambruschini**<sup>2287</sup>. That is why the church has allowed some nuns to take birth control pills when they were facing the danger of being raped during the **Lumumba** uprising in Zaire, and the disappearance of Yugoslavia.

A few words to the woman who has remained single<sup>2288</sup>.

Spinsterhood in a woman is a vocation of God. Not always because she chooses it, but because she has been elected for it by God, as He has disposed that many more women than men be born. A sign that God chooses many women for spinsterhood.

The first thing a spinster is to consider is that her spinsterhood is a vocation from God, and therefore she should not consider herself a failure, but accept her state with naturality. Search for an occupation where she will be useful to others and feel that her life is fulfilled. God has a mission for her. It must be discovered and complied with. To fulfill God's will is sure to make us happier in this life and also in the next.

There is another subject which I wish to talk about.

It is frequent that a crisis of loneliness happens to mothers of thirty or forty years when the children have left home and they have time on their hands. It could be the moment to reincorporate oneself to the workplace or to study. Even to find a constructive occupation which will make her feel useful. Dedicate herself to works of charity, to the apostolate, etc. What would be total foolishness would be to seek pleasure in activities such as bingo, booze, inconvenient videos, etc.

## 22. Another of the great dangers of sinning against this commandment is **dancing**.

Sexual satisfaction sought directly, outside of marriage, is a grave sin. And this is what many look for in the hugging of a dance. What they want is to hold a woman in their arms. And dancing gives them a stupendous occasion to be able to press her against their bodies.

Modern dancing can be a bit more passable, that is, if sensual movements are avoided. That is why, folk dancing has no moral misgivings whatsoever. And it would be sensational if they were to be popularized. But those dances of couples embracing, as dancing is today, where boys and girls put their bodies in contact, stuck to each other as a postage stamp to an envelope, are, to say the least, a danger for any normal boy to feel voluptuous desires. And this danger must be avoided if there is no cause to justify it.

Of course, there are ways and ways of dancing. Not everybody dances with the same evil intention. But the best thing is not to dance too closely, "let there be some air between them"<sup>2289</sup>. Dancing in itself is not bad, what makes it bad are the circumstances. How many sins of thought, word and deed, before, during and after the dance<sup>2290</sup>. That is why, even though theoretically it is possible to dance without sinning<sup>2291</sup>, reality is that the way people dance these days, close together, is a seeding for sin. And although one does not always sin gravely, isn't it to place oneself in danger of sinning?

<sup>2286</sup> ANDRE LEONARD: *La Moral Sexual explicada a los jóvenes, IV, D, a, 21* Ed. Palabra, Madrid.

<sup>2287</sup> STUDI CATTOLICI, 27(1961) 63-72

<sup>2288</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1658

<sup>2289</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 551, e.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2290</sup> Fr. COLOMA, S. I. La Gorriona

<sup>2291</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología de la caridad, n° 474* Ed. BAC. Madrid

**It is naive** to defend dancing as if it were an angelical and innocent entertainment. We all know what men look for in dancing is basically, foremost, the bodily contact. This is not the ideal means to keep your purity, to which we are obliged by a precept of **Jesus Christ**, and which is so hard to do because of the rebelliousness of concupiscence.

I once read something that I found amusing. It is on the morality of dancing-

It depends on the intention of the male subject

Also on the intention of the female subject

But above all

On what the male subject subjects the female subject to.

Don't be easy when dancing. Think of the way of keeping a firm stance in your purpose of avoiding it. Why should we always be teetering on the brink of sin? To be at the edge of a cliff is very dangerous. Besides, it is an anemic Christian, one who only stops when facing sin. We should know how to resign to those things that we like a lot, which would even be legal, but with which, we would give a bad example. **It is evident** that many gravely sin in dancing. Do not contribute with your cooperation, to have others sin.

Madrid's Cardinal, **D. Vicente Enrique Tarancón** says: "Modern dances are in themselves, dangerous. They carry a seedling of disorder and a danger of sin. Theology cannot admit them in principle. Theology must reject them and must suppose their immorality until the opposite is proven. The different hues that the diverse classes of these dances have do not alter their nature. Some will be openly scandalous. But all are essentially dangerous. If we were to admit that these modern dances are dangerous in themselves, because they hold an opportunity, close or far away, to sin, our posture before them must necessarily be prohibitive. And in concrete cases, it is only necessary to know if the motives and circumstances are given that morality demands so that one can put himself in the danger of sin. The gravest, in my judgment, is that modern dancing has been given the title of obligatory and natural in our society that wants to call itself Christian. It is necessary therefore, to have a strong reaction against this erroneous criteria that some Catholics have. Modern dance is a malady. As a principle, a Christian society cannot accept it as a normal way of entertainment. Theology condemns it because of the disorder that it has within itself"<sup>2292</sup>.

They are dishonest, and therefore those dances are illicit for all, because of the way the couples hold each other, because of the contacts they permit, and because of the music that accompanies them, they generally awaken sensuality. Besides, the person who from experience knows that certain dances, cause temptations and bad movements, must avoid them"<sup>2293</sup>.

23. The **lonely vice** (masturbation) consists of abusing your own body, exciting the genital organs to voluntarily attain the pleasure of orgasm. Sometimes, you start from mere curiosity, but if this situation is not corrected it will become an obsessive vice which will enslave the person and make him uninterested in anything else, like it happens to a drug addict.

Masturbation can become something obsessive in a person. It makes sexual pleasure something egotistical, when God has made it to be shared in matrimony. I know of cases of failed marriages because one of the two, enslaved by masturbation, would deny himself the natural expressions of love within marriage. Whoever lets himself be enslaved by the vice of masturbation can ruin his marital sexual harmony. A young woman was complaining during her visit to a doctor's

---

<sup>2292</sup> VICENTE ENRIQUE TARANCON: *Las diversiones a la luz de la Teología 2, VI*, Ed. PYLSA, Madrid

<sup>2293</sup> B HÄRING, *La Ley de Cristo, 2º, 2ª, 3ª, V, 5, b*.Ed. Herder. Barcelona

office, that her husband had very few sexual relationships with her,. He recognized, in front of her, that he preferred to masturbate himself<sup>2294</sup>

.Whoever has the disgrace of finding himself **enslaved** with this bad habit, must make his best effort to correct himself as soon as possible. This vice will chain you strongly, and each day it will be harder to get rid of it, and when it has a person chained to it, that person will be belittled, his will, will be obliterated, his character destroyed , it will perturb the development of his personality, weaken his faith<sup>2295</sup>, unbalance his nervous system make himself selfish and incapable of loving another person.

One cannot abuse the body. Nature will sooner or later collect the damages. The human body has its limits. One cannot spend energies destined to the integral development of the human being<sup>2296</sup>

Even for **Freud** “the masturbator incurs in the risk of blocking the development and maturation of his psycho affectivity <sup>2297</sup>. The habitual practice of masturbation leads to grave nervous imbalances<sup>2298</sup>.All doctors agree that when masturbation is frequent it conducts to mental lassitude<sup>2299</sup>.

And when masturbation is a vice, it enslaves like any other vice.

When masturbation becomes a habit, it must be defined as a lack of maturity. When masturbation presents symptoms of psychosis and neurosis, one must seek the help of a professional who will treat it accordingly. The sources which support fantasy,--readings, television, movies, must be considered as the base of many actions that would not have taken place, had they not been stimulated.<sup>2300</sup>

There are sex maniacs “that seek pleasure time and time again, by themselves, and end up, like drug addicts, in a circle of insatiable repetition, with the end of trying at each intent to surpass the incessant frustrations<sup>2301</sup>.

Masturbation made habit will normally engender beings that are psychically withdrawn into themselves and are specially incapable of rising to an authentic sexual love<sup>2302</sup>.

The masturbation vice is a cause of many failures in studies and in sports. This is well known by students and athletes.<sup>2303</sup>

When a human being is in the habit of satisfying an instinct in a certain way, he can get to the point that he loses , through a psychological mechanism, the desire or the attraction for all other forms. The habit of satiating the sexual hunger in an unnatural and vicious form, can get to cause repelle for the natural act, through which the masturbator enters fully into the field of psychological sexual incapacity<sup>2304</sup>

The vice of masturbation leads to the premature ejaculation in marriage, which does not allow to be in tune with the woman’s rhythm, which is slower, and causes grave problems in the matrimonial sexual harmony.

<sup>2294</sup> TONY ANATRELLA: *El sexo olvidado*, I 4 Ed. Sal Terrae Santander. 1994

<sup>2295</sup> Dr. LUIS RIESGO: *Hablando en familia*, III, 5 EAPSA, Madrid 1973

<sup>2296</sup> ENRIQUE M<sup>a</sup> HUELIN, S. I.: *juventud, Hacia donde? Málaga. 1973*

<sup>2297</sup> Dr. HONORIO SAN JUAN *Estudios sobre sexualidad*, 3<sup>o</sup> III. Toledo. 1979

<sup>2298</sup> Dr. JOSÉ TOBOLI: *Estudios sobre sexualidad*, 4<sup>o</sup>, II .Toledo

<sup>2299</sup> DUBOIS: *La revolución sexual*, XIII, 2 Barcelona, 1975

<sup>2300</sup> EDMUNDO ELBERT: *Problemas actuales de la psicología*, X, 3, 4, 8 Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>2301</sup> Several authors. *Sexuality and Christian life*,

<sup>2302</sup> B. HARING: *La Ley de Cristo*, 3<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup> i. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2303</sup> EDUARDO ARCUSA, S. I.: *Eternas Preguntas*, IV, 2. Ed. Balmes. Barcelona

<sup>2304</sup> RAFAEL BOHIGUES, S. I.: *El riesgo de ser joven*, III, 3 Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao



American doctors who had treated girls that masturbated themselves, discovered that after marriage they became frigid wives.<sup>2305</sup>

It is not intelligent to consider masturbation as something natural, as it causes a series of problems in the adolescent. Not only in the religious field, but in the affective, psychological, intellectual, etc., where the harmful effects are felt. That the young man in full adolescence strongly feels the sexual impulse, has a profound educational value. Later on, in his conjugal life, he will have to dominate his inclinations<sup>2306</sup>.

These body parts must be respected and must only be touched when needed, for cleaning, hygiene, etc., But one should never touch these organs for pleasure. You do not play with this.

This is a degrading sin, repugnant, unconceivable in a proper person. However, if later on you are ashamed to confess it, then the disgrace doubles and becomes irreparable. If you had the disgrace of falling, do not allow the sin of not confessing it. Go to a priest and open your conscience so that he may forgive you and help you out of this sad state. Have faith. There is hope. Many started this bad habit without realizing its importance. It could be because they discovered it in a casual way, or because they were taught by another person who intentionally covered the importance of the act. But masturbation is a vice, and it can strongly enslave and change the character of the person and even his religious ideology.

Masturbation can lead to losing your faith. Many incredulities have started with masturbation<sup>2307</sup>. The youngster has an inclination to masturbate, hears that the church forbids it, and feels the temptation to leave the church that forbids what he liked to do, and maybe has a hard time avoiding it.

But on the other hand, we must not forget that masturbation does not contribute in overcoming the sexual problem or the tension of a given moment. It leads, by itself, in the long run, to a higher degree of eroticism and a growing obsession, so that in the long run the problem does not solve itself. Sex, let us not forget it (**Chauchard** repeats it constantly) is located mainly in the head. It has such an obsessive capacity, that the solution to the problem is only attained when man manages to modify his thoughts towards something that makes and gives him an illusion. The solution to the sexual problem, and to an excessive obsession, can only be found in an indirect manner, when man is able to direct his thoughts in something that illusions him. I have been witness as to how boys who have with illusion entered into sports, even in the presence of girls, or to another type of occupation, had no sexual problem, while this surfaced whenever they were lax and had no direction in their free time.<sup>2308</sup>

It is easy for those who have gotten accustomed to the habit of masturbation to experience a strong sentiment of guilt, capable of destroying all stimulus of life and to produce a permanent inferiority complex. The only pastoral effective treatment, is to try to open horizons towards open expressions of affection, and to cultural, professional, social and religious activities that will give some sense to their lives.

The graveness of each masturbatory act is not easily determined, as it depends on many circumstances and attenuating of the responsibility<sup>2309</sup> may be had. However, one must put great endeavor to avoid falling in the enslavement of this habit.

Affective traumas and some neurotic situations frequently provoke manifestations of self eroticism, that sometimes reaches, a clearly psychopathic convulsive character.

<sup>2305</sup> RUDOLF AFFEMANN: *La sexualidad en la vida de los jóvenes*, IX, 2. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>2306</sup> Dr. LUIS RIESGO: *Hablando en familia*. III.5 EAPSA. Madrid. 1973

<sup>2307</sup> P. LÓPEZ PEDRAZ, S. I.: *Cristianos en busca de respuestas*, XV, 1 Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>2308</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYES: *Moral de la sexualidad*, III, A. Ed. Tau Avila. 1988

<sup>2309</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2352

It has been proven that masturbation always exerts a bad influence, above all on juvenile psychology. It weakens will power, self esteem, and perturbs development of the personality. It creates melancholic and introverted beings and deep down, egotists. Masturbation is a selfish sexual satisfaction, that brands the person and incapacitates him for true love.

Masturbation is, many times, a sad and cheap recourse, a compensation, a second class consolation for that other success that we have not been able to acquire.

All in all, not all masturbatory acts are of the same gravity. When a young man has an interest in correcting himself, and puts the means within his reach, even though he may falter, these can have a certain atonement towards his guilt. You can always go to God asking for help, as He never abandons those who seek him, asking for help for something good and convenient. And as **Paul** says: *I can do all in He who comforts me.*

In adolescence, masturbation may appear as something temporary. Just like pimples and blackheads- But if it is repetitive, it can degenerate into a habit, and that is grave. It is logical that it is to leave a guilty feeling. No doubt it is better to dominate oneself than to be defeated. To dominate oneself is a sign of maturity. Victory is a sign of maturity. Falling is a sign of weakness, that is why it leaves a guilty feeling.

In adulthood, masturbation can be a symptom of something more serious, especially if it is persistent. It can indicate a state of mental adolescence, or some other psychic deficiency. It can be found, of course, in many types of mental senility and in alcoholism. In general, can appear in all mental states, in which a lack of personality cohesion will have a consequence of a loss of control of the most primitive instincts<sup>2310</sup>.

Sometimes falling into masturbation is not because of a lustful intention. It is a consequence of a depression, an anguish, an anxiety that does not allow to go to sleep, etc. Such cases can be remedied with some type of non addictive type of tranquilizer, such as Librium, etc.

At a conference by **Dr. D. José M<sup>e</sup> Poveda Ariño**, head of the Psychiatry Department of the Autonomous University of Madrid, called *Ciencia y Doctrina Moral Sexual*, I heard him say that masturbation is an act, avoidable by any normal person. And in those cases in which this overcoming may seem difficult, it is perfectly attainable with those products which a doctor may prescribe.

In January 1976, the Vatican published a document on Sexual Morality, where it states: "The deliberate use of the sexual faculty, outside of normal conjugal relationships, essentially contradicts the reason for this faculty. This document also says that "Masturbation is an intrinsic and gravely disorderly act"<sup>2311</sup>.

And in 1983, the Vatican published another document on sexual education where it says: "Masturbation is a grave moral disorder"<sup>2312</sup> and although God knows the subjective moral responsibility of each act, in no way can it be said that there are no mortal sins in the sexual field<sup>2313</sup>

But **you should not consider sinful** all of your fondling of your genital organs. They can be sinful if the touching is to excite the sexual pleasure; but other touching, that is done through need or for hygiene, is not sinful at all. And in the involuntary organic commotions that you may feel, all you must do is to repress your consent and be at peace. You have not sinned against purity. Learn to distinguish between feeling and consenting. It may be that sometimes you may feel some movement in your genitalia against your will. Learn to live without these sensations.

The sin is not in **the feeling**, but in **consenting**. In the ninth commandment I explain the way to fight against these bothersome temptations.

But if you had the disgrace of having voluntarily pleased yourself in this sexual gratification, then, you have tarnished your purity.

<sup>2310</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación sexual y conyugal*, 2<sup>a</sup>, II, 6. Ed. Mensajero, Bilbao

<sup>2311</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2352

<sup>2312</sup> YA Newspaper, 2- XII-83, pg. 34

<sup>2313</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1773 (17-I-76)

**Orgasm**, which is the shuddering that the body experiences with the satisfaction of sexual pleasure, is an exclusive right of the married person. A single person cannot voluntarily procure it for himself, nor accept it if he reaches it involuntarily. In this case it is also not licit to experience and savor it voluntarily, although you cannot avoid the pleasant sensation. But when it happens in your sleep, it is no sin at all.

The complete venereal pleasure, the orgasm, sought directly, is only allowed within matrimony, and within the conjugal act.

**24. Homosexuality** is the sexual attraction to a person of the same sex.

This is an aberration clearly punished in the Bible. It is the case of Sodom and Gomorrah<sup>2314</sup> And this is why homosexuals are called Sodomites.

The judicial legalization of homosexual couples goes against human nature, and reveals a grave corruption of the citizenry's moral conscience, as was said by **D. Elias Yanes**, President of the Spanish Episcopal Conference<sup>2315</sup>, "to compare homosexual unions" to matrimony is an aberration against natural law. It becomes responsible for grave negative effects that it would have on society to legitimize a moral evil. To allow those people to adopt children it to jeopardize those children's rights, who tomorrow, when they realize their situation, will suffer psychic misgivings when comparing themselves with the rest of their friends. Distinguished scientists are against the adoption of children by homosexual couples, because of the psychic traumas that the children would suffer.<sup>2316</sup>

One must not confuse authentic homosexuals, that have no interest in changing, with the feminine looking man, of which he is not responsible, and may not be a homosexual.

Homosexuality is an abnormality, but it is not a sin, unless it is practiced. If it is practiced and there is a corruption of minors, it constitutes a social danger. **It is not the same** to be a homosexual by choice, than one who is born that way, or who suffered a trauma in his infancy.

The homosexual by birth, who **dominates his tendency**, and does not corrupt his environment or pervert young ones or is not scandalous in public, has no reason to be considered as a social danger. The social danger does not depend on what the person is, but on what he does. The born homosexual<sup>2317</sup>, is as responsible for his tendency, as can be the myopic or the one who stutters. Therefore the homosexual who dominates his inclination must not be considered a corruptor, pervert or degrader; if he dominates his tendency, he can reach a noble virtue. He must put forth his best effort in dominating himself. And trust that God will help him. He sees all and is just<sup>2318</sup>.

Homosexuals who live a chaste life can become saints says the Holy See's newspaper<sup>2319</sup>.

To be comprehensive with homosexuals, who strive to dominate themselves, is not to justify their homosexuality. The homosexual must dominate his tendency, the same as the heterosexual, who cannot go with all the women who catch his eye. The homosexual must dominate his disorderly tendency the same way a kleptomaniac must dominate his tendency of taking what is not his.

**But this respect**, which we must have towards the homosexual who is not a social danger because he does not prey against the common good, does not mean that we consider the homosexual as a normal person who has the right to exercise his tendency in accordance with his inclination. If the homosexual has the right to live like he is, and not as how he should be, the same

<sup>2314</sup> Judas

<sup>2315</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 4-VII-94

<sup>2316</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 4-IX-, pg. 52

<sup>2317</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2359

<sup>2318</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2358s

<sup>2319</sup> L'Osservatore Romano, 23-IV-97

thing can be said of the thief and murderer. Man should accommodate his conduct to true human values.

Respect to the being of the homosexual by not considering him perverse or dangerous so long as his conduct is correct, does not eliminate that he cannot be considered as a normal person. It is like the hunchback who would want us to consider that being hunchbacked is being normal.

Pope **John Paul II**, in his reply to the European Parliament that compares the homosexual union to the natural matrimony, has said: "The church rejects discrimination towards the homosexuals, but considers that the judicial approval of homosexual practice is morally inadmissible. To be in understanding with someone who sins does not equate itself to approving the sin. **Jesus Christ** pardoned the adulteress, but told her to sin no more."<sup>2320</sup>

The permanent Commission of the Spanish Episcopate published a note on June 24, 1994, where it says: "The homosexual as a human being that he is, is worthy of all respect belonging to the human being"; but the homosexual inclination, even though in itself is not sinful, must be considered as objectively disordered, as it is a tendency, more or less dominant, a behavior intrinsically bad from the moralistic point of view.

Reason of the genital apparatus is the generation of life. And the sexual exercising in a homosexual has nothing to do with generation. **Marc Oraison** says: "I do not waver in affirming that the realization of the homosexual couple is in itself impossible"<sup>2321</sup>. For **Dr. John Loraine** of Edinburgh University, where he is Dean of the Endocrinology School, the homosexual is a sick person whose sexual hormones have gone crazy. After his experiments, **Lorraine** affirms that the homosexual is a patient for endocrinologists, as he is suffering a series of gonadic and physiological problems, which today can be accurately measured<sup>2322</sup>

One must recognize that outside of a few cases of voluntary perversion, most of the homosexuals, and their deviate tendency must be considered as an illness. Therefore, on the one hand, they must be given full respect and help that as human beings they deserve, but on the other hand, society, through all adequate means, must defend itself of all of its devastating contagiousness, so pernicious and destructive for human nature today and in the future<sup>2323</sup>.

There are women who have the vice of satiating their sexual appetite with other women. This is an aberration. The affection between two women must not be shown through the genital organs. If it is so, that friendship is unadvisable.

Homosexuality in women has been known from six hundred years before **Christ** in the Greek island of Lesbos. That is why a homosexual woman is called a **lesbian**.

A distinction must be made between the true homosexual who seeks another woman for her sexual activity, and the affection that an adolescent has for older women, for whom they get to feel true attraction, but with the absence of sexual activity. This tendency will disappear as soon as they fall in love with a man.

Heterosexuality is an inclination of the same personal nature of man. But the homosexual even though he is not a pervert, is an introvert, who has suffered a deviation of the natural sexual instinct.

Defenders of homosexuality **generalize** this tendency and want to make it appear as a different sexuality but natural, and therefore can freely act without restrictions to their tendency. That is why they classify as a homosexual all who have had an experience with a homosexual. This is not serious. With this same criteria we should consider as non homosexual all homosexuals who have had a heterosexual contact. A person can, through a transient and casual circumstance, have had a homosexual practice, which, although immoral, does not constitute homosexuality.

<sup>2320</sup> FAMILIA CRISTIANA Magazine, 4-IV-94, pg. 28

<sup>2321</sup> MARC ORAISON: *El problema homosexual*, pg. 63 Madrid. 1976

<sup>2322</sup> DUBOIS: *Nuevas Técnicas sexuales*, pg. 58. Barcelona. 1976

<sup>2323</sup> ROBINSON *Educación sexual y conyugal*. 2ª, III, 6 Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

**What characterizes** a homosexual is not the number of homosexual contacts, but the tendency towards persons of the same sex and the repugnancy towards a heterosexual relationship. According to the **Kinsey Report** there is homosexual population of 4%.

For a homosexual to change, it is indispensable for him to **want to change**, and then that he consent to psychotherapeutic treatment: “only psychotherapy can help him”.<sup>2324</sup>

**Dr. Juan Antonio Vallejo-Nájera**, in his precious work, *La puerta de la esperanza*, affirms that “ education within chastity is very healthy and very much helps to overcome the juvenile problems. On the other hand, the so called sexual freedom that is preached today really fills up the psychiatrists waiting rooms. And let’s not say that it is fashionable to say homosexuality is an alternative as valid as any other one. This is a lie. Being homosexual is highly complex. They must have all our comprehension and love, but to try to cure them, not to encourage them to be homosexual<sup>2325</sup> .

It is said that sexual inversion is constitutional, congenital, biological. Others look for the causes in psychic factors, as false education, environment, experiences that go back to childhood, etc. For others, homosexuality factors are jointly inborn and environmental.<sup>2326</sup>

Homosexuality of course, does not have the same importance in **adulthood** than in childhood. Among children it can be just a game that may not signify a sickening deviation Although it can affect their psychology.

Some end up as homosexuals because of their alcoholism and drugs.

In 1983 the Vatican published a document on sexual education, where it is stated: “There is no moral justification for homosexual acts”<sup>2327</sup>. Homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered and cannot receive approval in any case<sup>2328</sup>

Homosexuality is condemned in several passages of the Bible<sup>2329</sup>. The Old Testament of the Bible orders the death penalty for those who commit homosexual acts<sup>2330</sup>. And **Paul** says that homosexuals will not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven<sup>2331</sup>. It is understood, naturally, only those that do not dominate themselves and perform as homosexuals.

It is on the table today, the “de facto couples”. Political groups want to equal the rights of natural matrimony to homosexual and lesbian couples. **Fr. José M<sup>a</sup> Díaz Moreno, S. I.**, professor of matrimonial rights at the Faculty of Law of the Comillas University of Madrid, in an article on the subject, recaps his thoughts as follows:

- a) Catholics have the right and duty to defend the institution of matrimony as the only valid one.
- b) There is a grave moral obligation to oppose the possibility that the lesbian or homosexual couple can adopt children, because of the harm that they would receive.
- c) One must differentiate between the licitly legal and the licitly moral. Civil laws do not change the moral valorization.
- d) To those parents that have opted for a “de facto union” help must be given, with love, so that they may restructure their life in conformity with the Law of God and of the church<sup>2332</sup>.

<sup>2324</sup> MARC ORACIÓN: *El problema homosexual, II*. Madrid.

<sup>2325</sup> JUAN ANTONIO VALLEJO-NAJERA: *La puerta de la esperanza, III*. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona

<sup>2326</sup> MANUEL VIERA: *Vida sexual y psicología moderna, III*, 3.Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2327</sup> YA Newspaper, 2-XI-83, pg. 34

<sup>2328</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: Statement about certain questions on sexual Ethics, n° 8; Romans 1:26-32, New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2357

<sup>2329</sup> Leviticus, 18:22; 20:13; Romans 1, 24-27; Corinthians 6:9s; Timothy 1:9s

<sup>2330</sup> Leviticus, 20:13

<sup>2331</sup> Corinthians, 6:9

<sup>2332</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine 2848 (5-VII-97) 7

The ABC Newspaper of Madrid published a study of the Ministry of Labor, according to which the equalization of matrimony to the “de facto” couples, will cost the state some 30,000 million pesetas in widowhood pension’s.<sup>2333</sup>

It is logical that we should not want our money to be dedicated to finance these unions. We think it is better that this money be dedicated to help families with numerous children, as in Spain we have the world’s lowest birth index.<sup>2334</sup>

25. **Chastity** is the domination of oneself, the capacity of orienting the sexual instinct in the service of love, and to integrate it in the development of the being<sup>2335</sup>

Christian Chastity supposes the overcoming of one’s selfishness, a capacity of sacrifice for the well being of others, nobility and loyalty in service and in love.<sup>2336</sup>

Chastity is youth’s greatest success before marriage. It is, also, the best way to understand and, above all, to value love. It is not a negation of sexuality, but the best of the preparations for conjugal love. As it is a training in generosity, of duty and in self dominance, qualities so important in the exercise of human sexuality.

In youth, chastity trains and forms personality. It assumes an effort that gives the person a strong will and a sense of possession and dominance of oneself, which at the same time, is a source of great happiness and joy. Chaste youngsters, normally, are more constant in their work and their studies, have higher expectations, are more idealists.

Purity is an eminently positive and constructive virtue which tempers the character and strengthens it. It produces peace, equilibrium of the spirit, internal harmony. It purifies and elevates love, it causes joy, physical and moral energy, it gives a higher yield in sports and in studies, and prepares for conjugal love<sup>2337</sup>

In August 1983, Pope **John Paul II** said to the adolescents in Lourdes: “Those who speak of a spontaneous and easy love, deceive you. Love according to **Jesus Christ** is a difficult and demanding path. To be what God wants, demands a patient effort, a struggle against ourselves. One must call good and bad, by their names<sup>2338</sup>. **John Paul II** also said to the youth gathered at Rimini (Italy) in August 1985: Do you want to lock yourselves in the circle of your instincts? In man, the instinct does not have the right to have the last word, as it is with animals’.<sup>2339</sup>

Youth receives fire and enthusiasm from prayer in order to live with purity and carry out their human and Christian vocation, with a serene dominance of oneself and with a generous donation to others.<sup>2340</sup>

**What is impossible**, is to keep purity of the body without keeping purity of mind and soul<sup>2341</sup>. If you do not constrain your imagination and your thoughts, it is impossible for you to remain chaste. Sexual appetite, above all, is psychic. If you do not remove the roots of the imagination it is impossible to contain the consequences in the flesh. Sexual appetite increases according to how much attention you give it. Like the dogs who bark when you look at them, but remain silent when you pay no attention to them.

The great Belgian Moralist, **José Creusen** says: “Impurity, without being the gravest of sins, is the most common of the grave sins. Chastity, without being the most perfect of the virtues, is one of

<sup>2333</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid 10-VII-97, pg. 69

<sup>2334</sup> ABC Newspaper of Madrid 17-IV-97, pg. 8

<sup>2335</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith:

<sup>2336</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Esta es nuestra fe*, 2<sup>a</sup>, III, 7, 2, 1, b EDICE. Madrid. 1986

<sup>2337</sup> MANUEL VIERA: *Vida sexual y psicología moderna*, VI, 1. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2338</sup> YA Newspaper, 16-VIII-83, pg. 15

<sup>2339</sup> YA Newspaper, 27-VIII-85, pg. 30

<sup>2340</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Catholic Education: *Orientations on Human Love*, 46.

<sup>2341</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, II, n<sup>o</sup> 492s. Ed. BAC. Madrid

the more necessary ones” In the matter of chastity, the easiest is complete self-control. To go halfway is dangerous<sup>2342</sup>..

Many **want to liberate themselves** of the Catholic morality, which they consider oppressive, and what they do is to fall in the enslavement of sin which degrades man **Christ’s** yoke is soft and light<sup>2343</sup>., if it is carried with love and a co redeeming will.

Purity **cannot be kept** without the mortification of the senses. For whoever does not want to renounce the incentives of modern sensual life, which exalt concupiscence, it is natural .that he become a victim of perturbing temptations, and that the fall will be inevitable. Purity cannot be held half way. Nor with our own strength, but with the help of God. Whoever, with the help of God, decides to struggle with all his might, will surely win. It is not that the inclination will die, but that it be governed by the reigns of reason.

In life, one must train oneself. To train is to make an effort when it is not needed, in order to know when to make that effort- He who does not know how to say **no**, when he could say **yes**, will not know how to say **no** when he must say **no**. The one who does not know how to deprive himself by trial, will not know how to deprive himself of the illicit when necessary<sup>2344</sup>.

Exploitation of sexuality in itself and above all, with the only end of attaining sexual satisfaction is ruinous. Not only for individual life but also for collective life.<sup>2345</sup>

Pornographers, **defending their business**. State that virginity is no longer a virtue. And they present to us homosexuality and masturbation as natural things, but above all the words of man is the Law of God, which points to the good and the bad.

We frequently hear nowadays demeaning words towards virginity. They normally come from those who have lost it. Like in the story of the fox and the grapes, it is natural to belittle what one cannot obtain. But jewels do not lose their value because there are people who do not know how to appreciate them.

If we were to respond to hard external facts that massively define our society, we may have to conclude that, in the judgment of many, chastity, today, is an counter-value that has to be shed forever. If it was a value, today it is ballast.

But if the answer we give is analyzing the nature of chastity itself, contrasted with the philosophical concept of its value for man, then one must conclude that chastity is a value, a value in itself, primary and absolute because of its intrinsic kindness, and by its essential togetherness with human nature.

Does it all depend on the concept that we have of chastity? If we understand it as a repression, a mutilation, a negative behavior, a denaturalizing attitude, then it cannot be nor is it a value.

What is chastity then? Simply said, chastity is the ordering of the sexual potentiality of man in consonance with its specific condition of a rational being, intelligent and self determining.

To be a slave to his instincts in the sexual field, turns him into an animal, it denaturalizes him in his condition as a free being and in his condition of a self determining subject. To badly use the sexual capacity, is treason to human sexuality. Whilst chastity is the correct positioning of the sexual forces and affection in man, in consonance with the specific ends of sexuality and with the integral condition of the being as an intelligent self, and owner of his instincts, there is no doubt that chastity perfects man in his own condition as man. Perfection in the essential is always a good. And good, in its multiple forms, is a value.

A sixteen year old youngster says:

“With chastity, I believe that we learn to respect ourselves and not become animals”. Animals do everything through instinct. If we did not have a regulating principle, a means through which we

<sup>2342</sup> EDUARDO ARCUSA, S. I.: *Eternas preguntas, IV, 2* Ed. Balmes. Barcelona

<sup>2343</sup> Matthew 11:28ss

<sup>2344</sup> EDUARDO ARCUSA, S. I.: *Eternas preguntas, VIII, 4* Ed. Balmes. Barcelona

<sup>2345</sup> Various Authors: *Sexuality and Christian Life* Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1982

could dominate our instincts we would be like them. It is great that we learn to value something that we have and they do not. It is a satisfaction to enjoy something acquired through your own effort, through your decision, through your will. Being voluntarily chaste, I make myself superior to animals. I think this has its beauty and value.

Is it easy to live chaste at sixteen?

Basically, it does cost me, like it does others. But I must confess that it is easier for me to live it.

Why is it easier?

In the first place, I realize that it is not worthwhile to lose my chastity for the sexual pleasure of a moment. But somehow it is not too hard because of the education I have received from infancy.

Do you find values in chastity?

Knowing that our bodies have a destiny superior to that of leaving it here on earth. God's plans for man speak of a glorification of our body in the future life. Besides the bodily glorification donated by God, it also has to be a gift of this body, having known how to keep it integral, immaculate, like He gave it to us.

And a young single mother answers:

Truly, chastity has not been my forte. For me, it has practically not existed. I have not been chaste. But today, now that I have realized, I consider it wonderful. For me, chastity has not entered into my life because I have strayed from God. Today, I feel that I have found it and that is phenomenal.

Would you dare tell me why you have not been chaste?

Of course. I have not been chaste because I did not think, for living on the margin of everything. Maybe because it was easy, or not caring. You let yourself go for any reason.

When did you change?

One month after my child was born, I had the opportunity of being alone, with time to think, and I realized that there was something more than what I had lived. And I clearly saw that the God that my parents and my school had taught me about, really did exist and it was something true. If I love chastity now, it is because I love Him. God is very important in my life.

What other values do you believe chastity has?

I think there are other values. Before, when I was not chaste, when I was carried away by impulses, I was not free. On the other hand, now that I tend to be more chaste, I feel freer, I have been freed from my impulses. When I cast my impulses aside, my body gains serenity, dominion, health, beauty. And even dignity, because the body must not only be the instrument of pleasure, but a means to fulfill oneself in life's mission.<sup>2346</sup>

On the other hand, chastity **is easy to keep**, if you seek the help of the grace of God, and you fortify the soul with the sacraments of confession and communion.

The best advice you can give to the one who has started to roll down the hill of vice is frequent communion and confession with a fixed Spiritual Director. It is a sure remedy to correct oneself and part from sin. There is no sinner that will resist. The sacrament of confession, besides being a curing remedy, is also a preventative remedy. Communion and Spiritual Direction give strength and light to do it with efficiency.

You can therefore, talk, and it must be done, of an imperative of purity that is bestowed on the sweethearts, not as shameful coactions whose only finality is to create bothers for them, but like an interior force that vivifies the love, elevating it and keeping it at a superior plane. This purity deems to be free of all rejection towards the body and it is based, on the contrary, on the ultimate respect to the flesh, to which it restitutes its equilibrium, eliminating the elements of evasion which are a danger to it. As far as love itself, it consolidates it, and thus prepares the happiness that the couple will enjoy once it has bonded for a common life-<sup>2347</sup>

<sup>2346</sup> J.R. LIBERATO: *Junto al erotismo, Iª, II*. Ed. Stadium. Madrid 1974.

<sup>2347</sup> CHARBONEAU: *Noviazgo y felicidad, VI, 3*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona.



That premarital chastity is damaging to your health is a myth that was discarded some time ago the medical science and by psychology, and it is something that only those that are looking for an excuse to avoid chastity want to believe.

For **Freud** any neurosis was of a sexual origin. Today, his own disciples do not support that doctrine. **Adler** affirms: "Since that it is not true that a suppressed libido is the cause for neurosis, to release the sexual instinct does not in itself cure this neurosis" Chastity educates the will by the defeat it supposes. An education that does not demand efforts, leads to anarchy, it does not form adults but rather unbalanced people, without an aptitude for being able to confront life's tribulations. Self defeat is indispensable for the formation of the human being. To say that sexual impulses are irresistible, is not scientific. Modern biology declares that the genital reflexes can be dominated by exercising one's will. The power of the spirit over the body, of the psychic over the physical is very big. This is confirmed by modern psychology<sup>2348</sup>.

Chastity protects your future love. Youngsters who have learned to be responsible of their duty, are those who will later be responsible for that love. Conjugal love will demand deliverance, generosity and sacrifice, and they already have a good training in all of that. Besides, the best present that you can give yourselves as spouses, is that of an integral body and soul.

Chastity in your younger years is an effort. But it is an effort that brings with it an immense reward. An effort that reinforces and matures your personality. It is an effort that carries with it a deep happiness. An effort that those who know what true love is, understand and practice.<sup>2349</sup>

Adolescents receive from prayer "strength and enthusiasm to live with purity and fulfill their human and Christian vocation with a serene self control and a generous donation to others"<sup>2350</sup>.

The world laughs at purity and chastity as if they were spent and out of date. The world says: "One must give oneself the maximum of satisfactions in life". But **Jesus Christ** says: "Let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me"<sup>2351</sup>. The world says: "We must be free of old taboos". But **Jesus Christ** said: "Blessed are the pure in heart"<sup>2352</sup>. The world says: "Love is not sin. What is done for love is good. But the Bible limits sexual relations to matrimony: "Ye should abstain from fornication"<sup>2353</sup>. But whoremongers and adulterers God will judge"<sup>2354</sup>.

26. Prudishness is a defense mechanism, proper of chastity, which instinctively protects sexual intimacy through shame. It is a protecting wall of purity.

Prudishness is not fear of the naked body, but rather, respect for it. The one who tries to ignore the sexual is not chaste, but the one who knows how to look at it with clean eyes<sup>2355</sup> is.

Prudishness separates man from animals<sup>2356</sup>.

Prudishness helps in an effective way to avoid moral excesses and dangers of all sexual matters. It also avoids those vulgar and disorderly aspects that accompany certain sexual expressions.

Prudishness does not indicate prudishness, or an irrational adherence to shy habits. It supposes a respect to the most personal part of man. To protect oneself from the gaze of others, does not indicate foolishness, but to keep one's sexual parts private from the possessive use of others. To touch something is in a way, an act of possession. To see, is like to touch at a distance. To offer to foreign gaze the most intimate parts of the body, supposes to let oneself be possessed in

<sup>2348</sup> MANUEL VIERA: *La vida sexual y psicología moderna*, VI. I. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2349</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación sexual y conyugal*, 1ª, III, 12. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2350</sup> Sacred Congregation for the Catholic Education: *Orientations on Human Love*, 46.

<sup>2351</sup> Matthew, 16:24

<sup>2352</sup> Matthew, 5:8

<sup>2353</sup> I Thessalonians 4:3

<sup>2354</sup> Hebrews 13:4

<sup>2355</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2521-24

<sup>2356</sup> Dr. JUAN PABLO D'ORS YA Newspaper, 16-I-84, pg. 5

what one has as most intimate. Any exhibition suggests an act of deliverance. To do it in public resembles prostitution.<sup>2357</sup>

Educational psycho-pedagogue **Bernabe Tierno** says:

Education in prudishness is only possible where noble ideas and clean sentiments rule. Bashfulness is only felt by whom is still sensitive to the threats against virtue. In an environment that barely distinguishes the separating line between what is good and what is bad, one must return to youth the sense of personal dignity, and a greater sensibility to public opinion. We cannot commit the educational mistake of attributing all sexual reality to a sensation of degradation or a sense of shame which is many times identified with bashfulness.

As educators we must emphasize, not on sexual education, but on **the education of the person**. We do not educate the sexuality of the boy; it is he who is the true maker of his education as a person, who, in consequence, also expresses his sexual behaviors. What must be educated is not the sexuality, but the person.

The egocentric attitude of the person, has a compulsive neurosis, especially in adolescence, the need to auto-affirm which is clearly manifested in the sexual sector. The compulsion is that much stronger when the young person realizes his lack of value, which makes him hold on to sex as a means of self affirmation.

It is clear that an atmosphere loaded with sexual hedonism permeates our home through the door the of "television", it wraps the youngster throughout and contributes nary a thing to the mental hygiene that will favor the normal dominion of one's own impulses.

Trivialization of sexuality conduces to the devaluation of the heterosexual relationships, each time more frequent and earlier. Deep down, it is the devaluation of the "other" person which is reduced to the condition of a simple instrument in service of pleasure.

The way that certain communications media report abhorrent sexual practices contributes to the deformation of the concept and nature of the sexual roles with which youngsters must identify themselves<sup>2358</sup>.

**Let us try to see** all that this vice has as repugnant and abominable. This will help us to love chastity. All that is good and noble about her, about self dominance and respect, the impure vice has of low and despicable.

The impure person is a person without will. Reason, which should be the lady, becomes the slave of the animal instincts; the vicious habit that converts itself into the worst of the tyrants, demanding more and more each time, and turns the person into a selfish wench, with a selfishness of the worst kind. The impure person will sacrifice everything in order to satisfy his own passion. The impure vice takes away from the person, his ease of conscience, the joy, the freedom. The faith. The hope, true love, honor, the fortune, the health, and, the glory of heaven.

**It is not rare** that the person who lets himself be dominated by the impure vice will have, sooner or later, a hardness of heart, a loss of faith, and eternal condemnation.

We must take into account that sins against purity are not the only ones, nor are they the gravest. We must not forget that the good Christian, besides the virtue of purity, must have the virtue of justice and charity. There is amongst us too much ambition, greed, selfishness, aloofness, hatred, envy, ruinous hearts, and lack of professional honesty.

The faithful **have the right** to be fully informed in the Catholic Doctrine.

On January 7, 1987, the Spanish Episcopal Commission for the Doctrine of the Faith, published a document where it says: "To those who prepare catechism materials, religious teachings or of theological divulgation, we ask them to put forth a special effort in transmitting faithfully and with integrity the teachings of the church on these matters. Christian faithful have the right that they not be transmitted, lightly and arbitrarily, partial doctrines, of hypothesis related with moral, and concretely with sexual moral, without them having been previously subject to study and approval by

<sup>2357</sup> ALFONSO LÓPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, XII, 2 a. EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2358</sup> DR. BERNABÉ TIERNO, Chapters 58 and 59 of *Aprender a Educar*. , YA Sunday 17 & 24-III-1991

the theological community, and in the last instance, to the discernment of the pastors. The goal of the objective moral norms is not the repression of sexuality, but to protect and favor that the profound dynamics of sexuality reach its plenitude and sense<sup>2359</sup>.

A summary of the Christian idea of sexuality could be:

- a) God established the matrimonial institution as a principle and foundation of the family and of society.
- b) The sixth precept of the Decalogue –Thou shall not fornicate—protects human love and shows the moral way for the individual to freely cooperate in the plan of creation, using his capacity to engender, which he has received from God, only within marriage.
- c) Sex is a gift of God open to life, love and fecundity. Its natural and exclusive place is in matrimony. **Jesus Christ** elevated matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament.
- d) Generation is not the result of an irrational force, but of a free, complete and responsible delivery of oneself that is to say, human, in accordance with the natural dignity of the person created by God.
- e) As with the rest of the commandments, the sixth precept of the Decalogue is imprinted in human nature, it is part of the natural law, and therefore, it obliges all men.
- f) The virtue of chastity essentially consists in the ordering of the sexual function to the end which God has meant; that is why it is a possible virtue, that must be lived in accordance with the characteristics of the vocation ruled by God: virginity or matrimony.
- g) Frequently, the corruption of customs begins with the sins against chastity, which one tends to justify, in various way, through deforming the judgment of conscience.
- h) As it is a demand of the natural law, all men receive from God the necessary help to comply with this precept of the Decalogue. On the other hand it signals the need of supernatural means, which God never denies to believers who implored them through prayer<sup>2360</sup>.

27. There is nothing in particular that you should **strongly feel** the sexual instinct. What you cannot do is to allow it to dominate you. Everything in life has its time and place. Animals are regulated by instinct: outside the periods of “heat” they feel an absolute frigidity. As they have no intelligence, God has regulated their reproduction with a physiological law. But as man is a rational being, God has not wanted to subject this important function to a law that is purely physiological, but has left this to the freedom of choice.

Sexuality is much more than an instinctive tendency for the transmission of life. Sexuality permeates the whole person and specifies communication between people.

Man **must govern** this tendency with reason and will. God, trusting man, has left in his hands, the sexual instinct, establishing insurmountable barriers through his law, signaling the only licit way for the exercise of its function: matrimony.

The sexual instinct is so strong that it needs a law to govern it. The same way that it is necessary to have a law to govern atomic energy. The sixth commandment is a benefit from God for the good of humanity.

**God has wanted** that the transmission of life be made through the union of the sexual organs of the spouses, so that the husband deposits the seed of life in the body of the woman, which will develop into a new being, should they find her body with a recent ovum.

This sexual act, done in matrimony, in accordance with the law of God, has nothing wrong. Quite the contrary. As according to God’s law, **it is worthy**, as it complies with the law given by God.

<sup>2359</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, n° 2303 (24-I-87) 33

<sup>2360</sup> RAFAEL GÓMEZ PÉREZ: *Problemas morales de la existencia humana*, 4, V, 5. Ed. Magisterio Español. Madrid 1981.

And it is a pleasure that God offers as a reward to the behavior of the fundamental conjugal duty, it is licit and good, and it is sanctified by **Jesus Christ** who elevated matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament. To place this act outside marriage is a grave sin.

So that humankind **not disappear**, it is necessary that children continue to be born.

Therefore the act of generation is a necessary act in marriage, instituted by God, for the continuation of the human species.

The continuing mission of marriage, as to the raising and education of the children carries within it a great effort and sacrifice. So that man would not shy away from this sacrifice, and the conservation of the human species be guaranteed, God, impressed upon man and woman, an impulse that would move them to love each other and unite in matrimony.

Pleasure is good when it is used for the purpose that God established, but it is bad, when, while seeking it, we sway from the will of God.

God could have created men directly, by himself, as he did with angels, but he did not want to.

It was His will that man himself be in charge of procreating man. Thus giving man a test of trust., he associated him to His creative work. He gives him the power of transmitting life. With this He filled earthly life with charm.

How different life would be if God would have disposed that men come to life as adults. We would be deprived of the laughter of children. There would be no fatherly love, nor of children, nor of brothers and sisters. Each one would find himself alone in the world, without love and without family.

Purity is a virtue that **safeguards** that creating power of man. It is a positive virtue. That ennobles and requires a hero's and martyr's courage . A noble virtue that defends this sacred act that God has wanted to sanctify with a sacrament: the sacrament of marriage, which is a fountain of supernatural graces, that is why matrimony is, in Christianity, a road to sanctity, of union with God.

**Paul** speaks of a "great sacrament", a symbol of the perfect and strong union of **Jesus Christ** with the church.

That is why it is an infamy to make a mockery of paternity and love; pornography is a perversity, as it betrays one of the most sacred duties of man.

Pornography, as said by **Emilio Romero**, is a resource for the sexually abnormal. A well formed man does not need that excitement.<sup>2361</sup>

The transmission of life is a **sacred power** that God has given to man. It is a participation of the power created by God. That is why it is called the procreation of children. To this human act, God contributes with a divine act, and creates a human and immortal soul, so it will inhabit this new being at the time of its conception.

Therefore **the responsibility** that is put on man for all which is related with the act that starts life.

To profane this power of man is to betray one of the most sacred duties and responsibilities.

Sexuality, because of its own nature, is meant for the procreation and education of the children, to establish a common bond between parents and children: a family.

The family is the first and most definite sample of the socio-cultural dimension of sexuality. The family is the natural institution for the formation of the personality, in its social and cultural aspect.

The family is the **essence of society**. Its "basic cell", according to a terminology which dates back to the Greeks and Romans, and therefore it can be said, that as is the family, so is the society.

On the other hand, as the family depends on the idea that you may have of sexuality, this one influences indirectly, but effectively, in the configuration of society<sup>2362</sup>.

It has always been said that the family is the cell of society, the melting pot where the children's education is tempered.

<sup>2361</sup> YA Newspaper, 10-VI-84, pg. 6

<sup>2362</sup> RAFAEL GOMES PÉREZ: *Problemas morales de la existencia humana, IV, IV, 2*. Ed. Magisterio Español. Madrid 1981

There are some today, that announce the disappearance of the family, saying that it is a relic from the past, and that it must disappear in a progressive society. But when the last echo of the voices that announce its destruction is heard, the family will continue strong, as it has always survived the crises, because the family is the permanent form of human life. The family returns above all ideologies<sup>2363</sup>.

**28. Grave sins** against the sixth commandment are all actions done alone or with another person, which tend to seek complete sexual pleasure, outside the licit use of matrimony.

It is also a sin to place oneself voluntarily and without reason that would justify it to oneself, or others, in near danger of committing them.

To condescend to thoughts, desires or caresses of a passionate and intimate nature is sinful, because this type of sexual activity has the natural purpose of preparing the generative organs for the union and to produce the desire of said union..

Therefore, direct venereal actions are licit, as long as the following conditions are met:

1) That the intention of whoever is doing them has no impure intentions, in other words, that they are not performed with the intention of arousing your own sexual passion.

2) That it doesn't hold the possibility of a grave sin.

3) That there be sufficient relative reason, which cannot be mathematically measured, but taking into account the more or less stimulating character of the action in question, as the more stimulating that this is, the stronger the motive should be, as the risk to sin is habitual and the insecurity grows with the amount of passion.

Taking these principles into account, we can affirm that two people who love each other and desire to wed can give physical testimony of their feelings with the reasonable security of being able to dominate their passions in the case that they excite themselves against their will. To give a more concrete and satisfactory answer, one must take into account the frequency of the acts, the temperament of the parties, their vices and virtues, etc.

Therefore the need, at this point, as in many others, for the need of a personal spiritual director.

**Adultery** is always a grave sin.

It is committed, not only when the married person has sexual relations with a person who is not his consort, but with any other action that awakens the sexual instinct of a third person, and he will voluntarily accede in the passionate desire, even though you do not reach the sexual act as such. "Whoever looks at a woman with lust, **Jesus Christ** said, hath already committed adultery in his heart."<sup>2364</sup>

**Among married persons** it is a grave sin to desire to have a conjugal act out of matrimony or to imagine doing it with who is not your consort.

But many things who to bachelors are grave sins, are licit to married folk, so long as they are done within the conjugal act, or are a part of it.

The complete venereal gratification, the orgasm, sought directly, is only allowed within marriage, within the conjugal act or intertwined immediately there after, so long as it forms part of normal matrimonial relations.

It is licit for the married couple to have thoughts, imaginations, and desires that lead to the intimacy between the couple<sup>2365</sup>

Neither masturbation nor anal relationship are licit within marriage.

<sup>2363</sup> JOSÉ LUIS PINILLOS: YA Newspaper, 15-I-89, pg. 14

<sup>2364</sup> Matthew, 5:28

<sup>2365</sup> CAMACHO: *Moral íntima entre los cónyuges, I*, 8.Ed. Studium. Madrid

To refuse the conjugal act without reason, can be a grave sin, so long as the partner requests it in a reasonable manner<sup>2366</sup>.

The conjugal act is permitted at all times.

You can elect the days you want, even if they are days of fasting or lent. But the husband must have consideration with the wife on those days when she is indisposed. Sexual relations in marriage are licit at all times, but for reasons of hygiene, it is best to avoid them during the time of menstruation<sup>2367</sup>.

You must abstain also, during the first few weeks after childbirth. The best is to wait about a month. Never do it before fifteen days.

But with the doctor's advice, it may not be necessary to wait a full month.. You must also abstain at least, during the last month of pregnancy.

Doctors consider it to be ill advisable to have a child after age forty.

Talking about matrimony, I will relate the licit methods of birth control.

Generally, one must recommend moderation to the newlyweds, Christian mortification is also for those married, and because an unbridled sexuality can be very dangerous at difficult times.

But always having clear ideas of what entails what is licit and where sin begins.

In case of doubt, consult a priest.

So long as there is no sin, the married couple should not consider the acts of their matrimonial life as an obstacle to receiving communion.

Those things which God has made, have nothing of indignant as to the respect to be accorded to the Holy Eucharist..

## 69.- THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT OF THE LAW OF GOD IS: **THOU SHALL NOT STEAL.**

1. This commandment forbids to take away, withhold, damage, or destroy what does not belong to you, without the consent of the owner<sup>2368</sup>.

For example, I take my schoolmate's wristwatch and I sell it to someone else; or I do not want to return it to who loaned it to me; or in a fit of anger, I give the watch a tremendous blow with a hammer to wreak revenge on my friend: all of this is forbidden by the seventh commandment.

**Contracting debts** knowing that they will not be paid on the date accorded, is a very frequent sin in our times, where many people live above their possibilities.

This commandment also forbids **fraud**: to steal with apparent legality, with cunning, falsifications, lies, hypocrisies, forgery, false brands and origins, etc. Some of the modern forms of stealing are: checks without funds, of signing letters of exchange that can never be paid.

A thief is he who does a hold up with a weapon as the one who steals with a white glove by taking advantage of the need, to extricate the money abusively. Inflated prices which are placed in the case of certain situations can also be considered a grave sin.

**White gloved thieves**, are those who demand money for a service, which they were obligated to do in the first place. It is different to receive a gift, freely given by who is thankful for the service provided.

Also stealing are those who collect a wage for a position, job, destination, service, etc., and they do not carry it out or do it badly.

<sup>2366</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares*, 2º, 2ª, VII, 613.Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2367</sup> Dr. J. DOMÍNGUEZ: *Felicidad sexual*. V. 7. Ed. Plus Ultra. New York. 1971

<sup>2368</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 2401

There may be thieveries which human justice may not be able to punish, but God will not leave unpunished. As example, a person who refuses to pay a debt, just because his creditor has lost the document and has no witnesses.

Other types of robbery are usury, cheating in games where money is involved, in the **buy-sell transactions**, etc. For justice in the buy-sell transactions, one must bear in mind that neither of the parties wants to give the other a gift; but both want a reciprocal deal, exchanging items of equal value, but of different service to each other. In any and all exchange of goods, the value of each of the parts must receive a just and corresponding counterpart.

When the robbery has been with personal violence, the sin is even graver, and therefore, this circumstance must be manifested in confession. The same when it is a sacrilegious robbery: in example, stealing a consecrated chalice.

It is also an injustice, and sometimes a grave injustice, when through negligence **salaries or wages are withheld**, being able to pay them on time. When possible, it would be convenient to pay in cash, especially to those who need it.

2. All lost items have an owner, therefore, they cannot be kept without further ado. One must try to find out who is the owner and return them, being able to deduct the expensed which had been made (notices, advertisements, etc.) to locate the owner<sup>2369</sup>. The diligence in locating the owner, should be proportional to the value of the item, the greater the value, the greater the diligence. One can only keep the item, when after a diligence in proportion to the value of the item, the owner has not been located.<sup>2370</sup>

Taking good care of the things that we use (busses, railroads, gardens, etc.) is a sign of a good education and culture. To mistreat them is showing your lack of education. And you still have the obligation to repair them!

3. What is stolen, **must be returned**<sup>2371</sup>. It cannot be bought or sold. Who purchases items that are known to be stolen, is an accomplice to the theft and is obligated to restitution. Who buys from a thief, also buys the obligation to return the items stolen to their rightful owner, or to give to the poor the money of equal amount.

Whoever sins against this commandment has to have the purpose of returning the item stolen and to repair the damages done, so that he can be forgiven for the sin. Restitution is not always easy. The confessor may be able to orient the sinner in the best way of going about it.

It is convenient to have the following in mind about **restitution**:<sup>2372</sup>

1) Restitution must be made to the person or persons who have been unjustly harmed. If they have died, to their heirs. And if there are no heirs, to the poor or to charity. But no one can benefit from the theft.

2) If one can not retribute all that is owed, he must retribute, at least, what he can, and try to retribute in total as soon as he can.

3) Who cannot retribute immediately, must have the firm purpose to retribute as soon as it is possible.

4) If the restitution cannot be done personally, or if there is a preference to do it through another person, he can consult with the confessor.

5) If you are able to, but do not retribute, or do not repair the damages unjustly caused to the brethren, has no forgiveness from God: he cannot be absolved<sup>2373</sup>.

<sup>2369</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, nº 629, 1º*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2370</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 2409

<sup>2371</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 2412

<sup>2372</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, nº 772-780*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2373</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, nº 754*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

Restitution is not obligatory if by doing so, we lose the fame or social standing we have justly acquired.

If you cannot retribute at the moment, you must avoid useless and superfluous expenses in order to be able to retribute soonest. Whoever finds himself in a position that it is impossible to retribute, should try to do good for the damaged one and pray for him.

There are people who steal small things due to an internal impulse. It is a sickness that receives the name of **kleptomania**. It is convenient to cure it as soon as possible, as it will place the one who suffers it in an embarrassing situation. But there are other persons who steal in Hotels and Businesses for the sport of it, for the vanity of being able to brag about it. This is immoral, shameful and belittles whoever does it. And besides, the obligation to retribute to the offended party remains, and if this is not possible, giving alms in the amount of the theft.

4. Also sinning against this commandment is who in one form or another **cooperates with the thievery**, be it ordering, counseling, praising, helping, covering, or consenting, when being able and obligated to stop it<sup>2374</sup>.

Lets make an example: Any given day, at about 5 in the evening, and taking advantage of the light traffic and few people on the street, a taxicab stops in front of a jewelry store. Three masked men descend from the cab, guns in hand. They enter the establishment and rob many pieces of jewelry worth many thousands of dollars. They climb back into the cab and flee. In this example the ones who have sinned gravely are:

1<sup>st</sup> The head of the robbers, who was not in the cab, but was who sent them.

2<sup>nd</sup> Another thief, who was not present at the robbery, but who encouraged the others, somewhat doubtful, to do it.

3<sup>rd</sup> The cab driver, who freely and willingly offered to take them with a participation in the loot.

4<sup>th</sup> The three thieves, of course.

5<sup>th</sup> A relative of one of the thieves who hid the suitcase with the jewels in his house with full knowledge of what had happened.

6<sup>th</sup> Even the bystander, who saw them go into the store, and who could have easily called the police, preferred to sit down on a bench, somewhat distant, to see how the unusual spectacle concluded.

As the robbery was grave, all of them sinned gravely. Had the robbery been light, they would have also sinned, but their sin would have been venial.

**Collaboration** towards sin has different aspects:

It is called **formal cooperation** when you desire the sinful act. This is always sin.

It is called **material cooperation** when the sinful act is not desired, although you cooperate to it. This cooperation can be **immediate o mediate**. It is immediate if this cooperation is necessary for the sinful act. This cooperation is also sin. It is mediate, if this cooperation is not necessary for the sinful act. Mediate cooperation can be licit only if:

- a) The action of the cooperator is, by itself, good or indifferent.
- b) The intention of the cooperator does not approve the sin to which he is cooperating.
- c) That there be a motive to cooperate, because what is wanted is a good effect.
- d) The good effect not be a direct consequence of the bad effect<sup>2375</sup>.

<sup>2374</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares, 1º, 2º, III, nº 765-771* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2375</sup> JESÚS MARTINEZ GARCIA: *Hablemos de la Fe, III, 8.* Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992



5. The seventh commandment defends the **right to property**. It forbids stealing, as it is unfair to take away from someone what he licitly owns.

Man has the obligation to conserve his life<sup>2376</sup>, and to found a family<sup>2377</sup>, he has the right to provide himself of the means necessary for it. These means are obtained through his work. Therefore he has the right to keep for himself and his family what he has earned with his work. This right of man demands in others the duty to respect what belongs to him, this is called right of property. The right to property is in agreement with human nature<sup>2378</sup>.

The right of property, in a Christian sense, is the ability to dispose of the riches according to your free will or whim, listening only to yourself to fulfill your pleasure or usefulness. This concept, which belongs to the liberal school, is highly frowned upon by the Catholic morale; and although it recognizes through one of its fundamental principles the respect for legitimate property, it also has among its teachings the law of social justice and that the rich must be on earth the providence to the poor<sup>2379</sup>. It is true that the just possession of goods carries with it the obligation of the fair use of the same; but even though the abuse in the use of them is a sin, it does not annul the reality of the right<sup>2380</sup>. And if the owners, in disregard to their obligation, do not make good use of their property, it is up to the State – guardian of the common good – to establish proper sanctions, that could reach, if circumstances so merit, to expropriation and or confiscation. And it is understood that this intervention of the State must not be arbitrary, but must be subordinate to the common good of the nation<sup>2381</sup>.

The political authority has the right and obligation to regulate for the common good, the legitimate exercise of the right of property<sup>2382</sup>.

**Private property** links certain individuals with the goods of this world. These goods have in themselves an essential end placed by God, which cannot be frustrated, therefore, private property must always serve to this end. If to the contrary, it is disordered. This end consists that the goods of the earth were created so that each and every man could satisfy their needs<sup>2383</sup>. **Pius XII** said it well: “God, supreme provider of all things, does not want that some have abundant riches while others are in extreme need, in a way that they lack the necessary for every day life.<sup>2384</sup>. Who doesn’t want to distribute the wealth is like the one who does not want others to enter the theater so that he alone can enjoy what was prepared for others. This comparison was made by **Saint Bacilius**.

Animals are in the service of man<sup>2385</sup>. That is why “it is indignant to invest in them amounts which should remedy the misery of man.<sup>2386</sup>

The good use of money in rich and poor is }the central point of the social question. But I have already covered this in the fourth commandment.

6. Let’s talk here about the **obligation to give alms**<sup>2387</sup>. Whoever have goods of this world and seeing his brethren go lacking, closes his innards. How does he dwell in the charity of God<sup>2388</sup>.

<sup>2376</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1938c. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2377</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1938a. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2378</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1851. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2379</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup>. LLOVERA: *Tratado de sociología cristiana*. N°212. Ed. Luis Grill. Barcelona

<sup>2380</sup> PIUS XI Encyclical *Quadragesimo anno*, n° 17

<sup>2381</sup> JEAN VILLAIN, S. I.: *Enseñanza social de la iglesia*, 2<sup>a</sup>, 1<sup>o</sup>, I, 4, & 7. Ed. Aguilar. Madrid.

<sup>2382</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2406

<sup>2383</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2402

<sup>2384</sup> PIUS XII: Letter to the American Episcopate, 1940

<sup>2385</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2417

<sup>2386</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2418

<sup>2387</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2462

Let us not confuse the obligations of charity with the obligations of justice.<sup>2389</sup> It would be a mistake to want to substitute with charitable works the obligations of justice<sup>2390</sup>. But there will always be a place for charity, because there will always be disasters in this world.- And of course, better to give bread today, is to give the possibility that they do not have to ask for it tomorrow: jobs, schools, etc.

It will always be true, that which says: alms benefit more the one who gives them, than the one who receives it<sup>2391</sup>.

**Everyone** is obligated to charity. Those who have much, much. Those who have little, little. Each one, in accordance with his possibilities must cooperate to remedy the needs of those who have less. The Second Vatican Council says that the alms should not be given of the superfluous items, but also of the needed ones<sup>2392</sup>. The New Canon Code Law stipulates that. "all have the obligation to promote social justice, as well as to help the poor with their own goods"<sup>2393</sup>. Perhaps it is the **street beggars** that abuse and cheat; although many times there are true reasons of need which we must not turn a deaf ear to. But today there are organized charities which allow to direct alms to real and urgent needs.

In order for this exercise of charity to be truly extraordinary and show itself as such, it is necessary that one see in his brethren the image of God, according to which he has been created to his likeness, and to **Jesus Christ** to whom what is given to the destitute is in reality offered to him, it is important to consider with maximum delicacy the freedom and dignity of the person who is receiving the assistance; that it does not tarnish the purity of intention of the usefulness or through the desire of domination; that it satisfy above all the demands of justice, and that it not be used as an offering of charity when it is already owed as a form of justice, that the causes of the misdeeds be removed, not only the effects; and that the help be ordered in such a way that who is to receive it, will slowly but surely become liberated of external dependency and start to stand up for themselves<sup>2394</sup>.

Fortunately, the duty of giving alms is slowly but surely entering into the conscience of Catholics. Although some still do not fully comprehend that they are mere administrators of the goods that God has placed in their hands. And that God, who is owner of all, desires that these goods also help others, after having helped your own needs. It is not fair that the first parcel who receives water for irrigation absorb it all, and flood, not allowing water to flow to other parcels, who also need it. To give concrete amounts of the amount of charity is always somewhat risky, but to not give it is worse. A bit of orientation will not hurt.

**For an orientation** of what can be given, I will in continuation give you percentages obtained from different consultations with moralists, economists, and workers who are truly Christian. It is not to be taken as an absolute and obligatory norm, only as an orientation. The particular circumstances of one will not allow to reach it, but it will be greatly compensated with the generosity of others.

Profits are, what is left over after paying taxes to the IRS.

According to the European Economic Community, you are considered poor if you have a take home pay of less than 50% of the *per capita* income of your country. As in Spain, the per capita income is of 12,000 dollars, or about 1,200,000 pesetas a year, anyone making less than 60,000 pesetas a month can be considered to exempt of giving alms. Although Christian generosity should never have the door closed.

Income of less than a million pesetas per year, give from 1 to 5%

<sup>2388</sup> John, 3:17

<sup>2389</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2446

<sup>2390</sup> PIUS XI Encyclical *Quadragesimo anno*, n° 56 and *Divini Redemptoris*, n° 49

<sup>2391</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 891, b, 3º Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2392</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*. Constitution of the Church in the actual world. N° 98

<sup>2393</sup> New Canon Code Law, n° 222,2

<sup>2394</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Apostolicam Actuositatem*: decree on the apostolate of the secular, n° 8

Income from 1,000,000 to 5,000,000 annually: give from 5 to 10%  
 Income from 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 annually, give from 10 to 20%  
 Income in excess of 10,000,000 pesetas per year, give from 20 to 50%

Families with up to three children can reduce by 10% the amount resulting from applying these percentages. From four to seven children, they can reduce these amounts by 25%. Those that have more than eight children, can reduce it by 50%. There can be circumstances of extraordinary expenses which may require a personal consultation. An also **the generosity** of exemplary Christians will increase these orienting amounts. I know of people that give up to 25% of their income.

Another way of calculating what must be given as alms, could be, separate the fixed expenses, (rent or mortgage, utilities, food, cleaning, domestic help, automobile, transportation, insurance, credit cards, hairdresser, barber shop, children's allowance, school and educational materials); of what is left over after paying for these fixed expenses, spend half of it in clothing, entertainment, etc., and of the other half, take 50% for savings and the other 50% for alms.

We Spaniards should give much more to charity that what we give. What each Spaniard gives in money, on the average, is some seventy pesetas a year where we should be giving some fifteen thousand, in the light of the consumption of superfluous goods. Recapping what we give toe the Hunger Campaign, Caritas, Red Cross and Domund, according to the information provided by these organizations, it reaches an aggregate amount of twenty thousand million pesetas a year<sup>2395</sup>, while during the year we spend in:

1.- Alcoholic beverages	272,347 Million pesetas		
2.-Tobacco	455,653	“	“
3.- Bingo, Lotteries, etc.	1,342,360	“	“
4.- Slot machines	1,076.542	“	“

This information from 1996 can be ratified with the Contabilidad Nacional de España, which is published by the Instituto Nacional de Estadística.

Since games of chance have been allowed in Spain, this has been turned into a national vice. The fact that Spaniards spend in games of chance a grand total of 4,000,000,000,000 (twelve zeros) a year<sup>2396</sup> is an atrocity. Spain is the country which spends more on games of chance, right after the Philippines.<sup>2397</sup>

There are people who spend on Bingo what they need at home. This is immoral. And if what they spend is what they don't need, they should give it to the people who do need it. Money is not to be gambled. Unless it is in small amounts<sup>2398</sup>

But gambling is a vice. It usually starts out by betting small amounts of money, and many times it ends when what you gamble is unconceivable. **Ludopathy** (addiction to gambling) is today, in Spain, a problem as grave as drugs<sup>2399</sup>. Games of chance are turning Spain into a country of ludopaths. With so many lotteries, the vice has proliferated to the point that the Hospital Ramon y Cajal has started a protocol of investigation to test a medication to treat ludopathy<sup>2400</sup>. Almost two million Spaniards have an addiction to games of chance<sup>2401</sup>, According to **Ramon Marrero**, Councilor for Labor and Social Matters, a 5% of the Andalusia population, some three hundred and

<sup>2395</sup> ILLUMINARE Magazine, 335 (X-95) 13

<sup>2396</sup> YA Newspaper, 20-VI-90. pg. 24

<sup>2397</sup> DIARIO DE CADIZ 29-x-96. pg.. 27

<sup>2398</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2413

<sup>2399</sup> YA Newspaper 22-III-90, pg. 7

<sup>2400</sup> YA Newspaper 28-III-92, pg. 13

<sup>2401</sup> ABC Newspaper, Madrid, 29-X-96, pg. 73

fifty thousand people, suffer ludopathy. In 1994, they spent five hundred thousand million pesetas on gambling<sup>2402</sup>. A single ludopath **Angel Asenjo**, aged 58, turned himself in, claiming he was a slave to gambling. He stole from the bank where he worked over 243 million pesetas. He would play 70 thousand pesetas a day<sup>2403</sup>.

**Dr. Román Fernandez**, president of ACOJER, an association for the rehabilitation of compulsive gamblers, affirms that in Spain today, there are 380 thousand compulsive gamblers. **Ludopathy** originates all types of problems, labor, economic and social, as the gambler needs to play all the money he can get his hands on, and therefore will lose his job, his friends and his family. The need of money to gamble it away will take him to steal. Ludopaths experiment a need similar to that of the drug addict who needs to get himself a “fix”<sup>2404</sup>. Ludopathy is a mental illness. It is an illness that enslaves.

**Jose Sanchez Leon**, held up twenty two banks, to spend it all on gambling. He states that he would spend up to ten hours at the table, and would gamble millions each night. The prosecuting attorney requested a total of 154 years in prison for him<sup>2405</sup>.

**Elfriede Blauensteiner** killed sixteen lovers, rich and old by poisoning them, after having them change their will in her favor, to gamble the money away a several casinos<sup>2406</sup>.

7.- Catholic moral has traditionally admitted two possibilities in which an act which apparently is against private property is not considered as theft: these are the cases of **extreme need** and of **occult compensation**<sup>2407</sup>.

“Who finds himself in the case of extreme need has the right to take from the riches of other what is necessary for him”<sup>2408</sup>, as long as he does not put the owner in the same degree of need.”

**Extreme need** is more than grave and challenging need, it is a situation such that it would not be possible to continue living if it is not by taking the good of the brethren<sup>2409</sup>.

**Occult compensation** is the possibility through which one takes what in justice is owed, secretly taking possession of the good of the creditor and only to the amount of said debt<sup>2410</sup>. The debt must be openly clear, the desire to not satisfy by payment, also; other means of recovering what is owed have been exhausted, and the compensation must not harm a third party.<sup>2411</sup>

8. It is a grave sin, ordinarily speaking, to steal from a person the equivalent of his daily wage. Small thefts and amount to a grave sin, when they accrue: either for the intention of stealing much, little by little; or by keeping what was stolen, or by stealing in a short period of time, even though in several attempts, an amount than when the parts are added up, can get to be grave<sup>2412</sup>. Theft will be grave or light in accordance with the damage done. One must take into account the amount stolen, and the person robbed. Although there is an amount –called by theologians “absolutely grave” – which, because of its size, will always be a grave sin.

<sup>2402</sup> DIARIO DE CADIZ Nespaper, 28-X-95, pg. 21

<sup>2403</sup> DIARIO DE CADIZ Nespaper, 29-X-96, pg. 34

<sup>2404</sup> YA Newspaper 24-XI-88, pg. 16

<sup>2405</sup> DIARIO DE CADIZ Nespaper, 29-IX-95, pg. E4

<sup>2406</sup> EL PAIS Newspaper, 13-I-96, pg. 23

<sup>2407</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 2408

<sup>2408</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*. Constitution of the Church in the actual world. N° 69

<sup>2409</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 751* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2410</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 752* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2411</sup> Libro básico del creyente hoy. XXXVI, 3. Ed. PPC. Madrid

<sup>2412</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 750, 5º* Ed. BAC. Madrid

## 70.- THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT OF THE LAW OF GOD IS: **YOU SHALL NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS.**

1. This commandment orders not to lie, nor to needlessly count the defects of the brethren, nor to defile him, nor to have bad thought about him without reason, nor to tell secrets without sufficient reason to justify it.

2. This commandment forbids to make manifest things that are occult, but that we know under **secrecy**. There are things that are under the case of a natural secret. "It cannot be revealed without grave cause, something that of which we have knowledge, which refers to the life of another person, and whose revelation would cause harm. This obligation subsists even if it is not a told secret, and even if you have not been asked to hold it secret.

For it to be a legitimate secret, it is not necessary that it refers to grave matters: state secrets, professional secrets, etc. Although the name secret may not be the most adequate, also into this category you can include, the legitimate reserve that all persons have on their private and family life. In the majority of cases it is all about well known things to the circle of friends, that is to say, more than hiding something, it is about not generating unnecessary publicity.

It is **licit to reveal a secret**<sup>2413</sup>, (even the entrusted one) to avoid a grave danger to the one who holds it, or to the one who confided it, or to a third party unjustly harmed by the one who confided the secret, or for the need of the common good<sup>2414</sup>. But what the priest knows by having learned it through confession cannot be revealed under any circumstance, not even to save his life, nor to avoid a world war. (See n<sup>o</sup> 90).

3. **Reading correspondence** not addressed to us may be a grave sin<sup>2415</sup>, as we expose ourselves to find out about grave things which we are not entitled to know<sup>2416</sup>, unless that we suppose permission from the sender or the addressee. But it is licit for parents to read the correspondence of the children still under their care<sup>2417</sup>, although they should not do it without just cause. The best is for the children spontaneously read them to their parents when it seems convenient.

The Superiors can read the letters of their underlings, when with cause, they suspect that they contain something bad, or if the rulings grants them that right. Excepted however, are the letters written to the Major Superiors, and those destined to the confessors, who should never be read by anyone else than the addressee.

**4. Murmuring** is to broadcast defects of the brethren in their absence.

In the matter of murmuring it is possible to reach a grave sin if you take away the fame, even though the thing said are true, if they are grave and not public, unless there is cause that justifies it, as would be to prevent a harm. Besides, many times, afterwards, the tarnished fame cannot be restituted. It is like when you drop a bucket of water, you can never recover all of the water.

<sup>2413</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares*, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, III, n<sup>o</sup> 799. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2414</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n<sup>o</sup> 2491

<sup>2415</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares*, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, III, n<sup>o</sup> 398, 4<sup>a</sup>, c.. Madrid

<sup>2416</sup> N. HOLDIN, S. I.: *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, 2<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, VII, 5, n<sup>o</sup> 671 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2417</sup> N. HOLDIN, S. I.: *Teología Moral*, II, 672. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

Whoever with his questions, interest, etc., induces another one so that he unjustly defames his brethren, sins, grave or lightly, against justice, in accordance with what is said.

Whoever rejoices when hearing it, sins against charity. Who could impede it and does not do it, will sin if he is a superior: for example, the father of the family. A peer does not generally have to impede it, at least not an obligation of a grave sin. And if he foresees that his intervention will only serve to worsen matters, it is best not to say anything, but of course he can not show signs of approval of the fault. Disagreement can be shown by maintaining silence, not giving attention to it, and also even defending or excusing the brethren, if this is not counterproductive. There are persons who have the bad taste that they are always bringing up the defects of others: they are like dung beetles. On the other hand, I once heard this praise of a certain person: "he always speaks well of others". Isn't this second phrase much better?.

Whenever and wherever you can, praise what is appraisable. The whole world loves to be loved and recognized, and besides everyone is entitled to have his merits praised..

Those responsible for the means of social communication have the obligation to serve the truth and to not offend charity<sup>2418</sup>.

We should not speak ill of anyone. Unless there is a just cause, as would be: to warn another, to give advise, etc. It is not a lack of charity to attack the wolf, it is charity with the lambs.

We must know how to see the bright side of things. When faced with a bottle which is half empty, the pessimist gets sad, as it is half empty, but the optimist sees it half full, so he is happy.

A person, when hearing the criticism of another person, asked for a sheet of white paper, and then put a dot in the middle of the sheet. Then he asked the one who was criticizing

- What do you see here?

- A black dot!

- I see a white page!

Think bad and you will be right is a saying that is correct sometimes, but not very Christian. This one is a thousand times better "think well of everyone, unless you have a clear reason to doubt"

Besides, "experience shows us that the most lying man says many more truths that lies, and that the most evil man does many more good deeds that indifferent or bad ones<sup>2419</sup>. That is why **Jesus Christ** said: "Do not judge and thou shall not be judged"<sup>2420</sup>. It is truly a light judgment. "The actions and intentions of others should not be judged with a unfavorable reason"<sup>2421</sup>.

It is very hard to justly judge others. Appearances, sometimes are deceiving. The truth remains hidden in the heart. And only God knows the heart of men.

Some people need to always be in the limelight. Such as the "Giant headed and Giant" (Gigantes y Cabezudos - a Spanish tradition) in some processions, are looking for a means to overshadow and be seen by all. Even though this doll is made of paper mâche and is empty on the inside. But they want to be outstanding, to be larger than life, to be over everyone. That is why they get into these huge play ground dolls. And if they do not find a doll that can carry them, they will place a huge cardboard head on themselves like the "cabezudos": they criticize everything and anything, just because they have the truth on everything. Everyone else is ignorant, naïve or evil. The only ones who know what to do to be right are them. The only thing that is bad is the lack of proportion of their head with their heart, who could conceivably also be made of cardboard.

<sup>2418</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2497

<sup>2419</sup> JAIME BALMES: *El. Criterio*, VII, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2420</sup> Matthew, 7:1

<sup>2421</sup> MANUEL DE TUYA, O. P.: *La Biblia Comentada*. Matthew VII, a. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

5. **Calumny** is to remove fame from your brethren by placing on him sins or defects which he does not have, or faults that he has not committed<sup>2422</sup>.

There is obligation to retribute the fame or honor that has been removed, and to repair the damage that followed<sup>2423</sup>, if they have been foreseen, or at least in confusion<sup>2424</sup>.

The calumny will be grave or slight if the matter of the calumny is grave or light. But moralists warn that in this case it is easy to reach graveness, because of how much man estimates his own fame. The whole world gives his own honor more value than a fistful of coins.

You can retribute the person's fame by talking well of the person who you had belittled before, also praising him in other things – if what you said was true—or by saying that you have found out that what you had talked about is not true—if what you said was untrue—. Unless it is more prudent to let things go into oblivion.

5. **Lying** must be avoided because it is sin. But generally it is venial sin. The lie will be grave if it does grave harm to others<sup>2425</sup>.

Lying must be avoided because of the harm it produces on ourselves. The liar is not believed by anyone, even if he is telling the truth.

The trust between people has a great value. Trust can exist only if there is truth reigning<sup>2426</sup>. Lying perturbs the social order and the peaceful coexistence amongst men. Without mutual trust, based on truth, human society is not possible<sup>2427</sup>. All men feel a positive attraction to the truth, even though sometimes it is hard to live being faithful to the truth<sup>2428</sup>.

One thing is lying, and another is to **hide the truth**<sup>2429</sup>. You can never lie. But sometimes, you must hide the truth. For example, if an attorney is asked about secret matters that he cannot discover. This way of hiding the truth is called mental restriction<sup>2430</sup>.

It is said that a person is speaking with **mental restriction**, when he gives his words a different sense of the one they really have<sup>2431</sup>.

Sometimes there is an obligation to hide the truth (priests, doctors), and in others there is no obligation to say it, in example: whoever is asking prying questions. To lie is to deny the truth to who has a right to know it<sup>2432</sup>.

“No one is obligated to reveal a truth to someone who does not have the right to know it”<sup>2433</sup>.

In Christian philosophy, two notions of lying are possible and accepted: the denial of the truth, by itself, and the negation of the truth to who has a right to know it. Both definitions are supported by the same moral-ontological arguments. The first admits mental restrictions. In the second case, when one asks without a right to do so, you can receive any answer, because of his indiscretion, in asking what he has no right to know, one can oppose our discretion to not answer. The interlocutor has the right to know the truth. It is the base of human relations. But there are cases in which one must hide the truth from he who has no right to know<sup>2434</sup>.

<sup>2422</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2477

<sup>2423</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2487

<sup>2424</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 808*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2425</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2484

<sup>2426</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2469

<sup>2427</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 792, 3ª*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2428</sup> *Con nosotros está. 2º. XII. Madrid. 1976*

<sup>2429</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2489

<sup>2430</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2491

<sup>2431</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, III, n° 794* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2432</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2483

<sup>2433</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2489

<sup>2434</sup> PHILIPPE DE LA TRINITE. O.C.D.: *Dialogo don el marxismo? II, D. 1*. Ed. Aldecoa. Burgos

Among the talents that man possesses is the capacity of expressing and communicating feelings and thoughts through the use of the word. The good usage of the word is for all a duty of justice. Without this straightforward usage, it would not be possible to coexist. The malice of the lack of truth is something outstanding: even those who lie abhor that lying is used against them. Our brethren is entitled for us to speak with the truth, but they do not have the right –except in special cases- that we reveal what can be a matter of legitimate reserve. The hiding of the truth is licit when there is a known cause<sup>2435</sup>.

Finally, it is convenient to warn that **the joking lie** is not sinful, as it does no harm to anyone, which is said to entertain, so that all can understand that it is a joke, that will be cleared afterwards. A good example are the April 1<sup>st</sup> jokes, which everyone in the United States knows are jokes.

## 71.- THE NINTH COMMANDMENT OF THE LAW OF GOD IS **YOU WILL NOT LUST.**

1. This commandment refers to the internal sins against chastity, thought and desires. It completes the sixth. **Jesus Christ** says: “He who has looked at a married woman with lust, has already committed adultery with her in his heart”<sup>2436</sup>.

“Our Christian morals are not hypocritical, which only looks at the external, on the contrary, it demands congruity between the internal willing act and the external action”<sup>2437</sup>

Television these days propagates sexual fantasies. It is a way of spreading immorality, as the psychologists say: “the idea is a forerunner of the act”. That is why Catholic moral obligates to reject all dishonest desires and thoughts.

Whoever sincerely wants to avoid a forbidden act, must also avoid the road that takes you to it. It is of course about desires of forbidden things. For spouses, the desires of everything to which they are entitled, are licit. The same goes for the boyfriends and girlfriends who desire that the day of their marriage arrives.

It is clear that in order for there to be a sin in this commandment, as in any other, it is necessary to wish or voluntarily enjoy en that which is forbidden to do. Whoever has bad thoughts, imaginations or desires against his will, does not sin. To feel is not to consent. Feeling, many times does not depend on us, consent always. The sin is in consenting, not in the feeling. The body feels, the soul consents. And it is the soul who sins, not the body

Don't think that you have consented in a bad thought because it has lasted a short or long time. It can happen that your imagination will show a complete film of things, which, if they are thought without wanting, are no sin at all.

A thought can bother you for a long time, even last for days. Like a bothersome fly that comes back again and again. No matter how many times a mosquito hovers about you, it will not bite you if you do not let him. If you do not accept evil thoughts, and do everything in your power to reject it, not only do you not sin, but you are pleasing in the eyes of God.

You must also distinguish between liking and consenting. It is very possible that you feel attracted by the thing, that you see you like it, that you may suffer an organic commotion, and yet your will is rejecting all of this. While your will does not consent in enjoying that sensation, or delighting in that bad thought, there is no sin at all. It is not the same thing to feel an attraction that to palate a liking. It is not the same to experience a sensation, than to take advantage of it.<sup>2438</sup>

<sup>2435</sup> RAFAEL GOMEZ PEREZ: *Problemas morales de la existencia humana*, 5ª, 1 Ed. Magisterio Español. Madrid, 1981

<sup>2436</sup> Matthew, 5:28

<sup>2437</sup> ANTONIO TAPIES: *Nuestra Salvación*, 1ª, I, 28. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2438</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación*, 1ª, III, n° 69. Ed. BAC. Madrid



2. To defeat **bad thoughts** which are bothersome, the best thing is to ignore them and distract yourself with something else. The best weapon against a bad thought is another thought, but a good one. Try singing or whistling. Read a book. Pick up a pencil and multiply two large numbers. If you do not have a pencil, try to do it in your mind. Think of something totally different. Even if you feel it is an absurd, for example: try to form a baseball team with the nine fattest men you know. Think of yourself as the umpire, or that you are a referee in an international match, or that you're practicing a game that is of your interest. Something that will absorb your understanding, for example, remembering all the counties in your state,,, imagine the ten most beautiful cathedrals you know, call a friend on the phone, etc. You may even think: "and if I should die now?". This is possible. The object being to occupy your mind in something concrete. And if you can start an occupation which will absorb your complete attention, even better! Going out for a walk could help distracting you. Find yourself some trick that will erase from your imagination that thought which is bothering you. But first of all, pray to God or to the Virgin asking them for the grace to triumph, in example, with a ejaculatory. Immediately thereafter reject those thoughts and enjoy a moment of distraction.

It is necessary to acquire the habit of a rapid reaction against temptation, like when a hot cinder from a cigarette falls on your new coat.

3. Many times there are external circumstances, such as bad conversations, dangerous readings, dishonest spectacles and entertainment and television, will arouse imaginations, thoughts and desires of impure things. In these cases the first resource is to flee from those circumstances. Who voluntarily places himself, without just cause, in circumstances that constitute grave danger and opportunity to consent in thoughts or desires that are bad, commits a grave sin<sup>2439</sup>.

4. **Grave sin** against this commandment are: bad thoughts and desires if they have been voluntarily consented.

## **72.- -THE TENTH COMMANDMENT OF GOD IS: THY SHALL NOT COVET THY NEIGHBOR'S PROPERTY.**

1. This commandment is contained in the seventh. But it insists that you can also sin by desiring to take what doesn't belong to you<sup>2440</sup>. But this is naturally a consented and disorderly desire.

The tenth commandment forbids greed.

This does not mean that it would be a sin to wish to have, if you could legally do so, the same thing that your neighbor has. This commandment does not forbid an orderly desire of wealth, as it would be an aspiration to a better life, legally obtained; it does tell us however to be conformed with the gifts that God has given us and with those that we can legally obtain<sup>2441</sup>.

But it would be a sin to grovel against God because he does not give you more: and your being envious of others property.<sup>2442</sup>

2. Don't let bitterness in your heart corrode the peace of your soul. Even though life is hard, and the complaint can be on the tip of your tongue, do not let bitterness grab hold of your heart. Try

<sup>2439</sup> CATECISMO: Texto Nacional. Tercer Grado. Lección 33.

<sup>2440</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2536

<sup>2441</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2537

<sup>2442</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2539

to improve your situation and satisfy your needs, but without bitterness. God wants it, and the church – as your mother— is the first to try it, teaching all that it is what the worker deserves. Remember what I told you in the fourth commandment. Try harder, but always through licit means, not with a rebellious spirit, nor of hared, but with a Christian spirit, with faith in God's providence, and not forgetting that in this life, you cannot make suffering disappear.

On the other hand, do not forget that accumulating wealth is not everything. It is more important to do good deeds, as the eternal prize of heaven is worth much more than all of the gold in the world. If we were to truly believe this, we would place more effort in practicing the good.

The authority must place the means to foment better prosperity all around and improve the standard of living of the people, with a just distribution of wealth. Parents must provide the means convenient to assure the well-being and future of their children. The wealthy must care of their riches, making them grow through wise investments, generating other sources of wealth and new jobs, according with the needs of all. We must all cooperate with our work to the public and private well-being of all.

But the desire of riches must be moderated through the virtue of social and distributive justice. And we cannot aspire to them but through licit means and with honest goals. The immoderate desire of riches with selfish goals and unjust means causes social unrest, and even war among nations<sup>2443</sup>.

**Greed** is to idolize money. It is a desire to possess, without limit, that takes you to the exploitation of your brethren, or to not share with needy others your resources.

The anxiety of money can enslave the same way the one who has as the one who does not have.

The church exalts the letting go of worldly goods. But this does not oppose progress which tends to make misery disappear which prevents the practice of virtue in some social sectors of society.

3. The physiological tests of **Bert**<sup>2444</sup> on oxygen, required for our cells, have demonstrated that if they are lacking it, they suffer and die; but an excess is also bad, as it results in convulsions. In other words, our organism is made for a measure, and it is just as bad to have an excess as it is to be lacking. So is it with material goods. The same that there is a vital economic minimum. There also should be a vital maximum that cannot be overcome in order to stay in the human balance. In the countries where progress has reached high standards of living, and a freedom without limit, there has resulted that men are tired of living. That is why in them suicides have multiplied. The church has its reasons when it teaches an ascetic fight and of self termination. This betterment of man on himself, although demanding sacrifice and effort, also fill life with satisfactions.

Happiness is not having many things, but knowing how to enjoy what you have. Happiness flourishes from the innermost of our being. Whoever searches for happiness outside of himself, is like a snail looking for a house. Happiness is possible in all circumstances of life. Those that do not find it is because they look where it is not. Instead of looking for it in oneself, they look for it in external places that leave the heart empty, and then comes boredom and sadness, "happiness does not depend on what happens to us, but as to how we perceive it. Happiness is in enjoying what we have, and not in desiring what we can't have. A happy person will always find something positive in the negative"<sup>2445</sup>

<sup>2443</sup> CATECISMO: Texto Nacional. Tercer Grado. Lección 34.

<sup>2444</sup> CHAUCHARD: *El humanismo y la ciencia, III*, 5. Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>2445</sup> BERNABÉ TIerno: EL SEMANAL Magazine, 4-VI-95, pg. 102

73.- Besides God's Commandments, the Church has five commandments.

1. By the power received from Jesus Christ <sup>2446</sup>, the Church can impose precepts that gravely obligate men to an order for a better compliance with the Law's of God.<sup>2447</sup>.

The Church's commandments are of two classes:

The first three obligate all to attend mass, confess and to receive communion, this has already been seen. ( 45 to 61)

The fourth orders fasting and abstinence on those days determined by the Church.

2. **Fasting** consists of taking only one large meal during the day. But you can eat something light at the other two meals.

For breakfast, as an example, you can have milk, coffee or tea, or a bit of chocolate, about 60 grams (2 oz.) of bread, doughnuts, muffins, etc. At dinnertime, you can have up to 250 grams ( 8 oz) of food. If this sounds too complicated, then you can use the practical norm of some moralists who say that for whosoever has the obligation of fasting, it is sufficient that at breakfast time and dinner time, they only eat one half of what is their habit.. And if what they normally have is little, the amount to be suppressed can be less. Another practical norm is adding what you have in your small meals, it should not reach the total of what you have in your large meal of the day<sup>2448</sup>. In your large meal of the day, you can have all you want, but you should not have nothing during the day (food or drink) which can be considered food. You can take non-alimentary liquids such as soft drinks, coffee, tea and alcoholic drinks<sup>2449</sup>, accompanied by small snacks, such as peanuts, and or other tidbits, but it is really better not to have them.

**Abstinence** consists in not having meat, but meat broth is not forbidden<sup>2450</sup>, nor is animal fat, if it is a condiment. You can also have eggs and dairy products.

All Catholics above 18, and up to the of age of fifty nine years, must fast<sup>2451</sup>.

Abstinence is obligatory from the age of fourteen to the end of life<sup>2452</sup>. The truly poor are not required to fast or abstain, as well as the infirm and the workers<sup>2453</sup>. Also, those who are in a feeble-minded state are not to observe abstinence. The parish priest and priests can so dispense when there are sufficient reasons to do so.

**The days of fasting and abstinence** are Ash Wednesday and Holy Friday. Abstinence should be observed every Friday of the year, which doesn't coincide with a festive day. Abstinenes on Fridays outside of Lent can be substituted totally or partially by other forms of penitence, piety or charity, such as offering alms, visiting the sick, depriving oneself of tobacco or entertainment, or any other pleasure<sup>2454</sup>. Abstinence on Friday's in Lent, and the fasting and abstinence of Ash Wednesday and Holy Friday may not be substituted by your own initiative.

<sup>2446</sup> Matthew, 16:19

<sup>2447</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación, 1ª, III, n° 85*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2448</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, n° 426,2,e*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2449</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, n° 426,2,d*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2450</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, I, n° 426,1, a*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2451</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1252

<sup>2452</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1252

<sup>2453</sup> Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini, 7-II-66*

<sup>2454</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares, 1º, 2ª, I, n° 429,2* Ed. BAC. Madrid

A sporadic transgression of Law cannot be considered a grave sin, but it is if you do it habitually or by voluntarily ignoring it.<sup>2455</sup>

The spirit of the law is what is important. It is all about those few days of the year when you go a little hungry in order to make a sacrifice for our Lord.

The complete observation of the ecclesiastical discipline on penitence is gravely obligatory. But be warned that the Church does not want to establish measures and idiosyncrasies to the limits which in each case will determine the severity of the fault, as it does not desire that the faithful fall into servitude and in the routine of a merely external observance, and it prefers, to the contrary, that they themselves, without foregoing the opportune advice, form their conscience in a deliberate way in each case in accordance with the indications and spirit of the law, with a sense of responsibility before the Lord, who is to judge the sincerity and diligence of our attitude. But no doubt, the disdain and habitual inobservance of the precepts of the Church do constitute a grave sin.

The Spanish Episcopal Conference expects that the current penitential discipline, adapted to Spain, will help to increase in all the sense of sacrifice, the authenticity of a sincere Christian life, and the practice, more personal and conscious of mortification and charity<sup>2456</sup>.

The secretary of the French Episcopate has proposed that Catholics deprive themselves of tobacco or alcoholic beverages one day a week, as a new modality of abstinence<sup>2457</sup>.

**To do penance** is an obligation of every Christian. Every time that we comply with our obligations and offer them up to God, we do penance. When, in offering to God, we deprive ourselves of something that we like or }we do something that we disagree with, we do penance. When, for God, we accept life and its difficulties, we do penance. When, also for God, we are fair and fight against the injustices of life, we do penance. To repent for our sins and make ourselves friends with God, is to do penance.

Penance requires of something interior. God wants the heart, not only external works. If our intention were to stop at obeying the law, without offering it to God, we would not do penance. The first and obligatory penance we must do is to comply with the law of God. If we do not comply with what he orders us, we do not do penance. The principal language of man are his works.

3. The fifth commandment of the Church orders that we help her in her needs and in her works.

Let us not forget that it is the duty of all faithful to help in accordance with the possibilities of each, towards the economic needs of the cult, and to the decorous living of the ministers of God.

We have received all gifts from God. To contribute through them to the needs of the Church, is a way to thank God for what he has given us, and pray that the blessings continue to pour forth. Priests have consecrated their lives to working exclusively for the spiritual well being of men, therefore, it is from them that they should receive what is needed to satisfy their human needs and be able to continue studying and always be prepared for the practice of their ministry.

The New Canonic Code Law says: "The faithful have the obligation of helping the Church in its needs, so that it has what is necessary to carry out the divine cult, the apostolic and the charitable works and the appropriate sustenance of the ministers<sup>2458</sup>.

All good Catholics must also contribute to the operation of the Diocesan Seminary, where future priests are being formed, who later on will care for their souls.

As in other countries, also in Spain, you can help the Church by assigning it a small part of your taxes.

<sup>2455</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares, 1º, 2º, I, nº 429*, fEd. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2456</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1320 (10-XII-66)

<sup>2457</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1468 (29-XI-69) 29

<sup>2458</sup> New Canonic Code Law, nº 222. 1

We all must feel the Church as our own. It is a matter of justice to help the Church in everything relative to the apostolate, as the Church is the entity that gives us the greatest gift that one can receive in this world; the means of attaining heaven<sup>2459</sup>. Our collaboration towards the Church must not be limited to the economic; we must also lend a hand, in whatever way we can.

4. Besides these more general commandments, the Church also has others, such as, for instance, the prohibition of attending atheist schools, or places or centers where the teachings are contrary to those of Catholic doctrine.

The Catholic parents who send their children to these schools, even under the pretext that they teach other profane subjects very well, are grave sinners and are not worth of the sacramental absolution, because of the grave danger they place their children in<sup>2460</sup>,

The Second Vatican Council reminds parents of the obligation to trust their children in time and place, to the Catholic schools, supporting them with all their strength and collaborating with them for the good of their own children<sup>2461</sup>. For such a reason, they must make available and even demand all that is necessary so that their children may enjoy said spiritual help and progress in the Christian formation as well as in the profane<sup>2462</sup>.

The Spanish Bishops say: “the class of religion in Spain today, missing true academic rigor, is being subjected to a process of deterioration which will negatively influence the human and ethical aspects of the whole educational system<sup>2463</sup>. I read in the ABC newspaper of Madrid, on the same page, these two headlines: The Socialist Government makes Religious studies irrelevant. In Sweden, Religion class is obligatory<sup>2464</sup>.

Parents have the right to educate their children in conformity with their moral and religious convictions<sup>2465</sup>.

The **New Catechism of the Catholic Church** says: Parents have the right to choose for their children a school which corresponds to their own convictions, and the public powers have the obligation to guarantee this right of the parents and to assure the true conditions of this exercise<sup>2466</sup>.

As **John Paul II** said in his visit to Spain in 1992: Parents must elect for their children a school in which the bread of Christian faith is present<sup>2467</sup>. Parents have to obligation of preoccupying themselves that their children can be educated in the Catholic religion. If they do not undertake this, do not let them complain later when their children turn out “crooked”.

Don't be content with just asking for the religious education of your children at your children's school. You must verify what they are taught, and if they are deceived, in other words, sold a “false bill of goods”, you must complain like any consumer who has been tricked<sup>2468</sup>.

The Episcopal Commission on Teaching reminds us that we should demand that Catholic education can be received in the teaching centers<sup>2469</sup>. The Catholic religious teaching in school is an obligation and a right, as their service is regulated by law, and whose effectiveness must be supported by the whole Christian community. Bishops tell all Catholic parents the duty of registering their children in the subject of religion and Catholic moral. The same text reminds us of the

<sup>2459</sup> JESÚS MARTINEZ GARCIA: *Hablemos De la Fe, IV, 12*. Ed. RIALP, 1992

<sup>2460</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares, 2º, 2ª, I, nº 303* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2461</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gravissimum educationis* Declaration of Christian Education of the Youth, nº 8, New Canonic Code Law, nº793ss

<sup>2462</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine 2803s (24&31.VIII-96)

<sup>2463</sup> YA Newspaper – Sunday, 30-VI-91, pg. 12

<sup>2464</sup> ABC Newspaper, 3-IV-95, pg 75

<sup>2465</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, (2803s 24 & 31-VIII-96)34.

<sup>2466</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 2229

<sup>2467</sup> PALABRA Magazine, 231 (X-84) 24

<sup>2468</sup> PALABRA Magazine, 248 (III-86) 51

<sup>2469</sup> YA Newspaper, 8-IX-88, pg. 8

obligations that the Christian professors have to “collaborate in the Catholic religious formation of the students whose fathers have elected for them this type of formation” Last but not least they insist on the duty of society and of the governors to respect the right of the parents and of the students in conformity with the principles of the Spanish Constitution and of the international accords signed by the Spanish state with the Holy See in matters pertaining to teaching.

The Pontifical Council for the Family has published a document in which it says that the parents must take their children out of educational centers where a sexual morale, contrary to Church doctrine is taught<sup>2470</sup>.

Another of the Church commandments is not to marry opposed to the laws of the Church.

5. In 1917, the Canonic Law Code is published to systematize a great number of ecclesiastical laws. In 1983, a new Canonic Law Code is published to bring up to date and perfect the previous one.. The study of this reform has lasted 25 years, since Pope John XXIII initiated it. .

**74.-** God’s commandment can be summarized into two:

First of all, you shall love God above all things,. Secondly, and your brethren as thyself<sup>2471</sup>.

1.- This is what the following magnificent bits of advice mean:

Comply with all commandments

Never commit a grave sin

Try to please God in all things.

Never do unto others what you do not want others to do unto to you.

Behave unto others as you want them to behave towards you.

2.-There are persons who reduce their religiousness to serving their brethren. That is good, but it is not sufficient. There are human actions which do not benefit, nor harm brethren, but do please or displease God: such as going to mass or uttering blasphemies.

Today we are very sensitive to social justice. The solution is not in changing the structures, which will continue to be unjust, if we do not change men. If we were to change men, the structures would be better and there would be more justice. The best way is to follow **Christ’s** norm: do unto others as you wish them to do unto you<sup>2472</sup>

**75.- THE CHARACTERISTIC SIGN OF A GOOD CHRISTIAN IS THE LOVE OF GOD AND OF HIS BRETHERN<sup>2473</sup>.**

1. The Christian must comply with his obligations with the same perfection as if he were an atheist, but “in a different manner”. That is to say, with love for others, as if to **Jesus Christ** himself. What’s more, as **Christ** loves them: “*Love each other, as I have loved you*<sup>2474</sup>”.

<sup>2470</sup> ABC Newspaper. 21-XII-95, pg. 69

<sup>2471</sup> Deuteronomy, 6:5; Leviticus, 19:18; Matthew, 22:37-40; Luke, 10:27; Mark, 12:28-31

<sup>2472</sup> Matthew, 7:12

<sup>2473</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, n° 42.

<sup>2474</sup> John, 13:34

You cannot love God if you do not love your brother.

But not all brotherly love is by itself love of God. You can love a person because she is her parent's daughter, whom you love, but you can also love her for herself, and this does not suppose that you love her father, who can be totally indifferent to you<sup>2475</sup>. That is why Christian charity is to love thy neighbor because he is son of God<sup>2476</sup>. The contrary may be an atheistic humanism that is called **philanthropy**<sup>2477</sup>,

The texts from **John** are continuously quoted, as in them, he demands that charity be done with all in an energetic form: "If one were to say that he loves God, and does not love his brother, he is a liar"<sup>2478</sup>. But less frequently quoted is a phrase that in the thinking of John there is no doubt, and it need be remembered today in a special way: it is true that charity with God is a vain thing when it is not united to the love of brother, who is the son of God, as there is the profound reason of our duty towards him; but the love of brother who wishes to ignore the love of God, would not be true: "*In this we know that we love the children of God, if we love God*"<sup>2479</sup>.

These days one frequently hears, the words "mandate" and "law", they are words that are condemned to be proscribed in an absolute way. As if to talk about "permitted" things and "forbidden" things were a true and dangerous denaturalization of moral life.

It is evident above all, that these words, that they want to outlaw, are in the Gospel itself. They are true words of God. It is difficult to eliminate the word and idea of "mandate" from the first letter of **John**. They appear continuously and in the deepest sense. And in a systematic and unacceptable manner, they want to eliminate, for the same reason, the word and idea of "law" in the teachings of **Paul**. What he condemns is a certain concept of "law", but rather to give it another, to which he clearly gives it that name, and whose demands it does not cease to indicate in the clearest form.

At the bottom of the idea of law and of mandate there is the affirmation of someone who is the Lord and who has the right to speak to us as such. Let's listen to **Jesus Christ** when he speaks of "the Father's mandate", of the "will of the Father"; let us listen to the saints, both to those who are catalogued and those who we encounter in daily life. We shall hear that praise resounding in them; that humility, that obedience, which, far from inspiring repugnance for the use of the word "mandate", give it an untold flavor, such as psalm 119, in which divine law is praised.

It is true that a moral that does not have its beginning or its purpose in charity, is not such a moral, or at least the Christian moral. It is also not less true that a doctrine of charity which wants to ignore moral and its laws, is a dangerous chimera of which, charity is the first to pay the consequences.<sup>2480</sup>

Evidently the value of complying with a law depends on the love which is placed on it. A Christian that complies with a law only as an external requisite, reveals a lack of what is most important, love. Laws are necessary in an organized society. Just laws are always oriented to the common good. When complying with them, we show a love of brethren, and also a love of God, by accepting to be ruled by laws demanded by the nature He has given us.

When you truly love your brethren, your interior spontaneity can indicate the way of rectitude. But there is no doubt that this internal spontaneity is not sufficient on many occasions, in which it is necessary to go to external norms which will show us a better route to follow. But, I repeat, the true Christian must place much love in his behavior. Egoism is the great sin of man. Just as egotist is he who does not comply with a law for his own comfort, as the one who complies, just to avoid the sanction. The good Christian complies with the law, and does so with love and for love.

There is no moral without charity, which is its soul.

<sup>2475</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRAS, S. I.: *Cristianos en busca de respuestas*. Ed. Sal. Terrae. Santander 1975

<sup>2476</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1822

<sup>2477</sup> JOSE RIVERA-IRABURU. *Síntesis de espiritualidad católica*, XXI, 7. Ed. Gratis Date. Pamplona

<sup>2478</sup> John, 4:20

<sup>2479</sup> John, 5:2

<sup>2480</sup> Cardinal GARRONE: *¿Que hemos de creer?*, IV, 5 Ed. Paulinas. Bilbao

There is no true charity without moral, which gives it a body.  
The basis of everything is in the acceptance of God.

There are those who want no other moral norm than their own conscience. However, one must be aware that their conscience must be in agreement with objective reality, that is to say, in accordance with what experts and specialists say. For example, if astronomers say that the distance from earth to the moon is about 240 thousand miles, that is a truth independent from what I think. To me, it can seem that it is an exaggeration or that it is greater than that, but notwithstanding what I think, it does not change the distance from the earth to the moon, which is the distance which astronomers have measured. Equally, if the water from a fountain is not drinkable, and the sanitation authorities have stated so, it is dumb to drink from it. The water will not become potable, no matter what I think, but its being good to drink depends on the analysis that the specialists have made.

2. **Jesus Christ** wanted Christians to be recognized for this, in that we love one another<sup>2481</sup>. In general, one must love everyone, and not hate anyone in particular<sup>2482</sup>.

We must practice, in accordance with the occasions, multiple forms of charity<sup>2483</sup>. Catechisms speak of the works of charity: there are so many magnificent forms of practicing charity. Here they are:<sup>2484</sup>

#### WORKS OF CORPORAL MERCY

Visit and care for the sick. Feed the hungry. Give drink to the thirsty. Tend to the homeless. Clothe the naked. Help the exiled and the prisoners. Succor those who have lost a beloved one.

#### WORKS OF SPIRITUAL MERCY

Teach the ignorant. Give good advice to he who needs it. Correct those in error. Pardon the offenders. Console the sad. Suffer with patience the defects of the brethren. Pray to God for those alive and the dead.

**PAUL** says: *"I may have a faith that can move mountains; if I do not have charity, I am nothing"*<sup>2485</sup>. The love between brethren is the sign that **Christ** left us as distinctive of Christians. If this did not exist, the church would not be known to the world.

To love is not only not to do harm, but, above all, to do good. **Jesus Christ** has said that everything that we do to our brethren in his love, even if it is only to give him a glass of water, He will reward as if we had done it to Him<sup>2486</sup>. To orient one's life in a generous manner, is the optimum way to make oneself a man and to be truly happy<sup>2487</sup>.

It is also not Christian to practice charity and forget justice. But as Pope **John Paul II** has said repeatedly, justice alone is not enough. Charity is indispensable, the charity of a smile, of kindness, of servitude, of affection and of alms. Another way of practicing charity is to dedicate part of our free time in service to our brethren.

Besides "synchronic charity" with those with whom we live in this world, we must also think about the "diachronic charity", thinking about the human beings that are to succeed us on this planet, so as not to leave them with a contaminated nature<sup>2488</sup>. This is the sense of **ecology** which today is in vogue.

<sup>2481</sup> John, 15:12, 17

<sup>2482</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Jesucristo y la vida cristiana*, n° 533. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2483</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2447ss

<sup>2484</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference. *Esta es nuestra fe*, 2ª, III, 4, 5. EDICE. Madrid, 1986

<sup>2485</sup> I Corinthians, 12:2

<sup>2486</sup> Mark, 9:41

<sup>2487</sup> ALFONSO LOPEZ QUINTAS: *El amor humano*, XII, e. EDIBESA. Madrid

<sup>2488</sup> JUAN RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *Teología de la creación*, 2ª, VI, 3, 2. Ed Sal Terrae. Santander.



We are obliged “to the full respect of the creation, which is destined to the common good of humanity, past, present and future”<sup>2489</sup>

3. Make an effort to be a good and agreeable person with everyone, always with a charming amiability, availability at all times, having for each the right word, the smile, the jest, etc. All in all, everything that constitutes a discreet and sincere appreciation.<sup>2490</sup> It is important that you be kind. Kindness is the quality through which a person will be loved. It is all about considering, respecting and accepting people as they are and being happy with their successes. Kindness is to take care of each person according to what he needs at that specific moment. Kindness is a sign of maturity and grandeur of spirit. Try to be an educated, respectful, grateful, honest person, good and helpful to everyone. And above all, very Christian. This way you will be a person who is esteemed by everyone. You will be very satisfied with your way of being, and above all God will reward you.

Life in common is a continuous occasion of mutual assistance. At the beginning you will perhaps have to make an effort to be a helpful person, but later, this will be a habit for you and will be no effort at all. Those around you will be influenced by your kindness and will come to you frequently and spontaneously. Be constant and don't get tired when you are continuously bothered by others, as the good that you can do for them will be great. The good Christian is always in an attitude of the greatest service to his brethren in accordance with his possibilities.

Vividly worry about your wounded or sick companions. Go see them, if it is possible. Who knows if they find themselves saddened or abandoned. If it is so, your gesture will garner their friendship forever.

Avoid all that can bother your companions and try to dissimulate what bothers you of your companions, doing everything possible to show yourself as an affable and helpful person with them. Being charitable, besides being a virtue, is a sign of a good education. We all have faults and defects that bother others, and we must be patient when the rest bother us with theirs.

You must be understanding. “To understand is to see all of the possible aspects of a reality, an event, a person. There are some that do not have a point of view other than their own. The Hindustani tale of the blind and the elephant is well known:

A group of blind people were asked to guess what they had in front of them, only touching with their hands. And they were placed in front of an elephant.

One said it was a rope: he had touched the tail”

Another said it was a serpent: he had touched the trunk

Another said it was a tree: he had touched a leg

And it is that one cannot know things by just knowing a part of the whole.

It is reasonable to think that things, and persons are much more, are very complex. The exercise to understand, engages the totality of the events, and much more in the case of humans<sup>2491</sup>.

Sincerely praise all that is worthy of praise. Every person has defects and limitations. But also has virtues and positive things. To see that others know how to appreciate the good that is in us is one of the most heart-lifting things in life. Always place yourself and your things to the benefit of others, this, within reason. Never doubt in doing a favor for others, even if it means that you have to make a personal sacrifice. To do this for your brethren will give your soul a healthy happiness. Besides, you will win over the heart of your companions and this way it will be easier for you to do good for them. A man, humanly and spiritually perfect cannot exist without a cordial glee that illuminates those who surround him<sup>2492</sup>.

<sup>2489</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2415

<sup>2490</sup> PPC Pamphlet n° 112 *El arte de amar*.

<sup>2491</sup> MELCHOR ESCRIVA, S.I.: *Medicina de la personalidad*, 2ª, XLII. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>2492</sup> JOSE CALCERRADA, S.I.: *Forja tu acero*, n° 121 Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

Try to be happy and optimistic. The optimism is not a case of myopia that does not see the bad, nor stoicism that denies pain. Optimism does not deny the bad, nor the suffering, nor the need of effort, nor the hardship of life.... but it makes an effort in finding in all of this a good side, a comforting point of view, a useful end, a true value, unknown at first sight<sup>2493</sup>. If we know how to illuminate the bad with some good, we will embellish our life and will make those around us happier.

Another very important thing is learning to know how to listen. In your visits to the sick, you must know how to listen, Listening with interest is the best way to console the one who suffers. All of us love to be listened to. But so much more, he that is suffering. If in addition to your warm words, you can transmit peace and interior happiness, you will have done a good deed.

It is not the same to be good than to be stupid. To do good fills the human being with cheer and happiness. But one must not confuse gentility with letting one self be trampled upon and humiliated by a frustrated person who to reaffirm himself needs to do harm. To avoid letting him have his way, it is best to ignore it: as if his offenses did not affect us. But you must know how to defend yourself without rage, which unfavorably alters our spirit. It physically, psychically and spiritually bothers and unbalances us. We must do it, if not with our own dominance, with a sense of humor, and better yet with irony. But always in a reasonable form<sup>2494</sup>.

One must not confuse arrogance with pride, which is a super valuation of oneself with disrespect to the rest, with a reasonable self esteem. Self esteem is to value myself as to what I am and for what I am worth. It would be ridiculous to believe I am good for everything. But it would be sad to think that I am worth nothing. To know my possibilities and limitations, and to value myself for what I am. To feel my self competent in something and be appreciated for something gives me peace, happiness and trust in myself. This helps me to be happy. But especially if I place my capacity at the service of others.

Self acceptance gives confidence and security in oneself, and conduces to psychic maturity. To know ourselves well and to know what we can do and what exceeds our possibilities, is the key to doing things well and being content with ourselves<sup>2495</sup>.

Self acceptance does not mean liking oneself. I know my limitations and y try to better myself. We can always be learning and improving. We can always grow as persons. The art of the educator is to discover the capacity that each person has to perfect himself<sup>2496</sup>.

A Chinese proverb says: "The longest journey begins with the first step" The essence of the human being is to find the true meaning of life. Self-esteem helps us to live happily, cordially and optimistically while appreciating that we are well accepted by the rest just as we are, and we are good for something useful, even though we must sacrifice and make a tremendous effort to this end. And when things happen that are not to our liking, we should not be desperate nor should we be depressed. Accept things as they come, and continue on. My happiness is within me. It depends on my attitude towards life. Instead of trying to change persons, things and situations of life which are not within my reach, I can change my attitude towards them, not insisting on what is impossible, and not lose my interior peace and serenity. What is truly worthy are the spiritual qualities. Kindness, generosity, honesty, sympathy, service, etc, are in our hands. The truly Christian person will give priority to all things to the supernatural point of view. That is why he lives securely, trusts God and always has a happy and optimistic attitude.

Do not be arrogant with anyone, but on the contrary, be condescendingly good with all, unless it opposes your conscience, and if you believe that you have offended someone, do not doubt in giving an explanation. When another person gives you an explanation of the offenses that he has made, admit them with ease, even if you may think that they are insufficiently satisfactory.

---

<sup>2493</sup> ANGEL DEL HOGAR: *Felicidad en el hogar*, V. Ed. Descleé. Bilbao

<sup>2494</sup> BERNABÉ TIERNO: EL SEMANAL Magazine. 3-IV-94, pg. 61

<sup>2495</sup> BERNABÉ TIERNO: *Valores humanos*, 1ª, II. Ed. Taller de Editores. Madrid. 1993

<sup>2496</sup> BERNABÉ TIERNO: *Valores humanos*, 1ª, III. Ed. Taller de Editores. Madrid. 1993

4. All of this, besides being norms of good conduct, are consequences of Christian charity, whose manifestation in the love and sacrifice for your brethren was one of the principal recommendations that **Jesus Christ** left us in his Gospel.

An attitude of service is fundamental for all Christians. All one needs to do is to look at **Jesus Christ** who “*did not come to be served, but to serve*”<sup>2497</sup>. That is why the Second Vatican Council says that the Christian “can not find his own plenitude if it is not in the sincere giving of himself to others”<sup>2498</sup>.

I do not know the author of the following:

“Live, loving  
Love, suffering  
Suffer, quietly  
And always,  
Smiling”

Man is humanized when serving others with love: that is what **Jesus** did<sup>2499</sup>

The following thoughts are those of the Nobel prize winner in literature, **Rabindranath Tagore**:

I slept and dreamt that life was happiness.  
I woke up, and I saw that life was to serve.  
I served, and saw that serving was happiness  
The secret of happiness is in serving others<sup>2500</sup>

The same is expressed in this beautiful thought: “He who does not live to serve, is not worthy of living life”

Make today a good day; in service, generosity, happiness  
And you will have a full life, in satisfactions, happiness  
Tomorrow, encore

Those that do not live for an ideal are fastidiously bored. To feel fully realized in life, you must live for something. To have an ideal. And one of the ideals that rewards the most is to be useful to others.

In a society where the powerful are envied; and where we are continuously offered means of acquiring power, Christianity shows us the way of service as the only way that truly transforms a society; because it causes us to change from being rivals, to being brothers, from dominating others, to helping them.

To be a comprehensive person, kind and helpful with others, instead of being an egotistical and lax person, is the secret to be loved always and esteemed by the whole world.

On the other hand, the proud, despotic, hypocritical, vicious person, besides offending God, is despised by all.

Altruism is searching for the good of others even if at the cost of your own good. It is an attitude of service. All of mankind’s great gains were due to men who consecrated their life to others, forgetting about their own interests.

<sup>2497</sup> Mark, 10:45

<sup>2498</sup> Second Vatican Council; *Gaudium et Spes*: Constitution on the church in today’s world, n° 24

<sup>2499</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Luz del mundo*, XII,2, EDIC. Madrid. 1984

<sup>2500</sup> JOSE LUIS DE URRUTIA, S. I.: *Para ser mejor*, II, 2. Reina del Cielo Secretariat. Duque de Pastrana 5, Madrid-16

Never is man happier than when he is dedicated to serving his brethren.

We have been created to love, be loved, share and contribute to the common good.

To do without generosity and altruism in our lives is to kill love and our true happiness. It is possible to aspire to true happiness only if one contributes to the happiness of others. The most perfect form of being a man is "to go through the world doing good", just like **Jesus Christ**.<sup>2501</sup>

A Swedish proverb says: "A happiness shared is multiplied by two; and a shared sorrow is divided by two".

"True joy is born from the heart. It does not consist of the easy laugh, superficial and momentary. True joy flows from he who feels his life useful to others. Good deeds generate internal satisfaction. A good conscience always produces joy.

**Pascal** used to say: "Happiness is a marvelous article. The more that it is given, the more one gains" On the other hand, avarice is the contrary, the more you have, the more you want. So instead of filling a void, you make it larger.

Kindness is the unmistakable sign of the greatness of the soul. The good person, lives to give more than to receive. The good person understands that the good acts enrich the giver more than the receiver. His face reflects gratitude, as if saying: " I must thank you for allowing me to feel the joy of being good to you"<sup>2502</sup>.

Try so that all are persuaded, that in you they have a loyal person , but they will not attain anything when it comes to force your conscience. This is of capital importance. Experience shows that there's nothing that wins a person's sympathy more than a person with a straightforward conscience, that wholeness of character against which all situations that try to move her to evil, whether direct or indirect. The same that tried to debase her, will end by recognizing, even publicly, the great idea they have formed of her virtue and character. The despicable smile of some is the reaction of the mediocre so as not to recognize the values that he internally admires, but does not dare to imitate.

5. And if you have influence over your peers, use it to do as much good to them as possible. Start to conquer souls for **Christ**. Discreetly, but enthusiastically. Why should we leave the door open for the propagators of evil. A convinced Catholic person is not content to live his religion privately, but sets all his efforts and strength to conquer evil and reestablish the kingdom of God in the hearts of men, in society and in the whole world.

In this quest, we have a leader, **Jesus Christ**, our King and our Captain, who goes forth before us, helps us with his power of God, and promises the final victory. But He wants us to fight.

"*God wants all men to be saved*"<sup>2503</sup>. Therefore, He wants the solution of all problems, (even material) who oppose this: social problems, immorality, atheism, lack of clergy, egoism, hunger, etc. Now then, this will of God's is not absolute and unconditional. In that case there would not be a strength strong enough to oppose itself to this plan of God's. Therefore, if men want to save themselves, God helps them; if men want to cooperate to the salvation of others, God will also help. **Jesus Christ** who could have done the Works of the Salvation by himself, put it into the hands of man<sup>2504</sup>: "*Go forth into the world and preach to all the people. Whoever shall believe will be saved, who does not, will be condemned*"<sup>2505</sup>

The Second Vatican Council has dedicated a Decree to the apostolate of the secular. It says that this apostolate "can never be missing in the church, (nº 1), as "it is the plan of God on the world, that man is to perfect without stopping (nº 7) and the seculars "must impregnate and perfect

<sup>2501</sup> BERNABÉ TIerno: *Valores humanos, 1ª, IX*. Ed. Taller de Editores. Madrid. 1993

<sup>2502</sup> BERNABÉ TIerno: *Valores humanos, 1ª, XX*. Ed. Taller de Editores. Madrid. 1993

<sup>2503</sup> Timothy I, 2:4

<sup>2504</sup> P. AGACINO, S. I.: *Pastoral de la Oración. VIII*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2505</sup> Mark, 16:15s

everything in the temporal order with the evangelical spirit” (nº 5). They must “execute their apostolate in the world as if it were a germination”, (nº 2) and even though “the fecundity of their apostolate depends on their vital union with **Jesus Christ**” (nº 4) they must educate themselves well (nº 29) to reveal to the world the message of **Jesus Christ**, not only with the testimony of Christian life, but also with the word (nº 6). “While the total exercise of the apostolate must go on and receive its strength from charity, some works, through their own nature, are apt to convert themselves into a live expression of charity itself, which **Christ-Lord** wanted to be proof of his messianic mission. Therefore, mercy for the needy and the sick, and the calls to works of charity and mutual assistance to succor all human needs are considered by the Church as a singular honor.

Father **ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.**, commenting this Councillar Decree on the apostolate of the secular during the 1966 Lent conferences in the Basilica de Atocha, in Madrid, said: “The most important virtue of the Christian is charity. Charity has three aspects: Love of God, Love of Brethren and love of self. Looking from any angle, the demand of the apostolate to the secular comes forth. Why, can God be loved, and the brethren not, who is a child of God? Can brethren be loved and not be concerned about their spiritual and material interests? Can one truly love self, and lose that immense fountain of spiritual benefits which is to help others to save themselves?

James, the apostle, says at the end of his letter: “Whosoever saves a sinner, saves his soul”<sup>2506</sup>.

Lastly, the current state of the world, is a new argument that hurries the secular towards the apostolate. The invasion of materialism which has fallen upon our society and the scarcity of priests are for the secular Christian sufficient reason to give himself to the apostolate.

Many Christians consider that as they are not priests they do not have to speak up in their public life in favor of Christian life. The truth is, that in view of baptism and of our confirmation, the job of conquering the world for **Christ** falls on all Christians. In the first centuries of Christianity, it was the secular, the simple believers, who in their daily contacts with their peers, communicated in a totally spontaneous way, the Christian method in their community. Also, today all Christians must be conscious that it is the total community of faithful which constitutes the “people of God”, established by **Christ**, and it is not only the priests, but also the secular Christians who are in this world who can make the efficacy of divine life in the family multiply itself visibly. In the professional life, in the multiple fields of social and cultural activity, as well as in the use of leisure time. Every adult Christian must work with apostolic and missionary drive for the cause of **Christ**.

Even though missionary work is considered to be in the realm of specific religious orders, congregations, and other missionary activities, the missionary responsibility falls on the church as a total. Every Christian, therefore, in accordance with his situation, has the obligation to support the sacrificial work of the missionaries, as well as their works in their multiple necessities<sup>2507</sup>.

All of **Christ’s** disciples have the duty of giving **Christ’s** testimony in all places, and to whom ever would ask they should also give reason to the hope that they have in attaining eternal life.<sup>2508</sup>

It is necessary for all Catholics to do their apostolate in their **own surroundings**:

- a). For prayer: it is the most important. Speak to God of him, before speaking to him of God..
- b). For example: personal testimony is indispensable so that he accepts our message. Example convinces much more than words. Words can move, but examples overwhelm.
- c). For the word: it is the apostolate that Jesus Christ practiced. And the mandate He gave his apostles: preach. The whole world can have a pleasing word, give a good advice, a simple exhortation, a loving rebuttal given at an opportune moment, or a lengthy conversation. Also, the written word. If you like this book that you have in your hands, you could give it to someone.

<sup>2506</sup> James, 5:20

<sup>2507</sup> RODOLFO LIEBIG: *La otra revelación*, V. 6. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>2508</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, nº 10.

d). For the sacrifice that gives the more efficacy to the word. As **Pope John Paul II** on June 25, 1993 said: “Evangelization depends, more on the grace that pours forth from the cross of Christ than on a technique and pastoral methods, to which we join our pain. Evangelization obtains untold energies from the cooperation of the patients<sup>2509</sup>

e) For charity: which earns us the heart of others.

And once the seed is sown, let God germinate it. God does not ask us for success, only for work.

**D. Manuel Gonzalez**, who was the Bishop of Malaga and Palencia, who died with a reputation as a saint, spoke of the “mini” apostolate, small details of doing good on happenchance, a smile, a favor, a kind word, a cheering word. Take advantage of all times to give testimony of Jesus<sup>2510</sup>.

All faithful have the duty to work so that the message of salvation reaches more and more of the men of all the world<sup>2511</sup>. We must be like a flame, who gives others its light, but does not tire. Always willing to continue illuminating. A Christian community is ecclesial, **only if and in the measure in which** it participates in the evangelizing work of the church<sup>2512</sup>. Christian vocation is, by its own nature, a vocation to the apostolate<sup>2513</sup>.

The faithful has received his faith from another, and must transmit it to another<sup>2514</sup>.

Since it is proper of the seculars to live in this world, God calls them to exercise their apostolate in the world as a germination<sup>2515</sup>.

**Pope Pius XII** said in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*: “A truly tremendous mystery is that the salvation of many depends on the prayers and mortifications of the members of the mystical body of **Jesus Christ**. Even if it does sound strange, **Christ** wants to be helped by them in their mission of redemption “.

The apostolate of seculars is the participation in the same saving mission of the church<sup>2516</sup>; in which the participation can be done in two ways:

Firstly there is a form of apostolate which corresponds to the secular’s own vocation.

This consists in searching for the Kingdom of God, trying and ordering, according to Him, all temporary matters. They live in the century, that is to say, in each and every one of the activities and professions, as well as in the ordinary conditions of family and social life, condition which their life is intertwined.

It is there that the ones called by God are to carry out their own purpose, guiding themselves by the evangelical spirit, in a way that, like the yeast contributes from the inside to the sanctification of the world and thus discovers Christ to the rest, shining above all with the testimony of His life, faith, hope and charity. It is to them, very specially, that the task of illuminating and organizing all the temporary matters with which they are closely linked, in such a way that they may be continuously realized according to the spirit of **Jesus Christ**, and that they be developed for the Glory of the Creator and of the Redeemer.<sup>2517</sup>

Seculars are particularly called to make the church present and operative in the places and conditions where it cannot be the salt of the earth if not through them. Besides this apostolate, which encompasses absolutely all parishioners, the seculars can also be called in different ways to a more complete cooperation with the apostolate of the hierarchy, as those men and women who helped the apostle **PAUL** in the evangelization, working together with the Lord. (They could be catechists,

<sup>2509</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2646s (21-28, VIII. 93)

<sup>2510</sup> BALDOMERO JIMÉNEZ DUQUE *Volver a lo esencial*. XXX. Ed. Tau. Avila, 1985

<sup>2511</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 211 & 225.1

<sup>2512</sup> SANTOS SABUGAL, O.S.A.: *Credo*, 2<sup>a</sup>, II, 4, 3, 2, Ed. Monte Casino. Zamora

<sup>2513</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Appostolicam Actuositatem* Decree on the apostolate of de secular, n° 2.

<sup>2514</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 166

<sup>2515</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 940

<sup>2516</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. N° 33

<sup>2517</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. N° 31

propagate religious books, participate in parish works, become members of Catholic associations, etc.). The seculars are trained so that the hierarchy entrusts them with the performance of certain ecclesiastical duties, all towards a spiritual goal<sup>2518</sup>.

Some, amongst them, when consecrated ministers are missing or are unable because of persecution, will take their place in certain holy rites, so far as their abilities allow them to do so.<sup>2519</sup>

The Holy Spirit, by giving out his gifts to each as He wants, can, today, just as in the origins of the Church, give the most humble of the faithful these extraordinary charismas which are for the common good of the whole mystic body and respond to its necessities.<sup>2520</sup>

But the "judgment on its application belongs to those who preside the church, to those who are responsible for not putting out the Spirit, but to prove it and to keep the good."<sup>2521</sup>

Christians today have rediscovered the importance of the testimony of life and of the fraternal dialogue with the non Catholic. But it would be lamentable to replace the apostolate with the testimony, and the evangelization with the dialogue<sup>2522</sup>.

Spanish Bishops ask all seculars to deliver a double effort to the apostolate of evangelization, be it in an individual way, or within apostolic associations<sup>2523</sup>.

A Christian knows well his duty of promoting social justice, peace and liberty, as humanity must be perfected and developed until it reaches a total perfection as predicted by God.

In a society obscured by hypocrisy and injustice, the Christian opposes all forms of exploitation, abuses and prejudice, postponing his person in favor of the promotion of the rest.

Working for human promotion is for the Christian an end that has an intrinsic value and for which he follows conjoined with other men of diverse creeds. He alone cannot be content with this effort of humanization, as he is member of the church, whose mission is to announce to all men that God loves them and has sent his son Jesus Christ so that they can know his love.<sup>2524</sup>

One must be careful not to fall into a "new *pelagianism* that seeks salvation in the reform of the structures before rather than in the conversion to God."<sup>2525</sup>

Passivity in the church, clearly is not the attitude proper of the secular. They are church and have to act as protagonists of its history. A history that is very conditioned by the level and sense that the intervention of the secular has in the fulfillment of the salvific mission that it has. This is why it is of utmost importance that the secular take note of the labor that they have to carry out as living members of the People of God. The active incorporation of the secular to the works of the church is the most symptomatic sign of an adult Catholicism.

The secular, as is affirmed, cannot limit themselves to work on the edification of the People of God, or on the salvation of their soul for eternity, but must endeavor themselves in the Christian instauration of the temporary order.

Because of their position in the world the seculars are directly responsible for the efficient presence of the church as to the organization of society as conforms to the spirit of the gospel: it is specially up to them to illuminate and organize the temporary matters to which they are closely linked, in a way that they be done continuously according to the spirit of Jesus Christ, and that they be developed for the glory of the Creator Redeemer.

A first step of this apostolic covenant is the insertion of the Christian secular in the world, through the fulfillment of their duties of state; a fundamental aspect of their testimony as active members and responsible for the people of God and the human community. This testimony is an

<sup>2518</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. N° 33

<sup>2519</sup> A.G. MARTIMORT: *Los signos de la nueva alianza*, n° 86. Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca

<sup>2520</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. N° 35

<sup>2521</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. N° 12

<sup>2522</sup> Cardinal AGAGIANNIAN: *ECCLESIA Magazine*, 1306 (3-IX-67)16

<sup>2523</sup> *ECCLESIA Magazine*, 1376 (3-II-67)

<sup>2524</sup> Secretariat for the non Christian: *Presentación de la fe cristiana*, 3ª, 38. Ed. PPC. Madrid

<sup>2525</sup> *ECCLESIA Magazine*, 1376 (3-II-68)

ordinary demand for all those baptized an essential condition so that it can be said of them, that they lead a Christian life<sup>2526</sup>.

Seculars are called by God so that while they carry out their own profession, guided by the evangelical spirit, they can contribute to the sanctification of the world<sup>2527</sup>.

Catholics must feel obligated to promoting the true common good and therefore make their opinion weigh so that the civil power will be justly exercised, and that law respond to the moral principles and to the common good<sup>2528</sup>.

The kingdom of **Christ** is not an interior and spiritual reality; nor the salvation it brings us is subject to a private sphere. On the contrary, Jesus Christ wants to permeate it with everything, with his spirit, with his truth and with his life: the personal and social surroundings; the family, work and leisure worlds.<sup>2529</sup>

Those Catholics that under the pretext that we are not in a permanent city, as we seek the future one, consider that they can be careless with temporary obligations, are wrong. They should take into consideration that faith in itself is a motive which obligates them to a more perfect compliance with all of them, in accordance with the personal vocation of each.

But not less grave is the error of those whom, on the contrary, can think that they can deliver themselves to temporal matters, as if these were totally foreign to religious life, thinking that this is merely reduced to certain acts of cult and to the compliance with moral obligations. Divorce between faith and daily life must be considered one of the gravest errors of our times<sup>2530</sup>.

The Christian commitment takes us to place ourselves in the service of our brothers to build a world of peace and justice.

But the Christian knows that the future does not depend solely on human effort. He knows that the help of God is necessary. The Christian rejects the posturing of those who expect the authentic and total liberation of man, to come only from the human effort.<sup>2531</sup>

#### **Ways of doing the apostolate:**

- a) Donating sane magazines to worthy organizations.
- b) Giving good books, such as the one in your hands.
- c) Giving used clothes, which are usable, to institutions who will send them to needy countries
- d) Collaborate in the catechism of the parish.
- e) Visiting the sick at home, hospital, asylums, etc., even if they are not known to you, and speaking to them of God in an opportune manner.
- f) Give good advice and example.
- g) Give alms to charity for apostolic works.
- h) Give time and dedication to serve your brethren in charitable or apostolate works.

**6. Proselytizing of the sects** is not the same as the **Catholic Apostolate**. What worries the Catholic missionary is to save the man, the person. What moves the Catholic missionary is the desire to share the joy of faith.

As was said by **Paul VI**, in *Ecclesiam suam*<sup>2532</sup>.n We must worry about conveying the message of which we are depositors.

<sup>2526</sup> Libro básico del creyente hoy. XIX, 2. Ed. PPC. Madrid 1970

<sup>2527</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. N° 31

<sup>2528</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Aspostolicam Actuositatem*: Decree on the apostolate of the secular, 14

<sup>2529</sup> German Episcopal Conference: *Catecismo Católico para Adultos, 2º IV, 4, 2*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2530</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*: Constitution on the church in today's world, n° 43

<sup>2531</sup> Second Vatican Council *Gaudium et Spes*: Constitution on the church in today's world, n° 16



Light that doesn't illuminate is not light.

Missionary preaching is not imposed with violence, nor with tricks. Faith is offered with the truth, not with lies.

The Catholic missionary offers faith, if the missionary does not want it, it is his loss. Catholics offer faith without coercion.

A Muslim woman, converted in Italy to the Catholic faith, asked the police for protection in light of the danger of being condemned to death, as a vengeance, by the Islamic fundamentalists.<sup>2533</sup>

**Robert Hussein**, aged 44, from Kuwait, was condemned to death on June 9, 1996, for having left the Muslim faith and gone to the Catholic faith.<sup>2534</sup>

In the Sudan, four Christian Arabs were crucified for refusing to reject Catholicism and adhere to Islam.<sup>2535</sup>

Some, in order to disqualify certain Catholic groups who they do not like, label them as "sects"; as for example the Opus Dei. This is unfair. In order to give a group the name of "sect", it is necessary that they comprise the following two elements:

- a) that their doctrine not agree with the official teachings of the Catholic Church
- b) that it not recognize the authority of the Catholic hierarchy

It is evident that the Opus Dei does not fit into the label of "sect".<sup>2536</sup>

Sects are truly economic mafias who disguise themselves in religiousness to become untouchable and invulnerable.

They are truly destructive entities of individual freedom, manipulators of minds and creators of zombies at their service.

One of the more broadcasted sects in the last few years is the one called "**New Age**". It is an American sect, syncretistic and pantheist. In other words, it is a mixture of all of the world's religions, including witchcraft and esoteric ideas..

It presents itself as the only religion of the future, trying to exterminate all others. Its pantheism tries to make man divine while imitating **Lucifer**, who wanted to be like God. In the New Age there is cult to **Lucifer** who is considered lord of humanity<sup>2537</sup>. They are actively working for the arrival of the Antichrist<sup>2538</sup>

All sects begin gathering and helping, but not for the sake of helping, but for making contacts. What interests them is the number of adepts.

And then they are made addicts, destroying their personalities with psychological tactics. They are authentic psychological homicides..

The author has a video in Spanish called "The sects unmasked"<sup>2539</sup>

## 76.- THERE ARE FIVE THINGS NECESSARY TO MAKE A GOOD CONFESSION: EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENCE.

<sup>2532</sup> Paul VI: *Ecclesiam suam*, n° 33

<sup>2533</sup> DIARIO DE CADIZ Newspaper, 26-IX-95, pg. 25

<sup>2534</sup> AHORA Magazine: 23 (IX,I,96)37

<sup>2535</sup> 30 DIAS Magazine: 87 (1994)30

<sup>2536</sup> EUSEBIO GARCIA PESQUERA: HOGAR DE LA MADRE Magazine, 66 (IX,X,95) 9

<sup>2537</sup> M. BASILEA SCHLINK: Nueva Era. Ed. H.E. de Maria. Casilla 2436. Asunción, Paraguay.

<sup>2538</sup> Mons. BERNARD FELLAY. MARIA MENSAJERA Magazine, 187 (VIII-96) 24

<sup>2539</sup> Orders, to P.O. Box 2564-11080 Cádiz, Spain

PAIN OF SINS,  
 INTENTION OF CORRECTING ONE'S WAYS  
 TELLING YOUR CONFESSOR YOUR SINS  
 CARRYING OUT THE PENANCE<sup>2540</sup>

1. Who has had the disgrace of sinning gravely, if he wants to be saved **has no other remedy** than to confess himself so that his sins may be pardoned, as the sacrament of penance has been instituted by **Christ** to forgive the sins committed after baptism<sup>2541</sup>.

It is true that with the act of **perfect contrition**, one can recover the grace, but for this you must have, besides, the firm purpose of confessing these sins afterwards, even though they are already pardoned<sup>2542</sup>; as **Jesus Christ** has wanted to subject all the grave sins to the sacrament of confession.

“Through the will of the Christ, the church holds the power to pardon the sins of the baptized, and she exercises it habitually in the sacrament of penance through the bishops and the priests<sup>2543</sup>”

This sacrament is also called of Reconciliation, as it reconciles us with God and with the Christian Community from whom the sinner has vitally separated himself, when losing grace due to grave sin.

Never live in sin. If you should have the disgrace to fall, that same day make a perfect act of contrition and then go to confession immediately. Do not procrastinate about it.

He who confesses often is not because he has many sins, but to not have them. He who washes once a day, is dirtier than he who washes often.

God's mercy is infinite. The Bible says: “As the wind that erases the clouds from the sky, so shall my mercy erase the sins of your soul”, and in another quote “I shall take your sins and send them to the bottom of the ocean so that they will never float again”<sup>2544</sup>. But his justice is also infinite, and therefore he cannot pardon he who does not repent. That would be a monstrosity that God cannot do<sup>2545</sup>

2. **Pius XII** in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* speaks of the values of frequent confession saying that “it increases the esteem of oneself, Christian humility grows, the evildoing of customs is uprooted, a dam to spiritual laziness and negligence is built, and grace is increased through the same force of the sacrament!”<sup>2546</sup>. And the Second Vatican Council speaks of “the frequent sacramental confession, which when prepared by a habitual examination of conscience, is so much help to the necessary conversion of the heart”<sup>2547</sup>.

Upon recovering the state of grace through a well made confession, you also recover all the merits lost through mortal sin.<sup>2548</sup>

<sup>2540</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación, 1ª, III, n° 75* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2541</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 839, 911, 916* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2542</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 898*, Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2543</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 986

<sup>2544</sup> Micheas, 7:19

<sup>2545</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 2ª, 2ª, IV, 178. c.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2546</sup> Apostolicae Sedis Act, n° 35(1943)235

<sup>2547</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Presbyterium Ordinis, n° 18*

<sup>2548</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 2193* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

3. **It is very easy** for the one who lives in grave sin to be condemned for three reasons:

1.- Because later it is very possible that he may lack the will to confess, as he lacks it now.

2.- Because, even supposing that this will is not missing, it is possible that death may surprise him without time for confession.

3.- Finally, he who is careless about confession, and goes on garnering sins and more sins, will find it more and more difficult to break. A string will break much easier than a rope. To repent, you would need a prodigious stroke of grace. And God does not normally grant this supernatural grace to the one who is obstinate in being bad.

**Jesus Christ** warns those who want to play with God: "You shall seek me and ye shall not find me, and you shall die in your sin"<sup>2549</sup>

**77.- Examination of conscience** consists in remembering the sins committed since the last well made confession.

1. Naturally, the examination is made before confession<sup>2550</sup> and then tell the confessor all the sins that have been remembered; how many times each, if they are grave sins.

If you know **the exact number** of each type of grave sins, you must say it exactly. But if it is very difficult, it is sufficient to say it with the nearest approximation you can: for example, how many times, more or less, in a week, in a month, etc. And, if after confession, you remember with certainty that they are many more than you had confessed, you must say so in the next confession. But it is not necessary that you continue to think about the number of sins committed, as then we would never be at ease. If you did your exam diligently, you should not worry any more: all is forgiven.

The exam must be done with diligence, seriousness and sincerity; but not anguishing oneself<sup>2551</sup>. Confession is not a torment nor a torture, but an act of trust and love of God. It is not about tormenting the soul, but to give God a kinship report. God is Our Father

**78.- The examination of conscience** is made trying to remember the sins committed in thought, word and deed, or by omission, against the commandments of the Law of God, of the Church or against specific obligations. All this from the last well made confession.

**79.- The pain for sins** is to repent for having sinned and having offended God.

1. **To repent** for having done something, is to wish not to have done it, to understand that it is wrong, and to pain for having done it. Repentance is an abhorrence of the sin committed; a detesting of sin<sup>2552</sup>.

It is not sufficient to feel pained for having sinned due to a merely human motive. For example, as the sin is a lack of education (irreverence to the parents), or if it is a badly seen thing (adultery), or

<sup>2549</sup> John, 7.34; 8:21

<sup>2550</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1454

<sup>2551</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación, 1ª, III, n° 80*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2552</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1451

that it can bring damaging consequences to my health (prostitution), etc. etc. The repentant abhors the offense to God, and proposes not to offend Him again.

The pain of a wound is not the same – this is felt by the body – as the pain of the death of a mother – which is felt in the soul -- ,. Repentance is “pain of the soul”<sup>2553</sup>. But the pain of the heart that is required to make a good confession, is not necessarily required to be sensible, as you feel a great misunderstanding. It is sufficient to have a sincere desire to have it. Repentance is a matter of will. He who sincerely says: “I wish I had not committed such a sin”, has true pain.

Pain is the most important part of confession. It is indispensable: without pain there is no forgiveness of sins<sup>2554</sup>. That is why it is a folly to wait for the sick to be in a very critical stage before calling a priest. If the sick one loses his faculties, could he repent?. As without repenting, there is no pardon for the sins, nor is salvation possible. The pain must be had – before receiving the absolution – of all grave sins that have been committed. If there are only venial sins, it is necessary to at least be pained for one of them, or confess some sin from past life.

**80.-** There are two classes of repenting: perfect contrition and attrition.

**81.- Perfect contrition** is sin’s supernatural burden for the love of God, for His being so good, for He is my Father who loves me so much, and because he does not merit being offended, but to give him pleasure in everything and above all things. Contrition is to repent for having sinned, because sin is an offense to God. Always with the purpose of mending from now on and of confessing when possible<sup>2555</sup>. Contrition is perfect pain<sup>2556</sup>.

1. Even though contrition forgives, the Church obliges to a latter confession, because it is necessary for the sinner to make an adequate satisfaction; and this, must be imposed by the priest, as he is delegated by God to reconcile with the Church.

The act of contrition is the manifestation of the shame that we have for having offended God, for He is good, and He loves us so: there are tears not only for the fear of punishment, but for having saddened Him

<sup>2553</sup> DENZINGER-SCHRON: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, IV*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2554</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación, 1ª, III, n° 77*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2555</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1452

<sup>2556</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1492

**82.- Attrition** is a supernatural burden of having offended God, for fear of the punishments that God may send in this life and in the next, for the ugliness of the sin committed, which is an ingratitude towards God and a rebellious act. Always with the purpose of mending oneself and confessing.

Attrition is an imperfect pain, but it is sufficient for confession<sup>2557</sup>.

1. For example, a youngster playing with a ball inside his house breaks a piece of porcelain that the mother cherished and loved, and seeing what he has done, he repents. If what he fears is the punishment that awaits him, he has a pain similar to that of attrition, but if what hurts him is how his mother will be upset, he has a pain similar to contrition.

2. It is logical that attrition and contrition are somewhat joined. Even if one has contrition, that does not impede one's fearing hell, as corresponds to all who have faith. And even if one is repentant through attrition, one must suppose some degree of love to recover friendship with God.

**83.- Perfect contrition** is best, as with the purpose of confession and repair, all sins are forgiven, even if they are grave<sup>2558</sup>.

1. When one, in danger of death, is in a state of grave sin and does not have a priest close by who can pardon his sins, the obligation of making a perfect act of contrition with the purpose of confession as soon as possible exists. The act of contrition will pardon his sins, and if he should die at that moment, he will be saved. If he were to repent only with attrition, he does not receive pardon for his grave sins, unless he confesses<sup>2559</sup>, or receives the unction of the sick, many more will be saved if they developed the habit of frequently making a good act of contrition.

**We should** make an act of contrition whenever we have the disgrace of falling into grave sin. This way, we place ourselves in God's grace, until the time for confession.

**We should** make an act of repentance every night, and every time that we are conscious that we have fallen into sin. God is wanting to forgive us. But if we do not ask for pardon, he cannot pardon us. It would be a monstrosity to forgive a fault to he who does not want to repent from it. "Nobody laughs at God"<sup>2560</sup>.

Repentance is an **indispensable condition** to receive pardon. True repentance includes asking for God's forgiveness. "Our repentance would not be sincere should we try to disdain the ordinary way established by God to pardon us"

<sup>2561</sup>

<sup>2557</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 1ª, III, n° 77*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2558</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 1ª, III, n° 74*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2559</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 898* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2560</sup> Galatians, 6:7

<sup>2561</sup> DIEGO MUÑOZ, S. I.: *Pueblo de Dios, II, 3*. Montilla (Córdoba)

## 84.- The act of contrition is made by praying with your heart the “Jesus Christ my Lord”, or easier still, praying with all your heart, the following:

1. “God, I love you with all my heart and above all things. I repent of all my sins, because they offend You, who are so good. Lord, pardon me and help me so that I never again offend You, as this is my solemn vow.”

And if you want a shorter prayer for times of danger:

“God, pardon me, as I love you above all things.”

Besides, this brief act of contrition, will also be good for when you are going to confession, this in case you do not know “My Lord Jesus Christ”. If you know the long form of the act of contrition, you can pray it with devotion and being conscious of what you are saying; but if you think that it will not come out well, or you are going to say it as a parrot would, it is best that you wholeheartedly repeat several times: My God, forgive me!, My God, forgive me!,

Also, this act of contrition in four words, can be used to help other people to **die well**, such as relatives, friends, or even strangers, if you find, for example, a highway accident. Even though they seem dead, the hearing is the last sense you lose.

There is a lapse of the time between apparent death and true death<sup>2562</sup>.

The truest sign of real death is the decomposition of the body<sup>2563</sup>.

Many that seemed dead, said afterwards, when they had recovered, that they had been aware of all that happened, even though they could not utter a word, nor move a single muscle in their body.

That is why, if you run into a highway accident, do not doubt falling to your knees, and putting your mouth close to their ear, and saying at least three times: My God, forgive me!, My God, forgive me!, My God, forgive me!. If he should hear it and accept it, you are helping him to save his soul. And no one in this life has done him a greater favor than you., who at the time of his death have helped him gain Heaven.

We must preoccupy ourselves in helping the moribund die a good death. These days, the sense of death has a highly pagan feeling, and many persons, when confronting an accident or a dying person, worry about the doctor, and very few worry about preparing the soul for eternity. Take charge if you see that no one remembers to do it.

Let's hope that you can help many people to achieve a good death. The day that you meet them in heaven, you will see their gratitude, and you will feel happiness for having collaborated to the salvation of others.

I believe that with this act of contrition of four words, I can help you to confront death with tranquility, if at that transcendental moment you do not have a priest at your side to pardon you, and besides you can help others to a good death, and in this way collaborate to their eternal salvation.

When I was in Argentina in late 1960, I became aware of the act of contrition that is used there. I liked it very much and I transcribe it here:

“I am burdened My God, and I wholeheartedly repent for having offended Thee. I am burdened by the hell that I deserved and for the Heaven that I lost, but much greater is my burden, because of my sins I offended a God so great and so good as Thou. Before, I would have wanted to die rather than to offend you, and I firmly propose not to sin again, and avoid all forthcoming occasions of sin. Amen”.

This beautiful sonnet in Spanish is also a perfect act of contrition.

<sup>2562</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Se salvan todos?*, 2ª, VIII, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2563</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Se salvan todos?*, 2ª, VIII, 3. Ed. BAC. Madrid

It moves me not, My God, to love you  
 The heaven that you have promised me,  
 Nor the Hell so feared  
 To stop, for that reason; offending you

You move me Lord, it moves me seeing you  
 Nailed upon the cross, and beaten raw  
 It moves me to see your body so hurt  
 It moves me to see your affronts and your death

What moves me, in all, is your love and in such a manner  
 that if there were no heaven, I would love you  
 and if there were no hell, I would fear you

You do not have to give me because I love you  
 Because what I wait for will not wait  
 The same as I love you, I would love you.

This sonnet, whose authorship has been attributed to various authors, according to the well known journalist **Bartolomé Mostaza** it was authored by Doctor **Antonio de Rojas**, a notorious mystic of the seventeenth century<sup>2564</sup>.

2. To make an act of contrition it is not necessary to follow any prescribed formula. It is sufficient to heartily detest all sins as they are offensive to God..

When you want to make a perfect act of contrition, you can also do so by thinking of **Christ** crucified, and repenting, in his love, for your sins, which were the cause of his Passion and Death.

An act of contrition is an act of the will. It can be well done, even if it seems to you that you do not have any sensation of what you are saying. If you want to love God above all things and not sin again, that is sufficient. But you must truly want what you are saying be true. It is not sufficient to say the act of contrition with the lips alone. It is necessary to say it with your whole heart.

It is of capital importance to know how to make a perfect act of contrition, as it is very frequent to have to do it: there are many who at the time of death do not have a priest nearby to confess them.

Besides, it is convenient to make an act of contrition every night, after having made a brief examination of our conscience, and always adding the purpose of amendment and to confess oneself.

We must never forget that admirable advice:

Sinner, do not ever lie down  
 in sin  
 May it be that you waken  
 Already condemned

There are more people than we realize, who calmly go to bed and awaken in the other life, having suddenly died.

Just think, how many people were caught unprepared on September 11 in New York, or in Oklahoma The same has happened on many occasions caused by earthquakes<sup>2565</sup>.

---

<sup>2564</sup> YA Newspaper, 1-II.80, pg. 8

The hypothesis that at the time of death the person will receive a supernatural illumination which will allow him to ask forgiveness and can save himself is" discarded, as there is no trace of it in the revelation<sup>2566</sup>.

## 85.- The purpose of betterment is a firm resolution to not sin again.

1. The purpose rises freely from pain<sup>2567</sup>. If you are truly repentant, you will promise yourself not to sin again<sup>2568</sup>. "That the wicked modify his ways, and the criminal change his plans, that he return to the Lord and He will have pity<sup>2569</sup>

It is absurd to say to oneself "I will repent later". If you think that you will truly repent, why do now what will later on burden you for having done it? No one willingly breaks his leg, saying "I will later heal myself"

The purpose must be made before confession, and it is necessary for it to last when receiving absolution. The purpose has to be universal, that is to say, the commitment to never again commit a grave sin. It is not sufficient that it be limited to the sins of the current confession. It must be "forever". It would be ridiculous that one who has offended another would tell him "I am sorry for what happened, but I reserve the right to do it again, if I so want"

It there is no purpose of correction, the confession is invalid and is sacrilegious<sup>2570</sup>.

Do not think that your purpose is not sincere because you foresee that you will fall again. The purpose is of the will, to foresee is of the reason. It is sufficient for now to have a firm determination, with God's help, to not sin again. "it is not about the certainty that you will not sin again, but of the will not to fall again<sup>2571</sup>.

The fear that maybe later on you will fall again does not destroy your present will of not wanting to sin again. And the latter is what is required. In order to confess it is not necessary to be certain that you will not fall again. No one has this certainty. It is sufficient for now that you do not want to fall again. The same as when you leave home, you will not know if you will stumble, but you do know that you do not want to stumble<sup>2572</sup>

**John Paul II says:** "It is possible that even in the loyalty of the purpose of not sinning again, the experience of the past and the coincidence of the current weakness will arise the fear of new failings, but that does not go against the authenticity of the purpose, and when the will is joined with that fear, supported by prayer, to do what is possible to avoid the guilt<sup>2573</sup>.

2. But do not forget that for the purpose to be effective it is necessary to **seriously withdraw from the occasions to sin**, because "whosoever loves danger will perish in it"<sup>2574</sup>. "And if you

<sup>2565</sup> YA Newspaper, 7-III-72

<sup>2566</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO SAYÉS: *Mas allá de la muerte*, VI, 1. Ed. San Pablo, Madrid. 1996

<sup>2567</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 1ª, III, ° 78 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2568</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 897 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2569</sup> Isaiah, 55:7

<sup>2570</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 1º, III, nº 78 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2571</sup> KAROL WOJTYLA: *Ejercicios Espirituales para jóvenes*, 1ª, V. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2572</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología moral para seglares*, 2º, 2ª, IV, 205, a. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2573</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2788 (11-V-96) 34

<sup>2574</sup> Ecclesiastés, 3:27



surround yourself with bad company, you will be bad". There are battles in which the way to win is to avoid them to fight whenever it is necessary, is of courageous people. but to do battle without need is for idiots and braggarts.

If you do not want to burn yourself do not go too close to the fire. If you do not want to cut yourself, do not play with a knife. For he who wants to see all, hear all, read all, it is morally impossible to keep purity. It is necessary to brake the senses and the ..... concupiscence. Concupiscence is an insatiable beast. If you give it what it wants, it always wants more. And the more you give it, the more it will demand and with more vigor. The beast of concupiscence must be starved to death. If you have it punished, it will be easier to dominate it.

On the occasions for sinning one must withdraw as soon as possible. If you fool around, there will come a moment in which it will blind you, and you will get to a point where later on, with a cool head, it will seem impossible that you could have done them. Experience of life continuously proves this.

If the purpose would not extend itself to place all necessary means to avoid the next occasions to sin, it would not be efficient, it would show a will to sin, and therefore, not fit for pardon.

Anyone who, being able to, does not want to withdraw from an approaching occasion of a grave sin, cannot receive absolution. And if received, this absolution is invalid and sacrilegious<sup>2575</sup>.

The occasion to sin is, any person, thing or circumstance, external to us, which gives us the opportunity to sin, that makes it easy to sin, which brings to it and constitutes a danger of sin. It is called probable cause, if it is very probable that it will make us sin, whether by nature alone, or by circumstances, on said occasions, the majority of times one sins.

There is a grave obligation to avoid, if it can be done, the next occasion to gravely sin<sup>2576</sup>. In such a manner whoever exposes himself voluntarily and willingly to the danger of grave sin, even though he does not fall in sin, would gravely sin for having exposed himself in that manner, without a just cause.

**A close occasion** to sin is different from the **remote occasion**, in which the latter is a lesser probability to drag us to sin.

If the occasion to sin is necessary and cannot be avoided, one must seriously consider the means so that one does not fall. To do this, you must consult with your confessor.

**Jesus Christ** has some very harsh words on the obligation of escaping from the occasions to sin. He goes so far as to say, that if your hand is the cause of sin, you should cut it off, and that if your eye is the occasion to sin, you must yank it out, as it is better to arrive at the Kingdom of Heaven half blind or mutilated, than to be thrown, with both hands and eyes into the fire of hell<sup>2577</sup>.

A person who has a gangrenous leg will have it cut off to save himself. It is worthwhile to sacrifice the least to save the most.

To avoid a sin is less costly than to eradicate a vice. This is sometimes very difficult. It is easier to plant an acorn than it is to uproot a tree.

Repetitive acts create a habit and are enslaving. The Latin proverb says: Gutta cavat petram, non semel sed saepe cadendo. The drop of water, falling continuously, will ultimately bore through the stone.

To move away energetically from the occasions of sin, it is necessary to pray! Ask much of the Lord and the Virgin, and fortify our soul by communicating frequently.

<sup>2575</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, IV, 247, 2º Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2576</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 1211ss Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2577</sup> Matthew 18:8s

**86.-** You must voluntarily tell the **confessor everything**, with humility, and without deceit or lying, each and everyone of the grave sins<sup>2578</sup> not yet spoken in an individual well made confession<sup>2579</sup>, and in order to obtain absolution<sup>2580</sup>. To manifest your sins in order to receive advice would not be considered as a sacramental confession, or to force you to be silent, etc.<sup>2581</sup>.

1. Before initiating confession, the priest can read to the penitent, or remind him, of a text or passage of the Holy Scriptures in which the mercy of God is shown and the calling of man to conversion<sup>2582</sup>.

**Pope John Paul II** on January 30, 1981, said: “The teachings of the Council of Trent are current, and will be current forever<sup>2583</sup>, as pertaining to the need of an integral confession of mortal sins<sup>2584</sup>. It is indispensable to manifest sins with all sincerity and frankness, without intention of disfiguring or occulting them. If we were to confess with vague or ambiguous phrases with the hope that the confessor not understand what we are saying, our confession might be invalid and even be sacrilegious. One must clearly manifest to the confessor the sins committed so that he may judge the state of the soul according to the number and gravity of the sins confessed.

“Absolution demands, when speaking of mortal sins, that the priest fully and clearly understand and value the quality and number of sins<sup>2585</sup>. The confessor must also know the mitigating or aggravating circumstances, and also the possible responsibilities garnered by that sin.

It is also necessary that the penitent be present with the confessor. A confession over the telephone is not valid<sup>2586</sup>.

If a grave sin is forgotten, it does not matter, sin forgotten, sin forgiven. But if I later on remember, I must include it in the next confession<sup>2587</sup>. In the meantime, one can communicate. And it is not necessary to confess only to say it, as it is already forgiven<sup>2588</sup>.

But if the confession was badly made, it is necessary to once again confess all those grave sins, in another well made confession.

In case there is an exceptional condition or circumstance for silencing a grave sin in your confession: an unbearable shame in confessing it to a certain confessor, for example, due to the friendship you have with him and not having another confessor available, if the secret is in danger, as there may be someone nearby who could learn about it, and there is no way of avoiding it [(a hospital ward, a confessional surrounded by people, etc.)] But this grave sin, now licitly omitted, you must confess in another confession<sup>2589</sup>.

If on some occasion you want to confess and cannot find a priest that understands your language, or you cannot speak, it is sufficient that you make yourself understood of the repentance of your sins through gestures<sup>2590</sup>, as example, beating your chest<sup>2591</sup>.

<sup>2578</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 917 Ed. Herder. Barcelona. Ritual de la Penitencia 1975, n° 7

<sup>2579</sup> New Canon Law Code, n° 988, 1

<sup>2580</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1493

<sup>2581</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, IV. 206 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2582</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference *Esta es Nuestra Fe*. 2ª, II, 3. EDICE. Madrid 1986

<sup>2583</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1679-1683 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2584</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2018 (14-II-81) 8

<sup>2585</sup> JOHN PAUL II ECCLESIA Magazine 2168(31-III-84)7

<sup>2586</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, 4ª, II, 2, 194. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2587</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1111 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2588</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, IV. 216 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2589</sup> B. HARING, C. SS. R.: *La Ley de Cristo*, 1º, 1º, 5ª, 2ª, II, 5. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2590</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 147 Ed. Herder. Barcelona.

<sup>2591</sup> This is how the deaf mutes confess

This gesture is sufficient for the priest to give you absolution. But these sins, pardoned in this way, you must manifest the next time that you confess with a priest who understands the language you speak.

A confession to an absent confessor is not licit<sup>2592</sup>.

2. Recently, The Sacred Congregation for the Faith has published a document in which the norms for the individual manifestation of sins during confession and circumstances in which **collective absolution** may be given. The individual and complete confession, followed by the absolution, is the only ordinary way that the faithful have to reconcile themselves with God and with the Church<sup>2593</sup>; unless a physical or moral impossibility should dispense them from said confession<sup>2594</sup>. It is licit to give the sacramental absolution simultaneously to many faithful, confessed only in a generic mode but conveniently exhorted to repentance, when seeing the number of penitents, there would not be a sufficient number of priests to conveniently listen to the confession of each one in a reasonable time period, and therefore the penitents would be forced, without any fault of their own, to be deprived for a long time of the Sacramental Grace or the Sacred Communion<sup>2595</sup>.

These conditions, according to some, are necessary for the validity of the sacrament, but the faithful who receive the collective absolution, can be at ease, as God will grant it, because they did everything on their part<sup>2596</sup>. There is a theological principle that states: "Whosoever does what is his part, God will not deny him His grace."

It is the Diocesan Bishop who is to judge this convenience<sup>2597</sup>. Requesting it prior to notifying it after the fact, should there not have been time to request it previously<sup>2598</sup>.

On November 19, 1988, the Spanish Episcopal Conference published a document, approved by the Holy See, which declares that in these days, in Spain, circumstances do not exist which would justify the general sacramental absolution. And Oviedo's Bishop, **D. Gabino Diaz Merchánd** told the clergy of the archdioceses of Aviles-Centro, that the collective absolutions which are given without complying with the conditions given by the church are not licit and are invalid. The reason being that the minister who prepares the sacrament has to have the intention to do what the church wants to do, and the church does not want the administration of the sacrament of penitence to be given outside of the conditions which she has established<sup>2599</sup>.

Those who have received a communitarian absolution of grave sins, must afterwards confess individually before receiving another collective absolution, and, in any case, before a year is up, unless there is a just cause for which they cannot do it<sup>2600</sup>.

The faithful who want to benefit from a collective absolution, if they are properly prepared, must manifest by some external sign that they wish to receive said absolution, as, for example, kneeling, by bowing their head, etc.<sup>2601</sup>.

A concrete case of the application of collective absolution would be in case of a collective and imminent death, without having time to hear the confession individually<sup>2602</sup>, for example in the case of an airplane about to crash.

<sup>2592</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1088 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2593</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1487

<sup>2594</sup> New Canonic Code Law n° 960

<sup>2595</sup> New Canonic Code Law n° 961

<sup>2596</sup> CARLOS JOSE BECKER, S. I.; Professor at the Gregorian Pontifical University in Rome

<sup>2597</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1483

<sup>2598</sup> Penitential Rite, 1975, n°32s

<sup>2599</sup> SIEMPRE P' ADELANTE Magazine 279 (16-1-94) 15

<sup>2600</sup> PAUL VI. *Ordo paenitentiae*, n° 18

<sup>2601</sup> Rite of Penitence, 1975. n° 35

<sup>2602</sup> New Canonic Law Code, n° 961. 1. 1°

## 87.- Venial sins are not necessarily to be confessed, but it is convenient.

A fever, even if it is only a few degrees, is a signal that there is something wrong in the body. One must always combat the bad, even if it is not grave. When in a hospital, you tell the doctor, not only the grave things, but also the small ones, just in case they complicate things. Do the same with a priest so that your soul may be cured.

**88.-** Besides grave sins, one must tell the confessor how many times they have been committed, and if there is a special or severe circumstance which would vary the species of malice of the sin<sup>2603</sup>.

1. The Council of Trent says that “In the Sacrament of Penitence, through divine right, it is necessary for the forgiveness of sins, to confess each and all of the mortal sins which you remember, after a diligent and due examination, and the aggravating circumstances that change the specie of the sin<sup>2604</sup>.”

In order to find out the number of sins committed remember what was covered in number 77.

2. It is not necessary that you tell the history of the sin, but you must tell the aggravating circumstances that will vary the specie or malice of the sin. A circumstance will vary the specie or malice of a sin, if it converts to grave a sin which is venial, or it opposes different virtues or commandments<sup>2605</sup>.

As an example, it is not the same to murder an ordinary man, than it is to murder your father. In the first case you are going against the fifth commandment, which orders to respect the life of others. In the second case, you also sin against the fourth commandment which orders us to “honor thy father and thy mother”.

**Circumstances** can change the morality of an action<sup>2606</sup>. Never can circumstances make a bad action good, when in itself it is bad. But it can make bad an action which was good, or it can make worse an action that in itself was already bad<sup>2607</sup>.

You must manifest the aggravating circumstances of your sin, if at the time of committing it, you were aware of your special malice.

There are also **attenuating circumstances** which diminish the gravity of the sin<sup>2608</sup>.

That is why you must not be surprised if the confessor asks you about your sins, as he must know how many and under what circumstances you committed the sins that he is about to forgive you for. The priest must help you to make an integral confession and that your repentance be

<sup>2603</sup> New Canon Law Code, n° 988,1

<sup>2604</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, (917) Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2605</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 1ª, III, n° 81, b. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2606</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1754

<sup>2607</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1753s

<sup>2608</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 1ª, III, n° 81 Ed. BAC. Madrid

sincere. He should also give you opportune advice, and instruct you so that you may lead a Christian life<sup>2609</sup>.

The principal aggravating or attenuating circumstances are:

**Who:** adultery, if one of the two is married.

**What:** stealing a few or a million dollars.

**How:** stealing violently

**When:** blaspheming during mass

**Where:** sinning in public causing the scandal of others

**Why:** insult to cause blasphemy

3. **Doubtful sins** – as has already been stated in number 61 – are really not necessary to be confessed, but it is convenient to do so for ease of mind. Certain sins you must confess as certain and the doubtful ones, as doubtful.

If you confessed in good faith, a grave sin as a doubtful one, and later on you discover that it was certain, you do not have to accuse yourself again, as the absolution pardoned it as it was in reality<sup>2610</sup>. To have the obligation to confess a grave sin it must have truly happened, and it has not been confessed.

It is also convenient to tell the confessor how much time has passed since the last time you confessed. It is convenient to say at the beginning of the confession.

**89.- WHOEVER VOLUNTARILY REMAINS SILENT ABOUT A GRAVE SIN DURING CONFESSION, BESIDES MAKING A BAD CONFESSION, HAS NO SINS PARDONED, AND BESIDES ADDS ANOTHER TERRIBLE SIN, WHICH IS CALLED SACRILEGE<sup>2611</sup>.**

1. All subsequent confessions in which this sin is voluntarily omitted, are also **sacrilegious**. But if it is forgotten, this sin is pardoned, because “sin forgotten, sin pardoned. But, if later on you remember, you have the obligation of manifesting it, of saying what happened.

For the obligation to confess a sin that was forgotten, there are three things missing: be sure:

- a) that the sin was truly committed.
- b) That it was certainly grave.
- c) That it is certain that it has not been confessed.

But if there is a doubt of any one of these three things, there is no obligation of confessing it. But it would be better to do it, manifesting the doubt.

**90.- WHOEVER VOLUNTARILY WITHHOLDS A GRAVE SIN AT THE TIME OF CONFESSION, IF HE WANTS TO BE SAVED, MUST MAKE HIS COMPLETE CONFESSION AGAIN AND MANIFEST THE SIN WHICH HE WITHHELD, STATING THAT HE WITHHELD IT KNOWINGLY<sup>2612</sup>**

<sup>2609</sup> PAUL IV: *Ordo paenitentiae*. N° 18

<sup>2610</sup> FANFANI: *Manual de Teología Moral*, IV

<sup>2611</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, IV. 210s Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2612</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P. : *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª IV. 215 Editorial BAC. Madrid

1.- Those Who have had the misfortune of making a sacrilegious confession, and since that time have been dragging their conscience, can in no manner continue in such a horrible state. Do not mistrust the great mercy of God. Approach an understanding priest, who will listen with love and comprehension. You will forever bless the day that you removed that great weight that tormented your soul.

Also, the confessing priest is not scared of anything, because of his studies and the practice he has in hearing confessions, already knows of all kinds of sins.

**It is sheer foolishness** to withhold grave sins because of shame at the time of confession, as the confessor cannot repeat anything he hears at the time of confession <sup>2613</sup>. Even if his life is in danger because of keeping the confessional secret<sup>2614</sup>. There have been priests who have given their life before betraying the confessional secret.

This secret, which does not admit any exceptions is called “**secrecy of the confessional**”<sup>2615</sup>.

It is a sin to hear other persons’ confessions. Those who, without meaning to, have learned of someone else’s confession do not sin; but are obligated to keep the secret<sup>2616</sup>.

It is rather curious that those who are reticent in confessing their sins to the confessor, will boast amongst their friends, frequently exaggerating the sin. What happens is that among friends these things are feats, while to the confessor they are sins; and this is humiliating. That is why, when at confession one must be very sincere. Those who are not sincere do not confess properly.

Never voluntarily omit a grave sin, as later on you will have to suffer much to confess it, and at the end you will have to confess it, and the longer you wait, the harder it will be, and if you do not say it, you will condemn yourself<sup>2617</sup>

If you have a sin that you are ashamed of confessing, I suggest that you confess it first. This will help you in making a good confession.

2.- The confessor will always be **your best friend** You can always go to him in times of need, and surely you will find love and understanding. Besides pardoning your sins, the confessor will console you, orient you and advise you, etc. Ask him about any moral doubts you may have. Ask for any advice you may need. Talk to him about anything and everything with absolute trust. He will hold it in deepest secrecy.

Priests are here so that men, through us, may find their salvation in God. The forgiveness of a sin, which from the psychological point of view, may not be of great relevance, is in reality more important than all what we may do to improve the life of men.. Even **Nietzche**, with his great and violent antichristianism, said: “ the priest is a sacrificial victim for the good of humanity”<sup>2618</sup>.

The priest guides the Christian community through the preaching of the word of God, with his advice, with his counseling, with his ways of dialogue, warmth, understanding, with his fidelity to **Jesus Christ**. The priest is foremost an educator.<sup>2619</sup>

<sup>2613</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2490

<sup>2614</sup> IV Lateran Council: DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 438 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2615</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1467

<sup>2616</sup> JESÚS MARTINEZ GARCIA: *Hablemos de la Fe*, IV, 10. Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>2617</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN:}, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 1ª, III, n° 80 Ed. BAC: Madrid

<sup>2618</sup> KOLB: *Sin Cristo*, XVI. Ed. Eurámerica. Madrid

<sup>2619</sup> SPANISH EPOISCOPAL CONFERENCE: *Catecismo Escolar*. Libro de Profesor, 8º EGB. EDICE

**JOHN PAUL II** in his book *Don y Misterio*, quoting **Peter**<sup>2620</sup>, says that the priest is the administrator of the mysteries of God. “ The priest receives from **Christ** the gifts of salvation to duly distribute them among the people”<sup>2621</sup>.

Historian, **José de Sigüenza**, when talking about **Friar Hernando de Talavera**, first Archbishop of Grenada, that Queen **Isabella the Catholic** had called him to say confession. It was the first time with him. There were two kneelers prepared, but the bishop sat down. The –Queen admonished him:

-We both must kneel.

The confessor then stated:

-No Madame, Your Highness must kneel down, to confess her sins, but I must remain sitting, as this is the tribunal of God, and I am here representing Him.

The Queen did not say anything, and confessed herself kneeling down. Afterwards she said: “This is the confessor that I was looking for”<sup>2622</sup>

I do not know how a sheet of paper got to my hands, it said:

Poor Priest!

If he is young, he lacks experience, If he is old, he must retire.

If he sings badly, they laugh. If he sings well, he is vain.

If he is long on sermons, he is a bore. If he is short, he has nothing to say.

If he speaks loudly, he scolds. If he does not raise his voice, you can't hear him.

If he listens in the confessional, he is a gossip. If he confesses in a hurry, he does not listen.

If he visits the flock, he is never in his office. If he does not do it he is aloof.

If he has a car, he lives like the rich. If he goes on foot, he is old fashioned.

If he asks for help, he is monetary. If he does not fix the church, he is derelict

And when he dies, many will miss him..

3.- **If you are unfortunate** and come into contact with a clergyman or a priest that does not live in accordance with his state, do not be alarmed by it. Sometimes, many fall, even those who are more obligated to serve God<sup>2623</sup>. But this must not make your faith waiver. Our faith does not rest with any man but in God, who never fails. Men are subject to changes. The one who is good today, may be evil tomorrow, and vice-versa. Even among the twelve apostles there was a traitor **Judas**. The priest who does not perform his duties well, will be duly judged by God. However, the religion does not cease to be true even though there are priests who do not overcome their passions. The same in Medicine, which continues to be true, even if there are doctors who are drug addicts.

There are bad priests, but in much smaller proportion than in any other profession<sup>2624</sup>. And on the other hand, an elevated degree of virtue has always been attained in priesthood, more than in any other profession.

When a priest sins, an educated person thinks: what heroism of so many other priest who while having the same inclinations and passions, they, however do not succumb<sup>2625</sup>

It would be an injustice to generalize the faults, which are exceptionally given in an isolated case, to all other priests. Such as if I, because I know two from your town who are drunkards, were to say that everyone in your town is a drunkard. It would be unjust to you. Besides, any fault in a priest

<sup>2620</sup> Corinthians, 4 1s

<sup>2621</sup> JOHN PAUL II: *Don y Misterio*. VIII, 1. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1996

<sup>2622</sup> IGLESIA-MUNDO Magazine. 268 (I-1984) 3

<sup>2623</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1550

<sup>2624</sup> KOLB: Sin Cristo, XVI. Ed. Eurámerica. Madrid

<sup>2625</sup> M. SÁNCHEZ GIL.: *Cien mil jóvenes sobre el abismo*. XVII. Ed. Studium. Madrid

draws more attention, precisely for that reason, because they are exceptional; a blemish of ink is much more notable on a light colored garment than on the overalls of a mechanic. About the accusations that are heard about priests, I recommend: *Yo no creo en los curas* by **Yanes**<sup>2626</sup>.

The phrase “Yo no creo en los curas” (I do not believe in priests) makes no sense. One must not believe in the priests. It is sufficient to believe in God. Among priests, as among any other human group, there are mediocre. Some do not reach what is expected of them. But they are made of the same clay as the other men.<sup>2627</sup>

What is important is that the priest takes me to God. What he is worth is secondary. What is important is that the wine be good, even if the vessel is made of clay.

To withdraw from God because we do not like the priest is like not taking a taxi because the driver is ugly.

The highway marker shows me the way. Be it of wood, stone or steel, that is the least, if it shows me the right way. But not to obey it because we do not like it is a matter of a fool..

If the priest shows me the way to be with God. If he shows it to me well, that is all that is important. The rest is secondary.

The misconception that many have about priests, is an error. No youngster studies to be a priest in order to have a good time. And he realizes this during the long years of study towards the priesthood, being subjected to a strict discipline and renouncing to many hard things, renouncing to having a girlfriend, and renouncing to a home. Also the studies to become a priest are so long and costly as those to be a doctor or an engineer, yet, however the majority of priests in Spain only earn the minimum inter-professional salary<sup>2628</sup>. Today, in Spain, clergy generally live worse than the middle class<sup>2629</sup>. It would be ridiculous that a youngster would think of becoming a priest to have a good time. Those who aspire to priesthood do so in order to better themselves and to make the world a better place. Because if there were no priests, the upper class would be worse than what they are, and the ones below would have less advocates, and you, instead of having this bond in your hands, perhaps you could have one to the detriment of your soul<sup>2630</sup>.

And if a priest does not show you a good example, do not guide yourself by what he does, but by **Christ's** doctrine which he preaches. **Christ** has spoken “Do what they say, but do not do as they do”<sup>2631</sup>. They are responsible for their deeds, and will be fully accountable to God for them; but you will be accountable to God for yours. If another person shall sin does not justify you sinning. Both of you shall go to hell, should you not seek God's forgiveness.

4. Confession, which forgives our sins, gives us back the sanctifying grace, (or increases it, if we had not lost it through grave sin). And with the grace it also gives us back the right to heaven and restores all past merits, which we had lost through grave sin.

5. Confession is a **great benefit from God** which we must know how to appreciate and put to good use. What is to become of us in the next life, if we did not have in this one a means to attain the pardon for our transgressions?

That is why the Church, who wants to assure our salvation, orders that we confess **at least once a year**<sup>2632</sup>.

<sup>2626</sup> ELIAS YANES: *Yo no creo en los curas*. Ed. Juan Flors. Barcelona

<sup>2627</sup> JOSE LUIS MARTÍN DESCALZO: *Yo amo a la Iglesia*. 5<sup>a</sup>, V. Ed. EDIBESA. Madrid. 1996

<sup>2628</sup> YA Newspaper, 17-XI-77, pg 20

<sup>2629</sup> YA Newspaper. 11-III-92. pg. 22

<sup>2630</sup> JOSE LUIS DE URRUTIA, S. I.: *La Iglesia y la cuestión social*. EAPSA. Madrid

<sup>2631</sup> Matthew 23:3

<sup>2632</sup> New Canonical Code Law n° 989



Annual confession is obligatory. Yet we should confess frequently. At least monthly. And this even though there be no grave sins, as confession, being a sacrament, will give us grace to be better

If you do not have grave sins, confess yourself of a venial sin, which are always around. And although I have told you that venial sins are not necessarily confessed, it is always convenient.

However, even though God wants me to confess frequently, and it is convenient for me, no man can force me to do so. Nor my employers, nor my friends, nor my family, nor a priest, no one. They may suggest that I confess, but force me, never. Confession has to be of free will. That it pours forth from inside. Because I value it and I want to be saved. Even though it may cost me. Medicines are not always palatable. If I were forced to go to confession and without pain, confession would be a comedy. And this is a grave sin. For confession to be valid, one must repent. Should someone, sometime force you to confess, and you are not in agreement, rather than making a bad confession, tell the priest that you are not going with the intention of confessing, and ask him to give you his blessing, all others will not take notice, and you will not have committed a sacrilege.

No matter how many sins you may have, and how large they may be, you must never mistrust God, but you must humbly approach Him and ask forgiveness that He is wanting to give you. God hates sin, but loves the sinner, and only wants for him to convert and be saved<sup>2633</sup>. All confessors **have the obligation** to hear confession from anyone who asks in a reasonable manner<sup>2634</sup>.

The priest's absolution is the worthy sign of God's pardon and the culminating moment in the celebration of the sacrament of penitence. Absolution takes place when the priest pronounces the sacramental formula. "I absolve you of your sins", while at the same time making the sign of the cross over the penitent.

## **91.- To carry out the penance** is to pray or to do whatever the confessor may tell me<sup>2635</sup>.

01. The pontifical exhortation of **John Paul II (Reconciliation and Penitence)** ( 31, 3) states that the deed of satisfaction must be actions of cult, charity, mercy and repair.

## **92.-** If I do not know or I cannot do it, I must tell the confessor so that he may change the penance.

1.- Penitence is also called satisfaction, as if in some manner it wishes to express our will to repair the damage we have done to the church when committing the sin, becoming cancerous members of the **Mystic Body of Christ**. To carry out the penance is an expression of our will of Christian conversion.

Penance must be carried out in the time frame that the confessor indicates. If the confessor has not stated a time, it is best to comply as soon as possible, lest we forget; but it can also be carried out after communion; and also confess oneself again before carrying it out, as long as there is a will to carry it out.<sup>2636</sup>

If the penance is not carried out because of forgetting involuntarily, one must not worry, the sins are forgiven. But if it is not carried out knowingly, although the sins are forgiven, you commit a new mortal or venial sin. According to the gravity of the penance given. Grave penance is that which

<sup>2633</sup> EZEQUIEL, 33:11

<sup>2634</sup> Ritual de la Penitencia, 1975, n° 10, b

<sup>2635</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1460

<sup>2636</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN. O. P.: *Teología Moral par Seglares. 2º, 2ª, IV, 232, 2º* Ed. BAC. Madrid

normally corresponds to grave sins<sup>2637</sup>. If after confession you do not remember the penance that the confessor gave you, or you are unable to carry it out, you must tell him so the next time you confess. In case that you cannot remember the penance that the confessor imposed, you can pray or do what in other similar confessions you received as penance.

2. The penance is always **very small** when compared to our sins<sup>2638</sup>. But even though it is so small, it is sufficient, as we participate in what is called "The Communion Of Saints". All of us who belong to the Catholic Church form a large family- which is called the Mystic Body of Christ<sup>2639</sup>, in which spiritual goods are common to all<sup>2640</sup>.

Whatever each one of us does for or suffers in Christ gives fruit for all of us.<sup>2641</sup>

We all benefit from the goods, gifts and graces that each one of us has received from God<sup>2642</sup>. Therefore, each one can enjoy the great spiritual treasure that is formed with the Merits of **Jesus Christ**, of the Virgin and all the saints who are in heaven, and with the good deeds of the Catholics<sup>2643</sup>.

3. The church uses the merits of this great spiritual treasure, when conceding us the **indulgences**<sup>2644</sup>. The church condemns those who affirm that the church does not have the power to grant them of that these are not useful<sup>2645</sup>.

The Pope has absolute power over all spiritual matters<sup>2646</sup>, and safeguards the complete spiritual treasure of the church to grant all class of indulgences<sup>2647</sup>.

The practice of indulgences is based on the doctrine of the **Mystic Body of Christ**. Indulgences are the remission of temporary shame due to the forgiven sins as to the guilt.<sup>2648</sup>

According to Catholic theology, all grave sins originate to whom commit them, as a guilt and a shame.

All guilt necessarily engenders a shame<sup>2649</sup>.

All guilt is erased with the absolution of the confessor.

The shame has to be paid with the suffering in purgatory or with the good deeds in this life<sup>2650</sup>. This is where indulgencies are applied where Catholics are forgiven for their sins under certain conditions, the temporary shame due to the sins already forgiven as to guilt. It is like eliminating the scar left by the wound that the sin has left in the soul.

With the indulgences we **can help** the deceased<sup>2651</sup>.

On January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1967, **Paul VI** published the Apostolic Constitution on the reform of Indulgences<sup>2652</sup>. It has suppressed the old form of quoting time as "three hundred days", "seven

<sup>2637</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN. O. P.: *Teología Moral par Seglares. 2º, 2ª, IV, 227, 2º* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2638</sup> LUIS CREUS VIDAL. *Introducción a la Apologética. 2ª, 17* Ed La Hormiga de Oro. Barcelona.

<sup>2639</sup> See nº 41

<sup>2640</sup> FELIPE CALLE, O.S.A.: *Razona tu Fe XXXVI, I.* Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid

<sup>2641</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 961

<sup>2642</sup> Conferencia Episcopal Española. *Esta es nuestra Fe, 2ª, I. 9. 1. f.* EDICE. Madrid

<sup>2643</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 1476s

<sup>2644</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 1478

<sup>2645</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia nº 989* Ed. Herder Barcelona

<sup>2646</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia nº 1323* Ed. Herder Barcelona

<sup>2647</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia nº 551* Ed. Herder Barcelona

<sup>2648</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 1498, 1471 Canonic Lay Code 992

<sup>2649</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Dios y su obra, Appendix 2, B, nº620* BAC. MADRID

<sup>2650</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 1472

<sup>2651</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 1479

years”, etc., which referred to the days of public penitence that sinners had to suffer, in the early days of the church, before receiving absolution for their grave sins. The new document can be defined in the following norms:

1. Indulgences **are divided** in partial and total.
2. The faithful who with contrite heart carries out an action that has a partial indulgence, will, besides the merit that this action produces, receive another identical one, through the intervention of the church. That is to say, he is doubly deserving.
3. A plenary indulgence can only be obtained once a day, unless in danger of death..

4. To obtain the plenary indulgence, besides carrying out the indulgenced action, and, that there is no want or adhesion to sin even if it be venial, on the part of the laic, one must comply with three conditions: sacramental confession, Eucharistic communion and saying a prayer on the intentions of the Pope. Confession can be made a few days before or after doing the prescribed deed<sup>2653</sup>. Communion can be received from the previous day to the eighth day. A single confession is worthy to gain several plenary indulgences. On the other hand, with a single communion and a single prayer for the intentions of the Pope, you can only get a single plenary indulgence- The prayer for the Pope can be an “Our Father” with a Hail Mary and Gloria.

According to this reform of the indulgences, the plenary indulgences that can be gained, one a day, under ordinary conditions, have been reduced to four.

The Way of the Cross

The Rosary

Adoration of the Holy Sacrament for one half hour

Reading the Bible for a half hour<sup>2654</sup>.

If the proper conditions are not complied with, or the proper disposition is missing, the indulgence will only be partial.

Those faithful who for personal reasons or situations are unable to confess or communicate, may be able to obtain the indulgence if they are wont to comply with these two conditions at the earliest moment possible.

Partial and complete indulgences can always be applied to the deceased as a suffrage<sup>2655</sup>. One can earn a plenary indulgence applicable to the deceased even though one has not been able to separate oneself from the aforesaid sin<sup>2656</sup>.

At the moment of death, any faithful, spiritually properly disposed, may gain a plenary indulgence, even though he does not have a priest that is able to administer it, so long as that during his lifetime he has habitually made prayer. It is an act of charity towards the souls in purgatory to gain plenary indulgences. (See N<sup>o</sup> 101).

### **93. IN THE LAST CASE IF ONE DOES NOT KNOW WHAT TO DO TO CONFESS PROPERLY, YOU CAN TELL THE CONFESSOR: “FATHER, HELP ME TO CONFESS”**

<sup>2652</sup> Acta Apostólica Sedis, 59 (1967)

<sup>2653</sup> EDUARDO FERNÁNDEZ REGATILLO, S. I.: *La reforma de las indulgencias, II,9*. CONFER Magazine, n<sup>o</sup>20 (1967) 14

<sup>2654</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine 1419 (7-XII-68) 25

<sup>2655</sup> New Canonic Law Code n<sup>o</sup> 994

<sup>2656</sup> EDUARDO FERNÁNDEZ REGATILLO, S. I.: *Las Indulgencias, 071*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

1. One must tell the confessor all things with sincerity, as one feels them in his conscience. But if you do not dare to, because of shame, you can tell the confessor that you have shame and the priest will help you with loving care.

And if you remember a sin which you have committed, even if the confessor does not ask you, tell him so that he may pardon you.

At the time that the priest is giving you the absolution and is blessing you, recite the "Jesus My Lord", and if you do not know it, beat your chest while saying several times, with all your soul: "My God, forgive me!, My God, forgive me!

**94.-** In confession, all sins which we have committed since baptism are pardoned, no matter how large, as long as they are said with true repentance and with purpose of repair, but not the original sin.

## OTHER SACRAMENTS

**95.- The original sin** is the sin that was committed by our first fathers and which all of us, except for the Virgin Mary inherit at the time of birth.

1. The Holy Virgin is the only one who has conceived without original sin. What we want to say is that when we bestow upon her the title of “Immaculate Conception”. God granted her this privilege as she was going to the Mother of Jesus Christ

**96.-** The original sin is washed away with the sacrament of Baptism.

1. The sacrament of Baptism, when washing away the original sin, gives our soul the sanctifying grace and makes us members of the Church, sons of God and heirs to heaven<sup>2657</sup>

There are many anabaptized pagans in this world. That is why, missionaries, leaving family and country behind, go to foreign lands to baptize them, instruct them, and make them children of God.

**Jesus Christ** told the Apostles: “*Thou shall bear me witness to the end of the earth*”<sup>2658</sup>

We can and should help the missionary work with our prayers, sacrifices and our alms. We have the obligation to do so, but in accordance with each one’s possibility.

The **Pontifical Missionary Works** are present in the Third World with:

Seven hundred and sixty four leprosariums .

Five thousand hospitals

Seven thousand orphanages

Eight thousand dispensaries

Nine thousand asylums.

And they educate:

One million University students

Six million middle and high school students

Fifteen million Grammar school students.<sup>2659</sup>

A lot of money is required to maintain this effort, together with a large number of missionaries. Spain is the country with the largest number of missionaries: 250,555<sup>2660</sup>

Sometimes we hear: Stop going to the missions. Let’s first install our Church here. That is to not understand the Catholicity of the Church. The Church is Catholic, in other words: UNIVERSAL. It has to be installed in the whole of humanity. It cannot be limited to a people or race. Its Universal Charity extends itself to all without distinction of color or race. The same to populations in decadence, to those of a brilliant future. Wherever there is a soul, the Church is there. Missionaries are an actualization of the Church.

Pope **John Paul II says**: “ When affirming that the Church is Catholic, we mean to say, that it is evangelizer, missionary and apostolic; if it didn’t have these characteristics it would not be the true Church of **Christ**”<sup>2661</sup>

---

<sup>2657</sup> Galatians, 4:7

<sup>2658</sup> Act, 1:8

<sup>2659</sup> ABC Newspaper, 21-X-95, pg. 63

<sup>2660</sup> ABC Newspaper, 21-X-95, pg. 63

<sup>2661</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2443(30-IX-89)22

2. Sacraments are rites, sacred ceremonies (which include words and action), instituted by **Jesus Christ**<sup>2662</sup>, which, if they are received with a good disposition, give supernatural life to the soul, in other words, they give us sanctifying grace<sup>2663</sup>, or they increase it if we are already in a state of grace<sup>2664</sup>. They are seven: Baptism, Confirmation, Penance (Confession), Eucharist, Anointing of the Sick, Holy Orders and Marriage. The Council of Trent defined that the seven sacraments were instituted by **Christ**<sup>2665</sup>.

The Gospel talks about the **Institution** of five sacraments> Baptism<sup>2666</sup>, Eucharist<sup>2667</sup>, Penance<sup>2668</sup>, Holy Orders<sup>2669</sup> and Matrimony<sup>2670</sup>

Confirmation and anointing of the sick is not covered in the Gospel, but the New Testament tells us that in the time of the Apostles they did exist, therefore they must have been instituted by Jesus Christ as were the other sacraments..

Confirmation is spoken about in the book of ACTS<sup>2671</sup>. The anointing of the sick is referred to in the Gospel of James<sup>2672</sup>. The institution of priesthood is spoken about in the book of ACTS<sup>2673</sup>, and marriages is spoken of in Paul's<sup>2674</sup> letter to the Corinthians.

There are three sacraments that **form the character**.

“**Character**” in Greek means, “indelible seal”.

These sacraments do stamp an indelible seal . That is to say, a spiritual seal in the soul that will never be erased<sup>2675</sup>, that is why they can only be received once<sup>2676</sup>. They cannot be repeated. They are: Baptism, Confirmation, and ordination. It is a matter of faith that the baptism, confirmation and ordination do give a stamp of character<sup>2677</sup>.

Sacraments are fundamentally actions by **Christ**<sup>2678</sup>. When **Peter** baptizes, it is **Christ** who does so.<sup>2679</sup>

Sacramental grace does not depend on the individual minister's sanctity, but in that of Christ, who is acting through him<sup>2680</sup>.

When celebrating a sacrament, the person celebrating must have the same sacramental intention that **Christ** had when enjoining his church with the same. However, the sanctifying power of the sacraments does not depend on faith alone, nor of sanctity of the ministers, as when someone baptizes or pardons, it is **Christ** himself who is baptizing or pardoning<sup>2681</sup>.

<sup>2662</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1114

<sup>2663</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1127

<sup>2664</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1131

<sup>2665</sup> DENZINGER> *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 989* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2666</sup> Matthew, 28:19

<sup>2667</sup> Matthew, 28:26

<sup>2668</sup> John, 20:23

<sup>2669</sup> DENZINGER> *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 938* Ed. Herder. Barcelona; EMILIO SAURAS. O. P. *Teología y Espiritualidad del Sacrificio de la Misa, V, 6*. Ed. Palabra. Madrid. 1980

<sup>2670</sup> Matthew, 19:6

<sup>2671</sup> ACTS, 8:17, 19:6

<sup>2672</sup> James 5:14

<sup>2673</sup> ACTS, 14:23

<sup>2674</sup> Corinthians 7:10s

<sup>2675</sup> JESÚS MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA.: *Hablemos de la Fe. I, 9* Ed. Rialp. Madrid. 1992

<sup>2676</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1121

<sup>2677</sup> DENZINGER.: *Magisterio de la Iglesia n° 852* Ed. Herder . Barcelona

<sup>2678</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1128

<sup>2679</sup> SAINT AGUSTÍN.: *Tractatus in Ioannis Evangelium, 6, 7* MIGNE. *Patrologia Latina, 35. 1428*

<sup>2680</sup> DENZINGER.: *Magisterio de la Iglesia n° 849* Ed. Herder . Barcelona

<sup>2681</sup> Conferencia Episcopal Española. *Esta es nuestra fe. 2ª II, 1*. EDICE. Madrid.

The conditions of validity and legality of each sacrament are to be determined exclusively by the Church, as **Christ** trusted it with this mission.<sup>2682</sup> Each sacrament adds a specific grace to the ordinary grace. It is not an entity difference, but a moral one; in accordance with the ends of each sacrament.<sup>2683</sup>

One must be baptized to worthily receive the sacraments (except for baptism) and in the Grace of God, (except to receive the absolution)<sup>2684</sup>

The sacraments are the principal source of sanctification that the Church of **Jesus Christ** has.<sup>2685</sup>

**97.** - It is obligatory to receive baptism, confession and communion, and also, matrimony to those who wish to be married and extreme unction to all at the time of death.

**1. Confirmation** is not absolutely necessary in order to be saved, but all who have not yet received it should receive it, if there is an opportune occasion<sup>2686</sup>, as it will help in obtaining eternal salvation.

**The sacrament of ordination** is only for those who desire to become priests.

“Marriage and ordination **are sacraments of state**. This means that both of them are received not with the idea of individual salvation, but to occupy a determined position within the church, and, within it to serve the community. Therefore the individual receives these sacraments not so much for himself as for all others. Spouses must understand that the graces that they obtain are more for the partner than for himself<sup>2687</sup>.”

**2. BAPTISM** is a sacrament through which when washing us with water and invoking the Holy Trinity, the original sin is erased<sup>2688</sup>. Baptism, besides washing the original sin, will pardon any other personal sin that the one being baptized may have<sup>2689</sup>, if he receives baptism after he has obtained the ability of reasoning (so long as he duly repents), and of all the sorrows due to them<sup>2690</sup>. Baptism introduces us to the church<sup>2691</sup>, making us Christians, members of the church, adoptive children of God and heirs to heaven<sup>2692</sup>. Through baptism we are born into a new life, to the life in grace and to life in faith<sup>2693</sup>.

As baptism is the door through which we enter the church, “if we have not received baptism, we cannot **validly receive** any other sacrament<sup>2694</sup>”

In the early ages of Christianity, baptism was carried out by the total immersion of the one to be baptized in a pool of water. But already at the beginning of Century II, *La Didajé*, already in the first

<sup>2682</sup> ROLAND LAWLER, O.F.M.: *La doctrina de Jesucristo*, 3ª XXVI, 6. Ed. Galduria. Jodar (Jaén)

<sup>2683</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN. O.P.: *Teología Moral par Seglares*, 2ª, 1ª, IV, 15, 1ª Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2684</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN. O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 2ª, IX, 26. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2685</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN. O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 2ª, IX Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2686</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 890

<sup>2687</sup> EUGEN WALTER: *Fuentes De santificación*, VII, 6. Ed. Herder. Barcelona.

<sup>2688</sup> ACTS. 2:38

<sup>2689</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 978 and 1263

<sup>2690</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 792 and 696 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2691</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 1213

<sup>2692</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 1265

<sup>2693</sup> Con nosotros está, 3ª, XLIV, 3. Madrid. 1976

<sup>2694</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Somos Hijos de Dios*, 1ª, VII, 1. BAC. Madrid

century, was speaking of baptism through infusion, by spilling water on the head over the one being baptized<sup>2695</sup>.

**Jehovah's Witnesses** celebrate baptism through immersion (by means of a bath), and consider any other form invalid, this based on **Christ** having received baptism in this manner in the Jordan River. But from the earliest times in Christianity, the baptism by ablution was also used, as is done today. If **Paul** baptized the jailer in jail<sup>2696</sup>, it is not probable that he did it through immersion. The same with Peter when in the day of Pentecost he baptized three thousand<sup>2697</sup>, it would not have been easy if it had been done through immersion. The oldest known catechism, *Didajé*, written in year 70 of our era, when many of **Christ's** disciples still lived, says:<sup>2698</sup> "If there is no running water, pour water on his head three times.

: "When a child is born, **he must be baptized immediately** to receive forgiveness for the original sin and become a Christian. The Vatican Commission for the Doctrine of Faith affirms that: "the obligation to baptize promptly any child born of Christian parents is still in full force, even though through the advances of modern medicine, and because of the diminishing rate of infant mortality, this form of "as soon as possible" can be understood with a greater amplitude"<sup>2699</sup>. But to "withhold this sacrament from children for a long time may be considered as a grave sin"<sup>2700</sup>. The current Canonic Law Code stipulates that the children must be baptized in the first weeks<sup>2701</sup>.

It is not absolutely certain that children who die without being baptized are saved. As is also not absolutely certain that they cannot be saved, God may have extraordinary means to save them that are unknown to us. That is why the church has a special mass for these children, trusting in the mercy of God<sup>2702</sup>.

"Gods mercy makes us trust that there is a way to salvation for the children that die without baptism"<sup>2703</sup>.

But it is clear that in case of mortal illness if one has two medicines, one that cures and another of which we are not certain it does, anyone with a bit of common sense will certainly use the first. The existence of **Limbo** is not a dogma of faith<sup>2704</sup>. "Limbo is the place or state where those who have died with only the original sin. They cannot enter heaven, nor go to hell or to the purgatory, as they have no personal sins"<sup>2705</sup>. Limbo is a theological conclusion defended this day by most Catholic theologians<sup>2706</sup>.

When baptizing a child, it is **convenient to give him a name** that is not foreign to the Christian feeling.<sup>2707</sup>

These names are that of Jesus, the Holy Virgin in its main advocacies and devotions and of the saints.

The patronage of a saint offers a model of charity and assures his intercession<sup>2708</sup>.

<sup>2695</sup> SPANISH EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE. *Teachers book – 8<sup>th</sup> grade EGB. VIII, 1*, EDICE. 1984

<sup>2696</sup> ACTS, 16:35

<sup>2697</sup> ACTS, 2:41

<sup>2698</sup> DIDAJÉ, VII, 3

<sup>2699</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1770 (7-II-76)7

<sup>2700</sup> JESÚS MARTINEZ GARCIA: *Hablemos de la Fe, II*, 7.Ed. RIALP. Madrid. 1992

<sup>2701</sup> New Canonic Law Code, n° 867.1

<sup>2702</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1261

<sup>2703</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1261

<sup>2704</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 3<sup>a</sup>, V, n° 265s* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2705</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 3<sup>a</sup>, V, n° 264* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2706</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 3<sup>a</sup>, V, n° 266* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2707</sup> New Canonic Law Code, n° 855



One must educate the baptized child in a Christian way, with the word, and with the example (prayers at home, attending Sunday mass and all obligatory feasts, confessing frequently, living social justice, fulfill professional obligations, be respectful of other's property, be responsible in public and social life, etc. etc.) and when reaching the age of reasoning, he should be prepared for the First Communion<sup>2709</sup>.

To give him a good Christian formation, he must be taken to the **parish catechism**, place him in a school where the Catholic Religion is taught, closely follow the religious formation that he receives at school, imbue a good conscience (discovering the value of fulfilling one's duties, habitually helping others, showing him that things are not good or bad because many or few do them, et.)

To assist in the Christian education of the baptized one, you appoint **Godparents**<sup>2710</sup>, who will take the place of the parents, should they be missing. In order that they can fully exercise their mission, they must live a life that is in accordance with their obligation, they should not have an impediment imposed by the church, be aware that their mission is not ornamental, but must be disposed to honestly comply with it, therefore they should be practicing Catholics, accepting the Magisterium of the Church, not belong to political parties that have an ideology that is opposed to the Gospel, do their professional work in accordance with moral criteria not incompatible with teachings of the Catholic Church, etc.

Depriving the children from baptism and a Catholic education thinking that by doing this we can give them more freedom so that they can choose when older, is as absurd as not teaching them a language, so that they can, when grown up, learn the language of their choice. It is logical that parents transmit to their children all of the gifts that they have received: education, culture, language and faith. Afterwards, as grown ups, each can use them freely or reject it responsibly. "When reaching the age of reasoning they must personally accept the gift received<sup>2711</sup>".

Their own children could later censor the parent's inhibition on this matter.

In accordance with a document of the Holy Congregation on the Doctrine of Faith, baptism must be administered in childhood, making sure of a true education in faith and Christian life<sup>2712</sup>. If a child were to receive huge inheritance, the parents would accept it immediately in order that he begin to enjoy it, and they would not wait until he grows up. Baptism is worth more than all inheritances. To make someone a great favor, one should not ask for permission. A child is vaccinated without asking his permission.

The **parish priest** is the one to baptize, but in case the child is in danger of dying before the priest arrives, anyone must baptize him, man or woman, even if not a Catholic, and even if he himself is not baptized<sup>2713</sup>. It is sufficient that he has enough maturity and reasoning power to want to do what Christ himself instituted and baptizing in the name of the Holy Trinity<sup>2714</sup>.

**To baptize** one must pour fresh water over the child's head, saying: "I baptize you in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost".

It is not valid to baptize with wine, but it would be with seawater<sup>2715</sup>.

The words are spoken at the same time the water is spilled. It must wet the skin of the head and run on it<sup>2716</sup>. If at all possible, it must be done with two witnesses. All in all, if the child survives, one must take him to the parish priest, explain what happened, so that he may fill out the requisites that are missing.

<sup>2708</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2165

<sup>2709</sup> New Canon Law Code, n° 914

<sup>2710</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1255

<sup>2711</sup> MIGUEL PEINADO: *Exposición de la fe cristiana*, 4ª, II, Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2712</sup> YA Newspaper, 22-XI-80. pg. 20

<sup>2713</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1256

<sup>2714</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, I, 49, 2ª. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>2715</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia*, 2ª, IX, 228. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2716</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, I, 44, 4ª, a. Ed. BAC. Madrid

Baptism can only be received once, as it imprints character<sup>2717</sup>, and leaves the soul sealed forever.

Here are a few norms about **urgent baptisms**- Although it is infrequent that it has to be carried out, as there are people in modern clinics and hospitals that have a lot of practice in doing so, it for me to mention them here so that a person can receive eternal glory. The church desires that the aborted fetuses be baptized, it is commanded so by the Canonic Law Code.

When in the case of an abortion, it is certain that it is a live human being; it must be baptized in accordance with the formula that I have just indicated. But if there is a doubt, it is conditioned to "If you are capable....., if you live..."<sup>2718</sup>.

There is a special difficulty with embryos. In order baptize it, one must take it with both hands and split the amniotic sack and then immerse it in a bowl containing water, so that the water permeates all the contents, and the person who is doing this action pronounces the same formula.

When the fetus presents the form of a human head, it is the head that is baptized. Should it show signs of life, the ordinary formula is used. If there is doubt that it is alive, it is conditioned. Only in the case of certain and total corruption should one omit baptism. Should the fetus be totally deformed and of a monstrous nature, it should be baptized, at least conditionally. If it is doubtful if it is a single or multiple birth, one must be baptized unconditionally and the rest conditionally. If it is clear that it is a multiple conjoined fetus, each one of them should be baptized separately.

If due to the difficulties of labor and delivery, the child is in danger of dying before being born, it must be baptized in the mothers womb; and if the first part that protrudes from the birth canal is a hand or a foot, that part is to receive the baptism, and later on, if it is born alive, one must baptize again on the head, conditionally. If the mother should die before the child is born, the fetus should be extracted by those prepared to do so, and baptized, unconditionally if he is truly alive, and conditionally if there is doubt that he may live<sup>2719</sup>: do not forget that the human fetus can live the other one or several hours<sup>2720</sup>, depending on each case.

Baptism is necessary to save oneself<sup>2721</sup>. But in the case of impossibility, it can be substituted by the wish of baptism, at least implicitly, which is contained in a sincere act of love to God<sup>2722</sup>. And it is clear that martyrdom is an excellent act of love of God<sup>2723</sup>. "Those who suffer death because of their faith, the catechumens and all men that, under the impulse of grace, without knowing the church, sincerely look for God, and try to comply with his will, are saved even though they have not been baptized"<sup>2724</sup>.

The need of baptism to be saved is clearly stated in the Gospel. **Jesus Christ** says to **Nicodemus**: "*He who is not born of water and of the Holy Spirit cannot enter into the kingdom of God*"<sup>2725</sup>. But from the first centuries of Christianity, there is talk of the **baptism by wish**, thinking not only of the catechumens who died before receiving their baptism, but also in all persons who, ignoring the **Gospel of Christ** and his church, seek the truth and subjected themselves to God's will as they knew it; as it was supposed that such people had explicitly wished the baptism if they knew of its need<sup>2726</sup>. The church now extends the baptism by wish to all those infidels who never betrayed

<sup>2717</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 852 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2718</sup> New Canonic Law Code, n° 871

<sup>2719</sup> New Canonic Law Code, n° 871

<sup>2720</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, I, 51, 4ªc. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2721</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1257

<sup>2722</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, I, 43, c. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2723</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1258

<sup>2724</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1281

<sup>2725</sup> John, 3:5

<sup>2726</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1260

their conscience and were always in disposition to do what God wanted. For these, God has to have a way so that they may be saved. This was the opinion of **Thomas**<sup>2727</sup>.

Adults who receive baptism must have the intention of receiving it<sup>2728</sup>.

**3. CONFIRMATION.** Is a sacrament through which, with the unction of the holy chrism<sup>2729</sup>, made on the forehead by the hand of the minister, and with the prescribed words, is granted to those baptized<sup>2730</sup>, the Holy Spirit firmly believe, to be witnesses in **Christ** in the deed and words and to intrepidly defend the faith which we receive through baptism<sup>2731</sup>.

The sacrament of confirmation makes us mature as Christians; it perfects us as a human being, and makes us better temples of the Holy Spirit.

Ordinarily, the Bishop imposes this sacrament, but should he delegate it, a priest can administer it<sup>2732</sup>.

We must strengthen the grace received with baptism with the sacrament of confirmation<sup>2733</sup>. We then can better comply with the duties of a Christian, and overcome the difficulties that are present on the road to our salvation. Christian life is in direct opposition with mundane life. A Christian lives in continuous tension; on the inside he fights against evil inclinations, and on the outside, against the world and the devil. Confirmation imprints on the soul the character of being Christ's soldier, and invigorates for the Christian combat. Confirmation ties us with more perfection to the church. It enriches us with a special fortitude of the Holy Spirit. It is to oblige oneself in a more serious manner to spread and defend the faith in word and deed<sup>2734</sup>. In No 75 I talked about the apostolate of the secular.

Confirmation must be received in **a state of grace**<sup>2735</sup>. He, who receives confirmation knowingly in a state of grave sin, commits a sacrilege. If the one confirmed **has reached puberty**, he must be sufficiently instructed in the Catholic Religion.

Although confirmation is not absolutely necessary for salvation, it is a mortal sin to disdain it<sup>2736</sup>.

**4.. PENITENCE.** It is also called confession or the sacrament of reconciliation. It is a sacrament, which through the absolution of the priest the repentant Christian, who accuses himself verily of the sins committed after baptism, receives a full pardon.

**5. EUCHARIST** It is a sacrament, which, under the material appearance of bread and wine, one receives the Body and Blood of Christ as spiritual food of the soul through the Holy Communion.

**6. ORDINATION** Is a sacrament which, through the imposition of hands by the Bishop, and his words, ordains baptized persons and makes them priests<sup>2737</sup>, (who do not have an impediment that may forbid it<sup>2738</sup>) and empowers them to pardon sins<sup>2739</sup>, to convert<sup>2740</sup> the bread and wine into the **Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ**<sup>2741</sup>

<sup>2727</sup> Thomas: *De Veritate*, XIV, 11, 1.

<sup>2728</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 411 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2729</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, II, 67, a.. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2730</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1306

<sup>2731</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 697. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2732</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1313

<sup>2733</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1316

<sup>2734</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium*: Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, n° 11

<sup>2735</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1310

<sup>2736</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 669 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2737</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1577

<sup>2738</sup> New Canon Law Code, 968

The sacrament of ordination is received by those who feel called by God to be priests and dedicate themselves to the eternal salvation of their brothers in all mankind- This is the greatest occupation in the world, as the fruit of their labor does not end in this world, because it is eternal.

Priesthood vocation carries celibacy with it, as recommended by the Lord<sup>2742</sup>.

Celibacy is obligatorily not because of priesthood's nature, but because of ecclesiastical Law<sup>2743</sup>.

In the Latin Catholic Church, priests are obligated to keep a perpetual celibacy<sup>2744</sup>.

Priest's celibacy in the Catholic Church dates back to the second century<sup>2745</sup>.

The church wants the candidates to priesthood to freely embrace celibacy for the love of God and service to mankind<sup>2746</sup>.

The church wants its priest's celibate so that they can dedicate themselves fully to the good of the souls, without the limitations of time and worry, which can come with raising a family.

A priest must be available one hundred percent of his time to dedicate himself to the caring of souls.

Although it is true that in some cases a wife could be of help, it is also true that in many others a wife could absorb his time for being sick physically or mentally, or by demanding more attention, etc.

And of course, the children will demand from him, not only attention, but also destinations in which their education would be easier, or avoid helping contagious patients, etc.

Simply said, the priest without a family is freer towards the apostolate, and in two thousand years of experience, it has been proven, thus is the reason why celibacy is demanded from priests.

But, above all, the priestly celibacy has a theological fundament: **Christ** was celibate, and the priest is *alter Christus*, in other words, "another **Christ**"<sup>2747</sup>. The basis for priestly celibacy is in the faith and love of **Christ**.

The love of **Jesus Christ** is universal, equal to all, without the hindrance of matrimonial love. Such is the love of a priest.

Vocation is not "receiving a phone call" from God. If a lad is in good health (he does not need to be a "superman"), is capable of studying (it is not necessary to be a genius), can customarily live in grace, with God's help (it is not necessary to already be a saint), has good intentions (is not looking to "make a living"), in other words he is looking for his own perfection and to save souls, must ask himself if God is calling him to priesthood.

It is not a matter of asking "Would I like to be a priest?" but rather "would God want me a priest?". If there is any doubt, you should ask an impartial adult.

We must pray and ask God for many priestly and religious vocations, as there is a lack of priests, missionaries, preachers, teachers, etc., and many nuns in hospitals, hospices, in old people's homes, schools, universities, etc. and others in the convents to pray for the Glory of God, and ask favor for sinners.

That is why it is a great apostolate to financially support the formation of future apostles and convents.

<sup>2739</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1461

<sup>2740</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1566

<sup>2741</sup> Council of Trent; DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 961. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2742</sup> Matthew, 19:12

<sup>2743</sup> Second Vatican Council. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*.

<sup>2744</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 979 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2745</sup> JOSE RATZINGER: *La sal de la tierra*, II, 11. Ed. Palabra. Madrid. 1997

<sup>2746</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1599

<sup>2747</sup> Cardinal STICKLER: *Ecclesiastical Celibacy*. SCRIPTA THEOLOGICA Magazine, 26 (I-94) 13-78

We must all ask God that there be many young ones who follow the voice of God, as there is a shortage of many and good priests and missionaries.

Parents must glee and be grateful to the calling of the Lord to one of his children<sup>2748</sup>.

Parents have the **deep obligation** of giving the necessary freedom to their children who wish to consecrate themselves to God<sup>2749</sup>. But it would also be a sin, and a grave one, to induce their children to -- for human reasons—to embrace, without vocation, the ecclesiastical state.

Parents must take care in not pressuring their children in the election of a profession and lifelong decision<sup>2750</sup>.

**7. MATRIMONY. a) Sacrament:** Matrimony is a sacrament in which, entered into, in accordance with the laws of the church, through the mutual consent of the spouses<sup>2751</sup>, expressed freely and sincerely, grants them the grace to sanctify their conjugal union and to duly comply with the matrimonial duties, such as conjugal harmony, fidelity, control of lust, character, mutual help and comfort, the education of the children and the support of the household<sup>2752</sup>. Grace by itself will not perform miracles when the conditions for a true and serious love have failed in the beginning; but it evidently can multiply and strengthen human love so that it can surpass its own weaknesses and deficiencies.

Matrimony, more than a cold contract, is an alliance, a community of life and love, a living together in which procreation, although being very important, is not the prime reason. Love and mutual help cannot be relegated to a second plane.

“Matrimony constitutes an intimate community of life and conjugal love”<sup>2753</sup>.

“Love between a man and a woman is something natural. There comes a time in which a man and a woman love each other, they decide to enter into a stable communion of life and love, to form a family. This communion of life and love is called matrimony. Man and woman enter into matrimony willingly, but neither of the two can, even in mutual agreement, break it”<sup>2754</sup>.

“Matrimony is a covenant by which a man and a woman, judicially responsible, give each other legally and mutually the perpetual and exclusive rights over their bodies, in order to perform the acts that are apt for procreation. This agreement must be mutual, conscious, free and responsible. The result of this covenant is the conjugal link; that is the permanent union, perpetual and exclusive of a male with a female to engender and educate children<sup>2755</sup>”. This conjugal link will last **as long as** the life of the spouses. “Unity and indissolubility are essential properties of matrimony”<sup>2756</sup>. “Unity, indissolubility and openness to fecundation are essential to matrimony”<sup>2757</sup>.

“Matrimony is a full and complete commitment of man and woman”<sup>2758</sup>. Those who do not wish to formalize matrimony in order to have free hands and to break it without any guilt when they wish to do so. In other words, there is no love. “To assure the validity of matrimony it is sufficient that the spouses not ignore that it is a permanent society between man and woman, in order to have children; and that the consent be free and sincere, manifested in accordance with the established ecclesiastical formula”<sup>2759</sup>.

<sup>2748</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2233

<sup>2749</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares, 1º, 2º, III, n° 842, c.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2750</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2230

<sup>2751</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1625-29

<sup>2752</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1608 & 1641s

<sup>2753</sup> SÁNCHEZ COVALED, S. I.: *Breviario Teológico de la Salvación, 3ª, VII, 1.* Salamanca, 1975

<sup>2754</sup> SPANISH EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE. *Scholastic Catechism – 8<sup>th</sup> grade EGB. VIX, 2, EDICE.* 1983.

<sup>2755</sup> SÁNCHEZ COVALEDA, S. I.: *Breviario Teológico de la Salvación, 3ª, VII, 1.* Salamanca, 1975

<sup>2756</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1056

<sup>2757</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1664

<sup>2758</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1057, 2

<sup>2759</sup> Libro básico del creyente hoy, XIX, 2. Ed. PPC. Madrid, 1970

In some countries, **matrimonial infidelity** and licentiousness have finished with true love. This is a tremendous disgrace. Comforts and entertainments cannot displace the love of your spouse and that of your children. Family love demands unity and family indissolubility. How can spouses love each other if they are not faithful to each other, nor do they give importance to adultery? How can it possibly be to enter matrimony when one knows that what one is to receive is a wasted body from love affairs with others? How can one love children when there is a doubt that they are your own? It is logical that these marriages end in failure. For having loved a wanton life, they have lost the most loving experience in life, the love of a home. Great thinkers will not lose much time in raising their voices that this type of life and habits is the wrong way, and if we would want to recover happiness in life, one must return to the matrimony, one and indissoluble of the Catholic church; reaching it through a way of a pure youth. Society will once again agree with the church. The catastrophic results of a licentiousness life demonstrate that the purity in the young and the fidelity in marriage, as commanded by the church, even though it may demand sacrifices and renouncements, is the only way to reach happiness in a home, and love.

The sacramental grace of matrimony is like a supernatural insurance policy to protect the risks of conjugal life. The premium of this policy is the Christian Spirit. The greater Christian Spirit, the greater guarantee of success of this insurance. And the proof is in the innumerable marriages of old timers who, after many years of matrimony, still love each other deeply and he says that she is a saint and his eyes well up with tears, she, on the other hand assures him in a thousand and one ways that there is no man like him, and will tell you unending tales of his behavior. Over fifty years of being like one, of mutual help, of uninterested love, of mutual suffering, to oversee each others defects and a great Christian spirit has given them the greatest happiness that one can have on earth. What a difference with those materialistic and sensual marriages! And not only in old age, as when the Christian spirit goes absent, it is extremely easy that they get bored with one another and what was home becomes a lions den.

**It is not the same** to live in matrimony than to live as a couple. Animals live like couples, more or less lasting, but not in marriage as persons.

Nowadays, one hears of what is called "live-ins". They live like in a marriage, without being so, and want the privileges of a married couple. But in order to have rights, one must assume the corresponding obligations.

The **New Catechism of the Catholic Church** says: "There is a free union when the man and the woman refuse to give their union a judicial and public form, although this union implies a sexual intimacy.

The expression in itself is a fallacy, what is the value of a relationship where the parties do not commit themselves to each other, and by doing this show that there is no trust in the other person, in oneself or in the future?

"This expression covers many different situations, concubine, rejection of matrimony as such, inability to accept one another through a long term commitment. All these situations offend the dignity of matrimony, destroy the idea of family itself, and weaken the sense of fidelity. They are contrary to any moral code: the sexual act must take place exclusively within the marriage. Out of marriage, it constitutes a grave sin and excludes from the sacramental communion"<sup>2760</sup>.

Anything that means placing the traditional family on the same level as other types of unions seems an aberration to us, so says **Mons José Sánchez**, Secretary General of the Spanish Episcopal Conference<sup>2761</sup>, when talking about homosexual unions. They cannot have the rights of matrimony because they are not. The Royal Academy Spanish Dictionary defines it thus: "Matrimony is the agreed union of a man and a woman concerted through rites and legal formalities"

The laws that govern matrimony **are independent** from the will of those who are contracting it. They must accept it as **Jesus Christ** instituted it.

<sup>2760</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2390

<sup>2761</sup> FAMILIA CRISTIANA Magazine, X, 1994

When a Catholic **wants to marry**, it is necessary to sanctify the union with the blessings for the priest during the sacrament of matrimony. The presence of the priest, a qualified church witness, is essential for the validity of the sacrament of matrimony<sup>2762</sup>. **The only valid matrimony** amongst Catholics is the sacrament<sup>2763</sup>. A civil marriage is totally invalid for Catholics<sup>2764</sup>; it is only valid for civil judicial effects such as surnames, inheritances, etc.<sup>2765</sup>.

The Catholic who only marries by Civil Law excludes himself from communion. The same with the divorced person who remarries cannot communicate as long as he does not fix his situation<sup>2766</sup>. All Catholics who have not willingly separated themselves from the church are **obligated** to a canonical matrimony<sup>2767</sup>. In other words, not a mere lack of religious practice, or the requirement of adherence to a non-Catholic religion. A written public statement would be a rejection of the church, but, as was said in the 1980 Synod, "faith is necessary for the sacrament of matrimony"<sup>2768</sup>.

A marriage of a Catholic person with one who is not requires special caution<sup>2769</sup>.

**In danger of death**, and under special circumstances in which there will not be a priest present for over a month, the future spouses can be married by two witnesses are of legal age<sup>2770</sup>. This matrimony is true sacrament, as the ministers of the matrimony are the celebrants themselves<sup>2771</sup>. The priest is only a qualified witness. And the church authorizes this way of celebrating matrimony under said circumstances. But afterwards one must report it, so that it can be registered in the parochial registers.<sup>2772</sup>

This sacrament must be received in a **state of grace**<sup>2773</sup>. Whoever receives this sacrament knowingly that he is in a state of grave sin, commits a sacrilege. This marriage, however, although being a sacrilege is certain and valid.

Before receiving the sacrament of matrimony, the couple intending to be married should have received the sacrament of confirmation, if they can do it without great inconvenience<sup>2774</sup>.

For the marriage to be **licit and valid**, it is necessary that both parties do not have or are tied with any of the impediments which are stated by the Laws of the Church<sup>2775</sup>, as would be, as an example, coercion, deceit of the person<sup>2776</sup>, or an important quality which may gravely perturb the conjugal life<sup>2777</sup>. Or lacking maturity, which will make the person unable to value the essential rights and obligations of the matrimony, or those who, for psychic reasons are also unable to value the basic obligations of a married couple.<sup>2778</sup>

The causes for annulment have increased now days with the advances in psychology. Mostly in the area of consensual defects<sup>2779</sup>.

Another impediment for the validity of matrimony is the non-acceptance of the basic properties of matrimony (unity and indissolubility): as would be wanting to have the right to divorce<sup>2780</sup>.

<sup>2762</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1108, 1

<sup>2763</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1055, 2

<sup>2764</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, VII, 537, 5º Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2765</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1059

<sup>2766</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1685

<sup>2767</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1117

<sup>2768</sup> YA Newspaper, 23-XI-80, pg. 22

<sup>2769</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1633-37

<sup>2770</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1116

<sup>2771</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1098

<sup>2772</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1121,2º

<sup>2773</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1622

<sup>2774</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1065

<sup>2775</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1073-1095

<sup>2776</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1097

<sup>2777</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1098

<sup>2778</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1095

<sup>2779</sup> JUAN EGUREN, S. I.:

<sup>2780</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, VII, 473. Ed. BAC. Madrid

A man or a woman who have not reached 18 years of age cannot validly enter into a canonical matrimony<sup>2781</sup>. Before age 18, generally, one engenders weak and sickly children<sup>2782</sup>.

“Those who have not reached the age of reasoning are incapable of consent<sup>2783</sup>”

**There are exceptional cases** in which the church will point out the absence of the matrimonial link due to some of these impediments. It will then declare the matrimony void. The echo given by the heartthrob magazines to the annulments granted to various celebrities makes it seem that these annulments are granted in exchange for money.

It is true that obtaining a declaration of nullity costs money, this is because there are persons whose profession is to study these cases. But that does not cost millions as some want to believe. According to the Judicial Vicar of the Bishop of Cadiz, **Guillermo Dominguez**, in 1966, it cost about 80,000 Spanish pesetas.

However, if there is no money but there are reasons, it can be obtained for free.

In 1977, there were 534 annulments granted in Spain<sup>2784</sup>. Of these, 30% were granted at no cost, according to the Vicar of Madrid, Fr. **Martin Patiño**, when speaking on Radio Nacional, Studio 15 – 17, program on October 23, 1980<sup>2785</sup>

**b) Divorce: Divorce is a malady.** If it were good God would not forbid it. God has made matrimony indissoluble. But these days matrimony has to entered in with responsibility. Many marriages do not succeed because they have been entered into lightly, because of vanity, or in a whim, to make a third person angry, or simply for lust or egoism. Many marriages fail because they should have never taken place.

If **Christ** forbids divorce, the church cannot accept it. **Mons. Innocenti**, papal representative in Spain, said: governors or not, must take into account the Catholic doctrine in matters of divorce<sup>2786</sup>.

Divorce is not a solution for a Catholic. **Christ** says: “he who leaves his wife and marries another, commits adultery<sup>2787</sup>, “and he who marries a divorced woman, commits adultery<sup>2788</sup>. Adultery was punishable with death among the Hebrews, in other words, it was very grave.

That is why the Catholic Church only allows the **separation** of the spouses if life inside the marriage is unsustainable<sup>2789</sup>, but not marry again as long as the other spouse is living, as the matrimonial covenant remains until death of one of the spouses. Therefore one must choose between living together or solitude until death. Separation is the beginning of a road that leads to major problems. Before separating, the couple should go to a specialist in case their problems are solvable. Living separately, even though they do not join with another person (which would be adultery) can be a sin against charity towards the spouse and the children.

Civil divorce, which pretends to **break the sacramental link**, is totally invalid before God<sup>2790</sup>.

Civil authorities have no power over the canonical matrimony<sup>2791</sup>

“But if the civil divorce represents the only manner in which it is possible to assure certain legitimate rights, such as the care of the children, or the defense of the patrimony, it can be tolerated without it constituting a moral fault<sup>2792</sup>”

<sup>2781</sup> Article 11 of the General Decree of the Spanish Episcopal Conference in reference to the complementary Norms to the New Canon Law Code. ECCLESIA Magazine, n° 2183 (21-VII-84) 15

<sup>2782</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, VII 2, 530. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2783</sup> New Canon Code Law, n° 1095

<sup>2784</sup> YA Newspaper, 24-X-80, pg 8

<sup>2785</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine 2005(8-XI-80)

<sup>2786</sup> YA Newspaper, 24-XII-80, pg 25

<sup>2787</sup> Mark 10:11

<sup>2788</sup> Luke, 16:18

<sup>2789</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1649

<sup>2790</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, VII, n° 491, 7º Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2791</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 1560. 0Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2792</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2383



The divorcees who have remarried cannot approach the Holy Communion<sup>2793</sup>, as they have self excluded themselves from the church, as the live in a situation of public and permanent adultery<sup>2794</sup>. "They can only approach Communion if, avoiding scandal and having received the sacramental absolution, agree to live in absolute continence" as stated by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith<sup>2795</sup>.

In **John Paul II** speech at the closing of the Synod held in Rome in October 1980, that we must maintain the practice of the church of not allowing the remarried divorcees to receive the Eucharist. Unless that being unable to separate, they promise to live in total continence, and this should not be reason for scandal. In any case, quotes the Pope, they must persevere in prayer to obtain the grace of conversion and salvation<sup>2796</sup>. This however does not carry that the children may not be baptized. Each case must be studied and see the possibility of a **Catholic education** for their children<sup>2797</sup>. They must be encouraged to participate as much as possible in the Christian life<sup>2798</sup>.

**Divorce is an evil.** What some ask is if it can be considered as a lesser evil under certain circumstances could be permitted to avoid greater evils. The same as a surgical operation is a necessary evil; it is accepted to avoid greater evils. Other opine that the legality of divorce would bring society greater evils than those that follow its prohibition, as although divorce may solve some specific cases, it brings great damages to the common good, and what worsens a situation is not a solution, only what it resolves it. Solutions must care for general welfare and be in accordance with moral norms, as stated by **John Paul II** in New York. The good for all sometimes demands the sacrifice of one. When building a freeway, you can affect the interests of the owners of where the freeway is to pass; it can however be for the good of many.

The easy solution of divorce would cause the end of many marriages that have problems that are perfectly overcome that should have never been broken. That is why divorce causes more harm than good. A solution that harms more than it helps is not a solution. A medicine that takes away the freckles but causes skin cancer is not a good medicine.

The possibility of divorce conduces to family instability. Spouses hardly can stand each other, and easily think that by changing partner that what cannot disappear will disappear, as it is inherent to human deficiencies. There is no one without defects. Deceptions will surely continue to grow. According to Newsweek, six out of seven matrimones of divorced persons will end in divorce, and eight out of ten matrimones of twice divorced persons will divorce for a third time<sup>2799</sup>. In other words, divorce is a road to successive polygamy.

**Some feminists** consider divorce as a woman's liberation, however the church by forbidding divorce is defending the woman. It is a tragic situation for a married woman to be abandoned by her husband who has found an attractive young girl who has captured them and for her they will abandon their home and children. But these young girls will also be abandoned when they grow older, and will be replaced by younger and more attractive women.

According to the US census, there has been a 66% increase of Americans who live alone. The majority are men who have separated from their wives. According to the same statistics, one of every ten homes in which there are children, the father has gone<sup>2800</sup>.

Divorce begets divorce. In France, Germany, Switzerland and Denmark, in fourteen years divorce has doubled. In England, United States, Canada and Sweden, divorces have multiplied by

<sup>2793</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1650

<sup>2794</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2384

<sup>2795</sup> ECLESIA Magazine, 2707 (22-X-94) 37. n°4

<sup>2796</sup> YA Newspaper, 26-X-80. pg. 12

<sup>2797</sup> YA Newspaper, 31-III-92. pg 25

<sup>2798</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1651

<sup>2799</sup> YA Newspaper, 7-III-81. pg 6.

<sup>2800</sup> YA Newspaper, 25-IX-79.

three. And in Holland they have grown fourfold<sup>2801</sup>. In France there is a divorce for every two marriages<sup>2802</sup>. In the United States, over 50% of matrimonies divorce!<sup>2803</sup>.

**Frank Furstenberg** a University of Pennsylvania sociologist, affirms that today in the US, facing the terrible consequences of divorce, the stable marriage is back and to marry by the Church. Also, there are many courses everywhere, like the one offered by the University of Denver, CO., to overcome the lack of communication and mutual incomprehension in matrimony, which is the main cause of matrimonial failure.<sup>2804</sup>.

**A fling**, while momentarily appears to be marvelous, on the long run it is easy that it becomes as difficult as a stable marriage.

Sexual adventures without love, last more or less, but sooner or later will end, and generally in a bad way. On the other hand, "the faithful love of a stable couple, which has matured in its familiarity, is a source of a mutual pleasure deeper than any loveless infidelity can give."<sup>2805</sup>

While communication media air the cases of failed marriages of celebrities, in Spain, however, marriages who divorce benefits is only 0.04%<sup>2806</sup>. In Spain, 90% of families live in a stable marriage, as stated by the Directora General de Juventud, after a survey taken at the Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas. A whopping 89% of married Spaniards assures that they have never been unfaithful to their spouse, and 84% claims that they have not even wished it.<sup>2807</sup>

Notwithstanding the exposure given to the divorces of famous people, **Andrew Gailey**, sociologist at Chicago University, has made a study in 1995, which shows that 86% of Americans, 89% of Britons and 92% of Frenchmen have lived in matrimonial fidelity<sup>2808</sup>.

Although **in theory** they only allow divorce in special cases, it is inevitable that the number of cases increase until the door is fully opened, and then the smallest disgust will lead hastily to an irreparable divorce, and the spouse and children be abandoned.

According to **Isidoro Martin**, professor at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid: "Even if the laws of divorce at the beginning demand exacting causes, they will afterwards have a wide acceptance of causes. This is an indisputable fact."<sup>2809</sup>

**Maximiliano Bajoc** a doctor in Germany has prepared a study, which shows that in that country, there are sixteen thousand divorces because one of the couple snores. This means that the reasons for divorce are being widened uncontrollably.

What was theoretically established as a way to remedy cases of failed marriages, in practice will make many matrimonies fail, when they could have succeeded.

The stumbling blocks that the church places towards divorce have saved many marriages. A married man told me in Torreveja: "I give thanks to the church for not admitting divorce. If it did, I would have divorced in a moment of crisis in my marriage. Now that I have overcome it, I am very happy of not having divorced, as I love my wife very much and I am very happy with her. —and, if I had divorced, someone else would have taken her, and I would have lost her".

Many failed marriages would have been saved with a little effort.

A divorced man who has remarried said: " My second marriage is doing well. But I recognize that if I had made the same efforts with my first wife that I have with this second one, I am sure that we would not have separated, and conceivably I would be happier than what I am now. But then I was incapable of accepting the part of renunciation which is indispensable so that a couple can be successful".

<sup>2801</sup> YA Newspaper, 5-XII-80. pg. 27

<sup>2802</sup> YA Newspaper, 27-I-85, pg. 26

<sup>2803</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1999 (27-IX-80) 16

<sup>2804</sup> YA Newspaper, 17-IV-89, pg. 14

<sup>2805</sup> ANDREW GREELEY: *Reader's Digest Magazine*, XI-76, pg. 15

<sup>2806</sup> RAZÓN Y FE Magazine, XI-80, pg. 262

<sup>2807</sup> DIARIO DE CADIZ, 12-X-95. pg. 25

<sup>2808</sup> BLANCO Y NEGRO Magazine, 4032 (6-X-96) 16

<sup>2809</sup> YA Newspaper, 14-XI-80, pg. 8

It is of course, common doctrine in the Catholic Church that the **Sacramental Matrimony** is intrinsically indissoluble, or, in other words, that it cannot be dissolved at the free will of the couple, but some Catholics ask if it can be dissolved extrinsically, in other words, if it could be dissolved by the judgment of an authority foreign to the couple; after pondering the reasons brought forth. Only the consummated sacramental matrimony is also extrinsically indissoluble<sup>2810</sup>.

The New Canonic Code Law says: "A brief and consummated marriage can not be dissolved by any human power, nor for any cause other than death"<sup>2811</sup>

Some say, why should Catholics, who do not admit divorce, are going to impose on the rest of the citizenry? Speaking of this, Primate Cardinal **D. Marcelo Gonzalez**, speaking at a conference at the Century XXI Club: "That the Catholics have no right to impose on others their idea or concept of conjugal union, is a fallacy. It is not about imposing, but rather defending that which they believe is good, and should it deteriorate, they themselves will be victims of the new situation"<sup>2812</sup>.

However, even in countries with a majority of a Catholic population, there is a civil law that governs and regulates divorce. But, "the Christian must always follow the imperatives of his faith, notwithstanding the evolution of the laws of the state on the subject of matrimony."<sup>2813</sup>

Some say that divorce **is a right** of the human being. This is false! The rights of the human being, the same as the laws of physics have an objective value, they do not depend on the whim of each one. What is a right of the human being, is matrimony; one is free to marry or not; but if he marries, he must admit that marriage is like it is indissoluble. No one has the right to manipulate matrimony at his whim, the same as no one has the right to change the traffic laws to his will. One is free to stay at home, but if one goes on the highway, he must subject himself to the traffic laws, made for the common good. Likely, each one is free to marry or not, but not to change the nature of matrimony. Therefore, who willingly marries cannot freely break the matrimonial bond. To say that matrimony can be dissolved through mutual consent is inadmissible.

Matrimony is not only a commitment between a me and a you. It has an **inescapable** social function. That is why politicians and church do not renounce to impinge in it.

"Matrimony and family are considered as the base of human community: they are therefore, not left to the whim or interest of man."<sup>2814</sup>

The matrimonial bond does not depend on the free will of the betrothed. Its consent is irrevocable, and from it is born an institution confirmed by divine law which society must respect<sup>2815</sup>.

The open relationship of a man and a woman, who refuse to give judicial and public form to their relationship and sexual intimacy, always constitutes a grave sin, and exclude from the sacramental communion, as the sexual act must take place exclusively within matrimony<sup>2816</sup>. To marry, it is fundamental to love each other. But marriage is a very serious thing, with repercussions in society. And when a man does something serious in society, he formalizes it with a contract. For a Catholic, to live matrimonially without having received the sacrament of matrimony is a life of continuous sin that cannot bring home the blessing of God. And this is very grave.

The experiments that have been carried out in the communes with free love, where all belong to all, at the end, couples form within the commune, or have left the commune to form a couple with someone outside the commune. The "all for all" is only possible when there is no love and sex is done only to satisfy lust. But when love enters into the picture, you seek a stable partner. In other words, the stable human couple is something natural. The same divorcees who wish to break a couple, their desire is to form another couple, thinking that the change of partner would end the

<sup>2810</sup> JOSE M<sup>a</sup> LAHIDALGA: Matrimonio Civil y Canónico, VI. Servicio Editorial del Arzobispado de Madrid

<sup>2811</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1411

<sup>2812</sup> YA Newspaper, 30-V-80, pg. 35

<sup>2813</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *La estabilidad del matrimonio*. Madrid, 1977

<sup>2814</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Esta es nuestra Fe*, 2<sup>a</sup>, II, 6. EDICE. Madrid. 1986

<sup>2815</sup> ALBERTO BERNÁLDEZ. *El Divorcio en el Concilio Vaticano, II, I. A*. Ed. BAC. Madrid. 1977

<sup>2816</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2390

inherent imperfections to man. The solution is not to think of a person without defects, as there is none, but in loving a person in spite of his defects, and endure them with virtue.

Those who marry **thinking of divorcing**, if things do not go well, is that they are not in love; and if they do not love each other it is sure that they will fail. As matrimony, if it is not with love, is a living hell. No one gives a time frame to his love. Love wants to be eternal. Whosoever thinks of putting his love in a time frame, does not love. Who admits a frail fidelity, will have temporary passion, but it is not true love. Love demands exclusivity. That is the reason for jealousy. Whoever changes love easily, what he has are really sentimental whims. As one who is infatuated with a toy and then changes it for another one. Love is something else. True love wants to be eternal.

Love is not something that is fleeting, that is interesting so long as it works, as if it were an object that is abandoned when there is a new model in the market. For many, marriage is an ephemeral union, which can be easily broken at a time of crisis and be ready to star a new adventure with a different person.

The folly that a monogamous marriage **produces boredom** is only true when love is absent. As priests we know many matrimones that love each other and are happy after fifty years of marriage. Naturally, these couples do not go to the psychiatrist, and therefore are not included in the statistics of failed marriages.

On the other hand, it is notable that the ones who failed in their first marriage will again fail in their next marriage that is why it is so frequent that divorcees divorce again. The Demographic Yearbook of the United States affirms that 70% of the divorced repeat<sup>2817</sup>.

"Statistics have demonstrated that in the countries where divorce is at the mercy of any bafflement of the least futile excuse, have engendered a large and growing number of youngsters which are social misfits, delinquents, disoriented, prone to hooliganism, useless in the workplace, because they wee deprived of the adequate family structure and ambience.<sup>2818</sup>

"That divorce is paid for by the children is a truism that is manifested in the study carried out by **Martin Richards**, director for the Center of Family Investigation of Cambridge University, who has carried out an ambitious study on the psycho-social development of seventeen thousand British children. His conclusions are overwhelming, children of divorced parents fare much worse in life!<sup>2819</sup>" A statistic published by the Chicago Juvenile Court confirms that 80% of the minors who appear at that court are children of divorced parents."<sup>2820</sup>

Newsweek of 11-II-80, reports that in the US there are twelve million children of divorced parents who are under eighteen years of age, and according to the *Uniform Crime Report*(1976) of the minors processed for misdemeanors in the US, 82% are children of divorced parents.<sup>2821</sup>

Children are the **terrible victims** of divorce. They end up with a broken heart. With the wrong idea of a family and always with a failed education. The children of divorced parents are "orphans of living parents" (**Dr. Carnot**)

In the Second World Congress of Family Law held in San Francisco, CA., in June of 1997, American psychologist Judith **Wallerstein** presented a study on the disastrous consequences of divorce on the children<sup>2822</sup>.

"Divorce usually has demolishing effects on the children. Among others there have been depressive manifestations.<sup>2823</sup>

The children of divorced parents are more orphans that true orphans; as these at least can live with a memory and have deep love and respect for their deceased parents.

<sup>2817</sup> YA Newspaper, 28-II-80, pg. 4

<sup>2818</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 1244 (15-V-65) 4

<sup>2819</sup> ABC Newspaper, 12-VI-95, pg. 66

<sup>2820</sup> YA Newspapaer, 9-VIII-80, pg. 29

<sup>2821</sup> YA Newspaper, 7-III-81, pg. 6

<sup>2822</sup> ABC Newspaper, 4-VI-97, pg. 58

<sup>2823</sup> ENRIQUE ROJAS: *El Amor Inteligente, VIII*. Ed. Temas de Hoy. Madrid. 1997

Children **have a right** to a home and to parents that love and educate them. Divorce deprives them of this basic right. Many divorced parents are responsible that their children end up as delinquents, short on education, family life, and love. A great percentage of juvenile delinquents are a consequence of their parents divorce. They selfishly looked for their freedom, at a cost to their children's welfare. Well known statistics say that it has proven that psychic perturbations in almost half of the children of divorced parents.<sup>2824</sup> According to a study carried out in London, England, divorce is not only bad for the children's health, but also for that of the parents.<sup>2825</sup>

According to the Centre of Family Policy of London, studying 17,000 children, resulted that the children of divorced parents who remarry, have more psychological problems<sup>2826</sup>.

It is fundamental for a good education of your children that they feel loved. Many traumas are due to a lack of love.<sup>2827</sup>

Well-known psychiatrist **Dr. Juan Cardona Pastor** says: "A stable family is an indispensable requirement for the normal psychic equilibrium of a person"<sup>2828</sup>.

According to a study at the Centro de Investigaciones de la Realidad Social, (CIRES) "it is without discussion" that matrimony in Spain is alive. A 77% of those interviewed do not believe that matrimony is out of date. Assuring that fidelity is the most important thing in matrimonial success, and that living together lasts less than marriages.<sup>2829</sup>

If it were a person with whom it **is impossible** to live with, a consideration would be to study the possibility of declaring the matrimony null. Matrimony, as proclaimed by the Second Vatican Council, is "community in life and love"<sup>2830</sup>. If being sexually impotent is a cause of matrimonial nullity, another can be the not being able to achieve that "community of life" because of a destructive personality. It would be like a psychological impotency<sup>2831</sup>.

There are neurotic, psychotic and schizophrenic people with whom it is impossible to live with, and can justify a declaration of matrimonial nullity. It is so recognized by the New Code of Canonic Law, which says:

Those unable to enter into matrimony are: who have a grave defect of mature judgment on the duties and rights of the marriage they are about to enter into, and those who cannot assume the essential obligations of matrimony by cause of psychic nature<sup>2832</sup>, as would be the obligations of the conjugal act, a loving relationship and the education of the children.

**c) Adultery:** The sin of **adultery** is one of the more detestable ones. "I is committed when a man and a woman, one of which is married, establishes a sexual relation, even though it be occasional"<sup>2833</sup>. Adultery is a grave fault from the time of lusting for another person and putting it above the spouse. That is the sense of our Lord's words: "Whosoever looks at a woman with dishonest desires, has already committed adultery in his heart"<sup>2834</sup>.

As external sin is one of those enormous crimes, which amongst Jews and pagan alike were punishable by death<sup>2835</sup>.

<sup>2824</sup> YA Newspapaer, 5-XII-80, pg. 27

<sup>2825</sup> YA Newspapaer, 19-XI-91, pg. 26

<sup>2826</sup> YA Newspapaer, 4-XII-91, pg. 25

<sup>2827</sup> MATEO ANDRÉS, S. I.: *Matrimonio ADULTO, VIII, 4* Encuentros matrimoniales, Santo Domingo. Dominican Republic. 1987.

<sup>2828</sup> YA Newspaper, 15-III-87, pg. 40

<sup>2829</sup> YA Newspaper, 31-XII-90, pg. 54

<sup>2830</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*; Constitution of the Church over the current world, n° 48

<sup>2831</sup> ANTONIO REYES CALVO: *Capacidad del sujeto en orden al matrimonio como comunidad de vida y amor*. Salamanca, 1975

<sup>2832</sup> New Canonic Code Law, n° 1095 3°

<sup>2833</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2580

<sup>2834</sup> Matthew, 5:28

<sup>2835</sup> Deuteronomy, 22.22ss

Married people must have the **utmost prudence** in this matter, and carefully close the door of their heart to the smallest sign of a disorderly affection being bred to a third person. The long lost loves of the youth, the current friends of the family, the subordinates, the bosses, the work mates, can and do constitute a real threat to the virtue of the spouses.

**Enrique Rojas**, psychiatrist, in his book *El Amor Inteligente*<sup>2836</sup> tells the story of a young wife, 32 years of age, with two children, who after six years of marriage, frivolously fell in love with a married work mate. She became infatuated with a married man and left her husband, an excellent person, who had never denied her anything, and who had her on a pedestal. But she got tired of him. She did not appreciate the attentions he had with her, and took of with the other one.

But as **Dr. Enrique Rojas** says: The forecast for the new relationship is uncertain. Time will tell". It is very easy that in a short time, she becomes disillusioned with her new love just as she was disillusioned with her husband, with whom she had many reasons to love.

It is easy to fall in love; the hard part is staying in love.

The woman, with her flirtatiousness, is an artist in seducing a man, but this is not enough to build an authentic love. "Love must be supported by values"<sup>2837</sup>.

**Unsupported jealousy** must be avoided, but also being naïve, as this jeopardizes the fidelity of the spouse.

An extramarital affair may sink the family's happiness, which will have a hard time recovering the love and affection of before. This is priceless.

One does not arrive at adultery suddenly; it comes after a series of wanton acts, recklessness and concessions. At the beginning there is resistance, and one sees with horror the proximity of the tragedy. But if one begins to make small concessions, all is lost! You'll weaken more each time. Maybe less than what temptation requires, but the concessions will increase. Tragedy will be unavoidable. That is why one must take all types of precautions before it is too late. Spouses must help each other in this matter, avoiding all occasions. But they must also the no less grave danger of unfounded jealousy, which are the ruin of conjugal life<sup>2838</sup>.

The steps to adultery could be these:

A husband absorbed by his work

His wife feels alone

She casually runs into a man who is courteous and kind.

She lets her imagination run away of what being married to that man would be like

A casual meeting and a fleeting kiss with that second man

The need to repeat the moment

Afterwards, adultery, a broken family, and, it could be, eternal condemnation.

It is a slow process, but a certain one, should it not be clipped at the bud.

Sentimentalism is one of the causes that a person of good has to reach adultery.

It finds another who is going through a difficult situation. His good heart tells it to help, seeing no danger in doing so. A certain affection is born between them. She feels thankful and indebted, and wishes to please him in all, etc.

If the man, with premeditation, tricks her in order to abuse her innocence that is being a scoundrel.

Adultery can ruin a marriage. I remember a man, whose wife had had an amorous affair with another, told me, crying full of rage and pain: "I will never be able to make love to her. I would not be able to avoid thinking that she may be thinking of the other one".

<sup>2836</sup> ENRIQUE ROJAS: *El Amor Inteligente*, II Ed. Temas de Hoy. Madrid. 1997

<sup>2837</sup> ENRIQUE ROJAS: *El Amor Inteligente*, III Ed. Temas de Hoy. Madrid. 1997

<sup>2838</sup> Mons. STRENG: *Amor y Vida Conyugal*, VII Ed. Daimón. Barcelona. Cuarta Edición.

In perverted locations, some matrimones practice the interchange of couples, as an inoffensive game, but by doing this, they have prepared a time bomb, which, sooner or later, will blow up their marriage.

The man's lover may be a professional who is looking for married men in order to take their money. She is a harlot, who instead of working the streets does so in luxurious places: she is a professional of easy life. Other times it could be a naïve woman who insensibly wraps herself in a forbidden love. Although naïve, she is no less guilty, as she knows that that heart already has an owner.

**d) Matrimonial harmony:** Married couples should examine themselves with humility and loyalty to see if they should correct a defect that hinders the matrimonial harmony.

There are very few marriage that at **some time or another** have not had a serious misunderstanding. Sometimes disagreements are frequent. The causes could be many, pride, egotism, frivolity, stubbornness in always wanting to be right, uncontained sensuality, words spoken in anger, sickly jealousy, etc., Seldom will the guilt lie with only one. A loving silence, knowing when to cede with prudence, a calm explanation, to forgive and forget in a Christian fashion, etc. will help in overcoming many difficulties. Petty grievances, if prolonged, could end in something much more serious. The best thing is to end them immediately, with a little humor, a spirit of reconciliation, and a capacity to forget.

Sometime further on it is possible that the deceit of the spouse may appear. You should avoid any and all disqualifying words: "You're impossible", "I can't live with you", "I can't take it anymore", "I can't stand you", "This better be the last time", "Your attitude is impossible", etc., etc.

Never, and I mean never express to your spouse your feelings of aggressiveness. You can relieve your feelings by writing a letter stating your position. After writing the letter, destroy it immediately. Do not deliver it! You now must feel better.

Marital love does not exclude conflicts.. But one must solve them. Clear problems without injuring. It is best to look for solutions and not for guilt.

These days it is important to have a good mutual communication. Maybe it is prudent to ask: In what or how have I let you down? Love, like plants, must be nurtured in order to grow, if you do not take care of it, it will wither and die.

Sometimes it may happen, the desire to look outside the marriage for some sort of entertainment, which can be a hobby or another form of healthy entertainment to the other extreme, adultery. Not even paying attention to the children can justify non-attention to the spouse. Although an activity in service to the community may be perfectly compatible with conjugal harmony.

One must always try, with prudent ability, that all distensions –some times inevitable- do not extend beyond reason. If one does not act on them in time, a deep hurt can develop. A continued and deep disagreement in a marriage is one of the greater crosses to bear in this earthly life.

It is best to **bear the cross of marriage** mutually overcoming the deficiencies of character, defects, etc. In matrimony, not all is enjoyment. It is also built on comprehension, and renouncement; knowing and praising each other, understanding and forgiving.

It is best to not forget that man is **very different** to a woman.

Man and woman are equal in the eyes of the law, as they have the same personal dignity, but they are different in body and mind, this in order to complement each other. That is why a woman who is not feminine is considered a tomboy, and a man who is not masculine.....

Physiological differences between man and woman reach the brain.<sup>2839</sup> The discussion that the differences between man and woman is a consequence of the education received is not true. It is true that education does influence the way of being, but there is a foundation in nature. The same way that physiologically a man cannot deliver a child, psychologically a woman is gifted with the qualities needed for maternity, which is lacking in man. A woman's tenderness towards a child is something very different to what a man is capable of giving.

---

<sup>2839</sup> ABC Cultural, 192(7-VII-95)49.

The majority of men are capable of having a loveless sexual life, while on the other hand, a great majority of women are only capable of giving themselves to a man if they have a feeling of love towards him.

Man is more carnal; woman is softer; man must understand that she does not find pleasure in physical love, but only through psychic love.

Woman is prone to detail, man looks at things synthetically. Man likes to conquer, a woman, to be conquered, woman does not mind being dominated through strength, and man prefers to be dominated through tenderness. Woman has been born to love and man to struggle and fight. Not exclusively but preferably.

“Man manifests himself, above all, in his proactive character, entrepreneurship, creativity; woman, on the other hand, because of the warmth of her character, her receptiveness. Even her physical constitution, is in some manner molded to express this diverse form to be in this world<sup>2840</sup> .

Man reasons, woman intuits. Man is more cerebral, woman is more cordial, more sentimental, and she can of course let sentiments influence her reasoning. Man worries more about things, a woman, about people. Man has a tendency to the universal, woman to the concrete. Man is more interested in ideas, woman for affection. Man wants to be valued, woman to be loved. Man wins through force, woman through tears.

Woman allows herself to be dominated by sentiments much more than man. As she manifests her feelings very easily, man is somewhat prudish in manifesting them, which is why man frequently hides them. Woman loves and suffers with more intensity than man. That is why, when she hates she is terrible: her cruelty, her spirit of vengeance, and her wit to do harm are tremendous<sup>2841</sup> .

“Logic in man is reflexive, in woman it is intuitive. A man, who stumbles on the unforeseen, is disoriented and has to study the matter all over again. Woman, in a similar case, uses logic of adaptation or mutation. This matrimonial discrepancy seems to separate them from one another. Man should impose his reasoned criteria, without humiliating the wife; woman, with intuition, must help her husband trying to merge opinions. Matrimonial bliss is obtained by not having one or the other ordering, but both of them obeying.”

Imagination and sensibility are more likely in a woman. The organization of a home shows it. Her great sensibility makes the minute make her happy or make her cry. Things that appear insignificant for a man, a woman is disgusted by them.

Woman is easily contented with small hopes, details, kindnesses, etc. Man generally gives less importance to all of this and lives the greater ideas of faith, politics, business, etc. .

Male imagination is of ideas, and therefore, is intellectual, less prone to error as it is supported by reality and not on sentiment, which is proper to women. This discrepancy sometimes produces reproaches. Man should understand women and appreciate her sentiments.

Women’s judgment is faster, and she judges according to her feeling of love or hate; man however, judges after weighing maturely. This divergence can lead to the woman considering her man to be too calculating, and he consider her to be light headed and scatterbrained. However, the husband should not ignore the wife’s judgment, as she is capable of seeing details that man will normally not do, and which could lead to failure. These discrepancies are due to the sexual differentiation; the miracle of matrimony presided by love has the thoughts to be guessed. Woman accepting what man says. Man understanding what woman means. She is happy if the husband guesses her wishes. The diplomacy with which God has endowed woman can be used in being the guardian angel of her husband, but without his pride resenting it. Man’s self esteem is licit, but if exaggerated it would fall into a deep egotism, a quality which when used properly makes a woman feel protected with a sensation of peace and security. Woman is happy if those whom she loves are happy.

<sup>2840</sup> Con vosotros está, 2º, XXXIX, 2. Madrid. 1976

<sup>2841</sup> MELCHOR ESCRIVÁ, S. I.: *Medicina de la Personalidad, XIV –XXIII*. Ed. Sal Térrea. Santander



The desire to please is inborn in a woman. She goes forth to the conquest of man. This is the attitude that she must carry forth in her married life. This will be a means for her husband to conserve his chastity. Conjugal love is mixed, with three factors: first, sensible love, second, spiritual love, and third, supernatural love. Sensible love is what brings the two sexes together and fulfills the needed sexual endeavors of marriage. The spiritual values de mood qualities and wishes for the loved one the greatest good, giving oneself in body and soul. The supernatural offers our love for the proper sanctification and produces the continuity of our own life in our descendents, with a view to eternity

Matrimonial happiness is not obtained by overindulging in parties and riches, but with an orderly home, the love of the children and peace in the soul of both spouses, leaving the adversities and happiness in the hands of Christ<sup>2842</sup>.

Man is stable, woman is voluble, as was said by **Virgil** in his Eneida (IV,559) "woman is variable and unsteady". Also **Verdi**, in his famous opera *Rogolletto* (Act IV, 4<sup>o</sup>): "*la donna e mobile*" woman is variable. Sp shifting that many times not even she understands herself. As she is made for maternity, her psychology is affected by the physiological changes in her reproductive cycle. The periodic blood loss weakens her. She looks for the psychological support of man. The protection given by man gives her security. She likes a strong, manly partner. Not only physically, but also spiritually.

Many marriages **fail** as they have been entered into frivolously and lightly, without knowing and loving each other. Just for sexual lust. And this is not enough to make a marriage happy. Others fail because of immaturity. They marry without being prepared for matrimonial unity, without even having understood it. They live within marriage living their individuality and the married couple should live everything "for and with" the other.

For a marriage to succeed, it needs the collaboration of both, but only one is needed to sink it.

Matrimony is **not a service contract** but a community of life and love, as said by the II Vatican Council <sup>2843</sup>. Fleeing from any sacrifice takes the authenticity seal away from love.

As the time of your marriage goes by, you will find in your spouse some traits of character that you did not observe during the courtship. Do not confront in a disagreeable way. This would be counterproductive. Also, do not consider them of great importance. It is best that you look at the virtues that moved you to elect that person to be united in matrimony, and which are a counterweight. Nothing is perfect in this world, and we must resign ourselves to carryover the defects or our kin. Try to behave like if she or he was just like you wanted him/her. This will help the other person to be on the long run, like you wanted it.

During courtship, one only sees the good qualities of the person who one loves. There is much indulgence with the defects. On the other hand, once married, the contrary occurs, there is a certain tendency to forget the good qualities and to magnify the defects.

**Pride** plays a very important role in matrimonial quarrels. The remedy is humility, recognize the errors, and give explanations when there is a period of cal. And if you have a good humor, it is a good way to finish a quarrel. Conjugal difficulties are less grave than they appear, and can be overcome with a bit of good will.

Let us suppose that two spouses after a few years of living together find themselves in absolute disharmony, and furious and exasperated in such a way that they want to separate as soon as possible and at any cost. In the beginning they were very happy, they considered themselves to be in ecstasy. Now, however, they curse the day that they married. How has this been possible?

Both of them have defects, passions, errors, but who doesn't? How many have the same defects as them, or maybe even more, yet, they live in harmony! What is what has taken them down the road of infidelity and ruin?

---

<sup>2842</sup> Dr. FERNANDO BALLESTER: *Problemas Matrimoniales*, V. 8. Hermandad de San Cosme y San Damián. Barcelona

<sup>2843</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*: Constitucion sobre la Iglesia en el Mundo Actual, n° 48:

The husband, sometime after the wedding, has begun noticing the lagoons and defects of the wife; this has disgusted him and has become irritated. Lovingly he has pointed out to her these things, thinking that the wife would correct her defects. It seemed so simple and easy! But she has not corrected herself..... Then the husband's attention has become more and more pointed towards her errors and defects, with this, his distaste and then his bad mood have increased. It seemed that she did not love him and had bad will towards him, as her conduct did not change at all, nor did her way of being, which, would disgust him, irritate him and hurt him more vividly.

But the husband also had lagoons, defects, errors, and the woman at that same time has placed her attention on them, and in her soul has developed a drama equal to that of the husband's. She would think that he expected too much from her, and did not worry to change some of his habits, which offended her and made her bitter. It would not have been a great thing!..... And that is how they arrived where they did.

Some impartial judge would immediately say that the conduct of both has been stupid, and both are to blame and are authors of their misfortune. If each one of them, instead of focusing on the defects and grievances of the other, instead of doggedly insisting that the other change, would have observed his own defects and tried to make an effort in correcting what disgusted the other, they would have lived in peace and the good harmony would have consolidated even more. This was the only practical and reasonable conduct; it was also the only thing that they could do for each other, as they did not have power over the other's will. But they have not done what they could have done, they have pretended that it be the other that does if and that is how they have become dissatisfied<sup>2844</sup>

In this process of mutual "domestication" which all marriages must go through, it is essential, on the one hand, constancy, and on the other, mutual caring. No impatience with the other's defects; a good amount of tact, and above all, do not rub the spouse's face in it, harshly, with irony or ridicule. You cannot trap flies with vinegar. Also, do not try to make the other person to your image and likeness. Each one of you should try, and the effort should be contrary. Not so much try to redo the other as to adapt oneself to the other.<sup>2845</sup>

The vast majority of conflicts in marriage are caused through a lack of mutual adaptation. In order for marriage to progress, both should row in the same direction. If each rows in opposite directions, the boat will only turn on itself. Whoever is not willing to adapt himself to the other, it is best that he or she not marry. Without the effort of mutual adaptation, no one can stand marriage. The continuous clashes of opinions, plans, desires, tastes, etc., will turn marriage into a living hell.

It is possible that you do not coincide in tastes, plans, desires, etc. But if you love the person, you will gladly accept what the other person prefers. When both want to dominate, the clash is inevitable. When both wish to adapt, harmony is wonderful<sup>2846</sup>.

**Dr. Vallejo-Nájera**, speaking on Spanish Television stated that the root of many unsuccessful marriages is that one expects too much of the other, and becomes disillusioned<sup>2847</sup>.

To demand that the spouse adapt, that he improve his personality, wanting him to fight his defects and that he consolidate his qualities, is good. But to demand that this be done right away, and that the transformation be immediate, would be folly. You would obligate the spouse to be happy with just a change of appearances, would conduct him to adopt attitudes which necessarily be superficial; the result would not be long in manifesting itself with a regression to the old habits and a mutual deception. If something is to be avoided, this is it. It is best to proceed gradually, having time on your side and obtaining true results. This patience would be without discussion, superior form of love and an irrefutable testimony of disinterest. Knowing to wait for the spouse to overcome his defects, encouraging him without hostility, and helping him without making him go crazy, this is one

<sup>2844</sup> PABLO POVERA: *Vive TÚ Vocación*, XVII. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2845</sup> ROBINSON: *Educación Sexual y Conyugal*, 4<sup>a</sup>, III, 2 Ed. Mensajero, Bilbao

<sup>2846</sup> MARABEL MORGAN: *La Mujer Total*, VI. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona. 1976

<sup>2847</sup> DR. VALLEJO-NAJERA on TVE, 8-II-79 at 4 PM.

of the first steps in the path to the agreement of personalities. This agreement will take place with much more security in direct proportion to the calm in which it proceeds. To excite oneself will not do any good, the most you can get is exasperation and to exasperate the other. In such a setting, the agreement, instead of progressing, will retrocede and multiply the friction and exacerbate the confrontations. All this does not mean that one should withdraw into passivity and expect that the spouse decide, once and for all, to make an effort to adapt, but rather it means that when demanding from him some manifestations of good will, one will impose upon oneself a full proof patience, respecting the course of time and counting with the natural slowness of human evolution.

Knowing how to repeat a correction. Repeating it without letting it be known that one is tired of doing it, and about to explode. Repeating it, on the contrary with untiring affability, with a bit of good humor, but never out of time.

Subdue such impatience, such precipitation and impose to count with time. Wait for the required evolution to take place little by little. Time will always destroy what is done without it.

In all observation, one should avoid bitter words, in all criticism avoid cutting words, in all reproaches, avoid roughness; such are the conditions that are previous requisites to the conjugal covenant. This can only be carried out in a climate in which mutual reciprocity of comprehension is evident. This climate will be built if on one part and on the other the necessary ability is used to talk to each other with a benefit to both parties. Worrying about proceeding with tact will be conducive to not talking under the effects of violent emotions, which normally accompany the first reaction. What happens to our spirit is similar to what happens with water: when it gets muddied up, one can not see anything in it; one must wait and let it settle so that it can recover its clarity<sup>2848</sup>

Mutual criticism in marriage is good and it helps to improve. But it must be a criticism that grows out of love and is done with love. Not a reproaching criticism that bothers the other. These are useless and damaging, as they diminish the togetherness. A criticism that is an outpouring of aggressiveness produces aggressiveness in the other. The end of criticism must be to help the other to be better. That is why, ask not for impossibles, nor speak with vagueness which does not foretells what has to be changed; nor in a demanding way, but suggesting. And at the opportune time. A criticism out of time is damaging, or at the best, useless.

It is necessary, at all cost, to defeat foul moods, and to obtain that, cultivate the art of mutual forgiveness. One should not fear to go to far in this sense, because if it is dangerous to over forgive, it mucho more dangerous to not forgive sufficiently. If one were to have to decide between the two excesses, one must choose the first, as an excess of goodness can only serve love, while, on the contrary, it could not survive a negative to forgiveness.

It is in conjugal life where **Christ's** answer is best suited: "One must forgive seventy times seven<sup>2849</sup>". In other words, always! Only in the way that each one of the spouses make this Christian lay a norm of their daily life, will comprehension flourish in every day life. Any other orientations can only bring forth hardness and quarrels, which will end destroying their happiness. For life in common to be beautiful, for it to be harmonious, and have happiness reign in it, for love to be easy, it is precise that man and woman treat each other with charity, granting each other renewed forgiveness without cessation.

When you have to reprimand your spouse, do it without hurtful reproaches, which usually engender violent reactions. It is preferable to give a soft suggestion, which will allow an excuse, the agreement, the closeness.

Very frequently, pride is in the origin of the irritation. Some unconscious and repeated clumsy doings bring as a consequence that the offended woman seek refuge in a silent protest. She will close up. Refusing to go forth in the road of comprehension. Will not admit forgiveness. Thinking that she has initiated the steps to reconciliation too many times, she now withdraws to the defensive and manifests her protest with a stern stubbornness.

<sup>2848</sup> CHARBONEAU: *Noviazgo y Felicidad, V*, 2.Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2849</sup> Matthew, 18.22

She does not however, have a monopoly on bad mood. One must recognize that man also, uses it frequently, pressed on by pride. In him also, the phobia to give the first step can be successful. This is the best way to make life in common become unbearable. The triumph of obstinacy, pride, and bad mood, acts over love like a cancer. Many of the matrimonial failures are due to lack of communication. This is because the woman does not find in the man the attention to what she requires to communicate.

Very close to bad mood is being taciturn. It is a state of the spirit in one finds nothing to say. This defect is, in the vast majority of the cases, proprietary to man. Even though it not always is a consequence of ill will, this is not a reason not to be corrected. There are husbands who do not understand that in this manner they impose an extreme surplice. Throughout the day, she has no one to talk to. When the husband arrives, she feels a need to communicate with hi which is very understandable. But he is tired and exhausted, he is not wanting to converse. He barricades himself behind the newspaper, or watches television. When this is repeated with regularity, they start to become strangers. They are at the brink of failure. The husband must make an effort to be more understanding and give his wife the same treatment he did when he was courting her. One must make the home shine with happiness. It is the best safeguard for love<sup>2850</sup>.

**Dr. Enrique Rojas**, professor of psychiatry in Madrid, in his book titled "*El Amor Inteligente*"<sup>2851</sup> tells about a matrimony, with three children, just about to separate, because he, an excellent professional, only lived for his work, and his wife felt abandoned. He says that he likes feeling responsible for what she has in her hands, although he recognizes that he speaks little, but considers that in order to talk, one must have something to say, that talking for the sake of talking is ridiculous, and to talk about petty things, he would much rather remain quiet. But she does not tolerate this lack of communication. And he complains that she is always complaining about something or other. In sum, the lack of communication will end this marriage.

It is **not sufficient to coexist** in marriage, one must live together. And this is not possible if there is nothing in common. One must share likes and dislikes, ideas, values. It is not sufficient that the bodies be together, if the souls are separate.<sup>2852</sup> Communication is fundamental for matrimonial harmony. Speaking will clarify things. Silence muddles things where there should not have been a problem. One good day, a wife sees her husband driving in his car, with a young girl by his side. She is a co-worker, and is taking her to the doctor. But his wife imagines the worst. When he arrives home, with all naturality, as is his custom, goes to give his wife a kiss. She, with her preconceived idea in her head, welcomes him coolly. He is surprised but remains quiet. She also is silent.. The next day, he approaches her to give her a kiss, as usual, and he notices the same reaction as before. On the third day, he goes straight to his bedroom without trying to kiss her. She reaches her own conclusion: "there is o doubt he is seeing someone else". And we have a tragedy, which could have been avoided if there had been communication, and not silence amongst them.

There are women who complain that their husbands do not talk; but don't they realize, that it could be that they do not stop talking, as they talk incessantly telling their stories. Others constantly interrupt them when the husband is talking about something that he feels is interesting to tell, with a multitude of petty jabber: "how did you get that spot?" "is the soup good?", "careful with your ashes!", etc. This is their way of telling their husbands that what he is saying is of no interest to them, and the husband looses interest in talking. Many matrimonial differences are due to a lack of communication. One of them is bothered by something that the other did, or maybe suspects something. Instead of telling and clearing matters, silence is kept, and a long face is drawn. The other does not know what is wrong, and is also bothered. Tension rises, and could reach the breaking point. This would not have happened speaking with sincerity. Dialogue is not the juxtaposition of two monologues, but both parties trying to see with the others eyes.

<sup>2850</sup> CHARBONNEAU: *Noviazgo y Felicidad*, V, 3. c. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2851</sup> ENRIQUE ROJAS: *El Amor Inteligente*, II. Ed. Temas de Hoy. Madrid. 1997

<sup>2852</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRAS, S. I.: *Tres Trampas en el Noviazgo*, XIII. Ed. Paulinas, Caracas, 1978

**To remedy** the disagreements in matrimony, I recommend this excellent book “*Felicidad Conyugal: sus obstaculos; su exito*”<sup>2853</sup> Besides being an excellent book for married couples, it is also good for those who are approaching marriage, so that they may, from the beginning, how to avoid all steps that will separate them from conjugal happiness.

Marriage, as with all things, has its dark side, and it is necessary to tolerate it. Suffering is part of this life and one must tolerate and accept it.

**We must never forget** that even in a marriage in which there is true love reigning, there is always a place for sacrifice. Sometimes it may be necessary to a bit of self-discipline, so highly recommended by Christian ascetics. To the sexual control of the spouses. Including in the pre marriage talks and integral formation, sacrifice must always be promoted as an indispensable element of a Christian marriage.

Happiness in a marriage **does not sink** because at one time or another there is a discussion or disagreement. These are a consequence of human frailty. The sun always shines after the storm passes. When there is love and virtue, difficulties can be easily surpassed. It is very difficult that no problems arise in a marriage. What is important is that love be maintained and that the defects of the other person be overcome with virtue. And do not tell third parties the conjugal disagreements; unless asking for advice to a friend or an impartial person.

Spouses must know to **mutually appreciate** each other. That the wife appreciate the work of her husband, his social standing, his responsibility, his successes, etc. That the husband knows how to appreciate what he believes is the total commitment of the wife to the kids and home. Never speak belittling the other, even if it were a small incident. Always, when speaking of the spouse, let it be understood that you feel admiration.

The wife is totally immersed in household chores all day long. She finishes her day totally exhausted and never gets the much needed rest. The next day will only serve to accumulate more exhaustion. The husband also comes back from work tired. They never have time for “themselves”. They are fatigued, nervous and it is easy for sparks to fly. The husband must find time to listen to those things, which worry his wife. Dialogue among spouses is indispensable.

Matrimonial life **needs communication**. One must know how to express the feelings produced by the other spouse without hurting, and hear the sentiments that he produces without defending himself. A dialogue in such manner is the success of matrimonial life. To this end, we must learn to accept ourselves as we are, and accept the other as is. If we feel hatred for ourselves, we will clash with everyone else. He, who cannot get along with himself, cannot get along with others.<sup>2854</sup>

#### **How to make a marriage fail?**

- 1<sup>st</sup> Abandoning the showing of affection to the spouse.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Be carried away by the love of a third person.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Overvalue the defects of the spouse.
- 4<sup>th</sup> Answer back and raise your voice.
- 5<sup>th</sup> Extend petty nuisances, keep a long face and be difficult when forgiving or asking for forgiveness, when necessary.
- 6<sup>th</sup> Become uninterested in the other’s matters.
- 7<sup>th</sup> Become unconcerned about making the spouse happy.
- 8<sup>th</sup> Bother him continuously.

#### **To get out of a matrimonial conflict:**

- 1<sup>st</sup> Take note of the problem. Nothing can be resolved if one does not know of its existence.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> That wish to resolve it.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Look for the causes that originated it.
- 4<sup>th</sup> Do not accuse mutually.

<sup>2853</sup> ANGEL DEL HOGAR: *Felicidad Conyugal*. Ed. Desclée. Bilbao

<sup>2854</sup> MATEO ANDRES, S. I.: *Matrimonio Adulto*. X Encuentros Matrimoniales. Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic. 1987

- 5<sup>th</sup> Forgive, ask for forgiveness, offer forgiveness.
- 6<sup>th</sup> Start from what has you together, and lean on it.
- 7<sup>th</sup> Seek a possible solution.
- 8<sup>th</sup> Dialogue. Start talking, ask yourself: What is happening to us?
- 9<sup>th</sup> Listen, Bear. Tolerate.
- 10<sup>th</sup> Seek a third person's help (friend, advisor, priest); but not to side with us.

The happiness of a home cannot be looked for by each one independently. It has to be the happiness of both at the same time.

Love is an interpersonal encounter of an "I" with a "You" to form an "Us".

Authentic love does not look for the other person to make one happy, but one looks to make the other person happy, and making the other happy, one finds his own happiness<sup>2855</sup>.

Conjugal happiness is a daily conquest! Fire that is not stoked, will extinguish itself. The same happens with love. It demands from both a continuous effort for the well being of the couple and home. It is not always easy to comprehend each other. There is a certain amount of effort required to find oneself and find the road to harmony.

Loving is, above all, **seeking the other's well-being**. To bring tenderness to an extreme at all moments, personal hygiene, well mannered. The grossness, the untidiness, the rudeness, dirt, lead to matrimonial failure. The greatest intimacy demands the greatest care in oneself, and in the acts, if one does not want to prepare ones own misery, therefore duly destroying the marriage.

Spouses must make an effort in correcting their defects, and improve their character, to start molding oneself to the other, and to be in agreement most of the time. There are marriages that, after many years, love each other more than at the beginning; this is due to the mutual perfecting done with that continuous desire to make each other happy. If you want to avoid discussions in your marriage, try to please and make your spouse happy before your own desires and likes. When two spouses try to mutually please above and beyond their own interests and personal likes of each one, marriages is much softer.

Woman, for your matrimonial harmony:

1. Accept your husband as he is.
2. Admire him in his values. A man is happy when he feels admired by his woman. On the other hand, one of the things that humiliate him most is to see that she disdains him. Disdain kills love.
3. Adapt yourself to your spouses' life, and do not expect your spouse to change for you.

To procure your husband's happiness, you must realize that his psychology is very much different from yours.

The code of male psychology is precisely in the dominance of the **faculty of action** (reason and will) and the lesser development of sensibility.

From the teen years there is a manifestation of the male tendency to action and frequently to violent action.

A lower class youngster will be passionate towards sports, violent games, etc.

A grown man also has the need to work, organize, build. This can happen during courtship, or during the first months of marriage, during a period in which love occupies it all. Ordinarily, this does not last long. A true man, a really true man, who can live form love alone, does not exist. A woman cannot be happier than when she gives herself to living beings. Man has no greater happiness that when he immerses himself in businesses, to activity, to a job, having this not interfere or exclude his dedication to his family.

This is why you must understand the need your husband has for action. And you should not be surprised that your husband not think too much in you, as think in him or in your children. All men

---

<sup>2855</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRAZ, S. I.: *Cristianos en busca de respuestas, XIII, 10*. Ed. Sal Térrea, Santander.

turn to exterior activity. Is happy when building, creating something. Woman does not unveil her true nature until she gives herself to a great love, and can sacrifice herself for the people she loves.<sup>2856</sup>

Do not demand from your husband a courtesy or a loving action that is not "born" in him. Men are more prone to show their disagreement than their satisfaction. You should try to do all things well. But do not expect that a word of praise to come from your husband. He is accustomed in his work to not be congratulated for something well done. This is what is normal. On the other hand, he is reprimanded if something does not go right. He easily will carry the same tactic at home. It is logical that you would like to be thanked by him for the pride you take in your things. But it seems he does not care. Don't take it wrong. That is a man's way of being<sup>2857</sup>. The wife should help her husband to know her better as time goes on, continuing to bare her feminine soul, her intimate hopes, her complaints, her hopes, what hurts her, humiliates or disenchant her; what she expects of him and what lets her down<sup>2858</sup>.

There is a danger that the mother, for being over loving to the children, will abandon the attention to the husband, and that she not have his clothes, nor food, etc., ready, to his liking. The wife should also not eliminate the availability to the amorous desires of the husband: a young bride was ironing the baby's clothes when she was lovingly required by the husband:

---Wait a little while she finishes..

When she had finished ironing and folding the baby's clothes, and putting away the iron and ironing board, etc. etc., she felt deceived at the disinterest with which her husband received her, as he was now immersed in a detective novel, and for whom the "moment" had passed.<sup>2859</sup>

Your husband wants that you need of his love. Enjoy, if you take pleasure and enjoy with him. Try to do it and tell him. It will fill him with satisfaction<sup>2860</sup>.

It could be that your physical love is not as passionate as his; but you can always show yourself as loving and pleasing. This is not the time to talk to him about things that have nothing to do with the moment. When you have to reject his advances, do so with delicacy. Make it clear that you are not rejecting him, that you want to please him, but at another moment.

Man is conscious of his physical force in contraposition to his wife. It is not by testing your strength as a wife that you will get something from your husband, but by recapturing it at the right moment and with tenderness. A woman is weak when she tries to use strength with her husband, but she is strong and omnipotent over him when she is tender. Sweetness, patience and time can do more than strength and rage<sup>2861</sup>.

To know how to interpret the different attitudes of your husband, it is convenient for you to know that man is friendlier with his comforts and his well-being, than a woman. He is sensual in the full extent of the word. Woman regularly sacrifices her comforts for her vanity. She is capable of making great sacrifices to be beautiful. Man, on the other hand, will happily sacrifice his vanity for his comforts., he will remove his tie, or create fashion that does not require it; he will go in shirtsleeves, he will plop himself in the best sofa and snore. And will not be bothered to deposit the cigarette ashes in the ashtray. He is content to be served. He is demanding, he likes to be left alone.

If your husband is going to go out with you, do not make him wait,

Besides these traits common to all men, but, of course, there is no rule without an exception, you will find in your husband **unsuspected defects**, or at least of a dimension which was not known..

Confronted with these defects, you can adopt three attitudes: rebel, feel sorry for yourself or adapt.

<sup>2856</sup> PAUL HOESL: *Joven, si quieres ser moderna.....*, IV, 5. Ed. Studium. Madrid.

<sup>2857</sup> VIDENTE LOUSA, S. I.: *Tu Marido y tú*. León

<sup>2858</sup> FRANCISCO DE LA VEGA, S. I.: *El amor no se improvisa. Apéndice IV*. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2859</sup> ANGEL DEL HOGAR: *Amar al marido*, 3º, IV. Ed. Desclé. Bilbao

<sup>2860</sup> MARABEL MORGAN: *La mujer total*, X, 5s, Ed. Planeta. Barcelona

<sup>2861</sup> Padres Oblatos de Maria Inmaculada. *Curso de preparación al matrimonio. Lección XV*. Diego de León, 36. Madrid

Rebelling is to start discussions, clashes, scenes and provoke a crisis in the marriage.

Feeling sorry for yourself causes depression, sadness. And in consequence you will be less attentive to the management of your home, and you will be disinterested in your role as wife. Your husband, less happy, will detour from home, happiness will wither and the matrimony will walk another way towards a crisis.

Adapting, molding, renouncing to correct the uncorrectable and carry it with patience. With sweetness and patience induce the husband to correct what is correctible, in order to please you;. There must be comprehension..

Yield to him with sweetness and in good will. Do not forget that the husband is the head of the family<sup>2862</sup>. **Paul** says: "Women, obey thy husbands"<sup>2863</sup>.

During the matrimony, some little **stones** may present themselves, which may trip and tumble matrimonial happiness. It could be the absence of the wife from home, who is busy outside the home, and the husband, who does not find things as he likes them when returning home, or her flirting with a friend of the husband's, or of her maiden years. It could be her bad mood or her continuing of tales and stories as soon as the husband comes home, which makes him look for another place in which to pass a quiet time. If the woman has to make up a "tale" for the husband, she must wait for an opportune time so that the husband is better prepared.

Other times it will be the bad mood of the husband that the wife cannot stand and softly change. One must try to be jovial at all times . A friendly and warm habitual smile. Good mood works wonders in matrimonial love. There are women who become unbearable to their husbands, they are always complaining. The husband comes home from work tired, and at the moment that he crosses the door, hears nothing but laments from his wife All that she has suffered throughout the day she drops on his lap in a single blow. If the husband is very virtuous, he will patiently listen. But it is very easy that he not pay attention to her, and then she will get upset and make a scene. The blame lies with not knowing how to dominate oneself.

It is logical that you tell your husband those things on which you need advice. But do not tell him only the disagreeable things. Try to find also something that will be nice or agreeable. Do not exaggerate your aches and pains. Don't be a whiner. Such a woman is overbearing. Don't turn tears into a weapon against your husband. If you have serious problems, tell your husband. But do not bother him with petty nuisances, he has enough problems on the street. Try to slim the importance of your problems. The woman who always portrays the victim, ends up tiring<sup>2864</sup>. Do not increase his headaches- Think that he is coming home from work, and that you must be a reason of help and happiness, tell him what may please him, the joy of the kids. Be, for his spirit, the needed rest<sup>2865</sup>.

Besides, you must be interested in his professional work, so much as he wants to talk about it. If he doesn't want to talk, do not bother him. But if you ask him discreetly, it is possible that he may enjoy talking about his problems.

This **common interest center**, with strengthen your love. Never be jealous of his enthusiasm for his profession. You must be happy for him, as this makes him happier. Try to be in tune with him, appreciate his responsibility and prestige in his work, congratulate him in his successes, encourage him in his failures, follow all professional incidents with interest.<sup>2866</sup>. You must collaborate with him in all that you can. Everything that can be tone together is best done that done separately, lectures, prayers, etc. For the marriage to go well, communication is necessary. To this end:

1) Learn to listen: While he is talking to you, do not distract yourself by doing something else at the same time. Even if you think that you are gaining time, you are losing communication. Give him your total attention, even if he has told you the same thing many times before. A husband needs the

<sup>2862</sup> Ephesians, 5:23

<sup>2863</sup> Ephesians, 5:22; Colossians, 3:18, Titus 2:5

<sup>2864</sup> A. C. U. Pamphlets: Antes de que te Cases y ¿Serán felices?. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

<sup>2865</sup> Mother ALBERTA, Founder of the Order Purity of Mary. *Pensamientos*. N°584

<sup>2866</sup> ANGEL DEL HOGAR; *Amar al Marido*, 3º, III, c. Ed. Desclée. Bilbao.



admiration of the wife, and this is not possible if you do not listen with attention. If while he is telling you something, which he considers a success in the workplace, and you interrupt him asking if he has taken care of an errand, you demolish him. You are showing that you are not interested in what he does.

2) Do not boss him around. Only advice and with a lot of delicacy. “what if...”; “do you think...”; “if you can.....”. All husbands will run from a bossy and nagging wife. **Do not be bossy or nagging.** A husband told his wife “Stop bossing me around. I am your husband, not your child.”

3) Never belittle him nor say anything that shows a lack of appreciation for him. Quite the contrary: when it is opportune, say something to those present, with him there, that shows your appreciation of him.

4) Interest yourself in things that are passionate to your husband. That way you can talk to him about things and hobbies of his interest. Surely he will show appreciation<sup>2867</sup>.

You must always keep the house clean, pleasant and with warmth. That your husband have a favorite chair in which he can rest after a hard day's work. And don't be pestering him about getting the floor dirty, that he doesn't drop the cigarette ashes, that he doesn't leave things on the floor, etc. With all of this, you will shoo away a husband. It is known that men are very careless, and it is convenient that at least at home they can do what they want. Whatever they do of their own free will, good, but do not nag them!

If the husband feels good at home, he will not go out looking elsewhere for what he already has at home. The wife who appreciates her husband, will show interest for his things, she is his support and his rest, she tries to understand him and to make his life pleasant, she has a powerful weapon against infidelity. This will increase the love of your husband more than a new dress or a magnificent coiffure; although you should also do this. When a woman loves her husband, anything she does in preparing the home is an expression of her love. True love does not care about sacrifices. Precisely, it is expressed through sacrifice. What makes a home become a paradise or a jail is that there is or there isn't love.

Accept your husband as he is, and do not try to change him to your liking: you will fail and he will leave<sup>2868</sup>. You are joined for life. You have chosen. Your mission is not to choose who to please, but to please whom you have chosen.

Summarizing everything said, here are some norms for your life as a wife and mother. **You shall be a careful and prudent administrator.** Do not allow luxuries that your position does not allow. Also, do not spend time complaining of the meager income of your spouse that do not allow you to compete with your socially better off friends.

**Collaborate at all times with your husband**, you should be available to help him in the daily toil of keeping the house. During hard times, you will make personal sacrifices for the good of the household. When your husband comes home from work in a bad mood, don't worsen it by being imprudent. Be a sounding board and allow him to slowly speak of what is bothering him, but if he doesn't want to do it, don't be bothered, leave him alone. Your silent contemplation will bring him tranquility. Silent love: nor inopportune intromission, nor cold lack of interest, which will distance him from you.

**You should not give great importance to your family, nor give too little importance to his.** Although you love yours as always and would like to visit them frequently, you must bear in mind that the first and foremost love of your life is **your husband**. Do not sour his life with tense relations with his family. Look at his parents as though they were yours. Never belittle his family to him, and much less his mother. It is instinctive that we hold antipathy to those who speak badly of the ones we love. The wife must not be jealous that her husband has attentions towards his mother, which are a

<sup>2867</sup> MARABEL MORGAN: *La mujer total, XI, 3*. Ed. Planeta. Barcelona. 1976

<sup>2868</sup> MARABEL MORGAN: *La mujer total, IV*, Ed. Planeta. Barcelona. 1976

good trait in all good sons; nor that her mother in law may have for her son, which is natural in all mothers.

**You will embellish your home and you will be the center piece of attention,** With this you will get your husband to be attracted to his home and towards you. No matter how modest your home, if you show ingenuity and good taste, you can convert it into a haven full of light and happiness, where your husband anxiously wants to get to and seek refuge after a long day's work. Dedicate yourself to your home as much as possible. That the husband be at home, comfortable and content. Greeks used to say: "A lot of home, a firm husband". In fixing yourself up, do not forget that you should be attractive only to your husband. To others, it is sufficient that you be presentable. Dominate your vanity.

It is very important that when your husband comes home that he finds you well groomed and prepared to spend sometime with him. Don't forget that the first charm of the house is you. Some wives become careless after marriage and do not take care of themselves. Avoid being untidy. You should always be **attractive and pretty**. Don't forget that your husband will be in the office, at work, in the bar and on the street, with girls that are very well made up, attractive, pleasant and charming. You must yield them nothing. Don't be one who when being single did not pass up the smallest detail of their appearance, and, when time passes after marriage, turn into slobs. They are cheated. A great part of the disaffection of the husband towards the wife has a starting point. You should always be prim and proper in front of your husband. Making him want to come back home to be with you.

**You should be understanding and know how to overlook the errors and faults of your husband.** It is natural that certain thing of your husband cause you grief; it is natural and you would not be human if it weren't like that. But you should not boil in rage because of them. A lot of patience, and many a dose of comprehension. If you want something to be corrected, ask him tenderly. Never get out of bed with the resentment and rage of the previous day. Avoid cutting phrases, as for example: "my sister is lucky with her husband".

**Pan-Hoei-Pan**, an antique Chinese writer says that the best dressing of a wife is:

- a) a respect without limits to the husband which will make him feel admired.
- b) a continuous attention over her behavior, to correct her defects, and cultivate the traits that make her kind, with a solid virtue, sweet word, agreeable presence, delicate manners.

**e) Matrimonial love:** When returning back from work, tell your wife those things which you think might be of interest to her. Sometimes ask for her point of view, where she may give some input. This will increase the union and understanding. And, even if you come home tired and with no vigor, do not be brusque in asking to be left alone. Understand that she also has been busy all day long, doing housework. Maybe she has had a quarrel with a child or a neighbor which has affected her greatly and needs to bounce it off of you. You must know how to give up some of your comforts, and give her the attention that she is requiring. Man prefers to show his love with acts (he works for his wife, he is faithful, etc.), but he must not forget that she wants to be loved, and much more if she hears it without having asked for it.

A woman is difficult to understand. Sometimes, she herself does not understand herself. But whoever loves her, must try to understand her. She cannot demand that she be understood, but to make an effort in understanding her.<sup>2869</sup>

Do not forget that it is during menopause that the woman is in greater need of love, affection, attention, appreciation and comprehension.

You must know that there are days in a woman's menstrual cycle, and during pregnancy where you will find her more nervous, irritable, strange, unstable, sad, depressed, ill-humored, willing to disagree on anything, or to shed tears at the drop of a hat, etc. One must be patient with her. In those days, the husband he must be especially kind, understanding, full of loving and understanding. In those days, she doesn't even understand herself.. It is even possible that caresses will bother and

<sup>2869</sup> CHARBONNEAU: *Noviazgo y felicidad*, III, 2. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

irritate her. The best thing to do is to leave her alone and wait. But, in general, the wife needs of your attentions. Therefore, you should always show appreciation of a meal well served, or in something in the home that pleases you. That will make her happy, and in making her happy, you will also feel happy. Love demands respect, kindness, delicacy, generosity, fidelity. Many marriages fail, not for lack of sexual knowledge, but because the husband and wife have not learned to value and respect themselves as persons. Knowing the workings of sex is easy. But this is not sufficient to love the other as a person. This love is fundamental to make a family. "To create a family there has to be a marriage. And the marriage is constituted through the definite deliverance before God and in front of the community of two people who thereby become husband and wife"<sup>2870</sup>.

On the other hand, you must not forget that the woman is much more sentimental and affectionate than the man, and therefore, is much more in need of signs of care and tenderness. Give them frequently. It is really notable, that many, who in the time of courtship had manifestations of love, sometimes even excessively, after marriage, and precisely when these manifestations are most needed to reinforce the union and matrimonial love, they behave with their wives in a cold, dry and even disagreeable manner.

A husband should not consider his home as a truck stop, just a place where he goes to eat and sleep. He must dedicate some time to his wife and children. He must know how to make his wife feel that he needs of her. Feeling needed, she will be filled with satisfaction.

Recognize and thank her for the attentions and courtesies that she may with you. Tell her that the food she has prepared is delicious. But never tell her that the one your mother prepared was better, even if it was! Do not let her not feel belittled, rather make sure she feels encouraged to prepare things to your liking. And if things are not to your liking, do not make a scene, just let it be known, tenderly, without any anger. If you must call her attention, never do it at the time it has bothered you. Is it probable that you will overreact in your reproaches, and she will resist and make matters worse. Wait for an opportune time, and in privacy and with love, sweetly tell her what you want.

Give your wife sufficient household money without being disagreeable about it, making sure there is a little liberty as to how she is to spend it, not demanding detailed accounts as to how she spent it.. although she may have to consult with you when a major decision is to be taken. Some marriages, in order to avoid conflict in the administration of monies, separate in three unequal parts of the monies for expenses: a) a fixed amount for the expenses necessary for the home, which is administered by the wife; b) a fixed quota for the expenses that the husband wants to make; c) another quota for the wife to spend in her personal needs with absolute freedom. From this last bit, she must dress herself, make any superfluous expenses she may consider, etc.

Do not get involved in the running of the household. Take her with you whenever possible. Dedicate some time with her so that she can talk to you about anything she wants, and listen willingly. Frequently show interest in her health, and pamper her when she is not well. One of the things that a woman most desires is to see her wishes granted, without having to express them. Try to guess them and satisfy them. Don't be shy in praising whenever the occasion rises. Especially if she is young, keep on telling her how well she looks in that dress, or how exquisite that hairdo is. Make sure that there are many praises to her beauty and qualities. It is possible that she may receive them from many men, and are lacking from her from where they should come.

Conjugal love is made of a **myriad of small details**, apparently without importance, which really contribute more to the happiness of the home than is believed. Love is nurtured by small items, insignificant details. Small and delicate things are the habitual parlance of love. The tenderness of a man towards his wife can contribute in a grand manner to the happiness of the home, this together with the consideration and care that he may have towards her. Give her a present for her saint's day, her wedding anniversary, etc., even though it may be small. It is not the material value of the present, but the idea behind it that reaches the heart. There is more reason to give presents that do not

---

<sup>2870</sup> PABLO LOPEZ CASTELLOTE: *Los cristianos y la educación de los hijos. V, 12*. Ed. CEAC. Barcelona. 1981

require a cash outlay, such as a show of kindness, recognizing her values and efforts to take care of you, praising her in front of other people, showing pride in her; few things make a woman happier than to feel appreciated.

Be careful of not praising other women in front your wife. Avoid terms of endearment or excessive attention to other women in her presence. And if what you are doing is feeding your ego about loves of times past, this is something that is sure to hurt her deeply. Never praise the charms of your secretary or your neighbor. In no manner should she feel underestimated by you. ON the contrary, do not bargain sincere phrases of praise to your wife, and be attentive and kind with her as when you were courting and falling in love with her. Your intimacy should not be the origin of carelessness, inattention and negligence to cool your relationship. A lot of tenderness. If you are going to be late for dinner, try to advise your wife. Do not tarnish needlessly, nor be disorderly. Things that appear to be not important to you, make her nervous and will call for an argument.

When a woman falls in love she dreams of the ideal man. That is why it is so easy for them to feel bothered, discontent or defrauded by the little defects of her husband which make the myth of the "ideal man" which she had formed, crumble before her eyes. That is why it is not sufficient to be faithful, loving, and able to succeed in life. There is importance above all, in those defects that in public can place her in ridicule: rude treatment of a food server, leave a miserly tip, wear dirty shoes, a spot on the tie, petulance in wanting to always be right, a large ego, always being better than anyone else, unmanly presumptuousness, being vain in front of a mirror, and acting like a woman., etc.

Also important are the details you may have with her; walking down the street at a pace she cannot keep up with, continue reading the newspaper when she is speaking to you, not paying attention to her, or doing it in a bad mood; humiliate her (and much less in public) saying unpleasant things, as for example: "Shut up, you don't understand a bit about this".

There are husbands that do not talk to their wives, they only boss them.

To attain the happiness of your wife, you must realize that her psychology is different from yours. It may happen that your impetuosity in demanding what you are entitled to, to her, who by nature is less passionate than you, would seem to be brutal. You must therefore, proceed in this, with moderation, delicately and tenderly. The woman is slower and needs preparation. "The husband must give great importance to the foreplay. He must try to arouse the sexual desire of the wife before the coitus. Having sex without preparing the wife, without a kiss, nor a tender caress, is something that a husband should never do. He should dedicate at least five to ten minutes before the coitus, to create a sexual ambience. With terms of endearment, with kisses, hugs, and the touching which most please your wife. He must in a way, conquer the wife every time he is going to ask her for sex<sup>2871</sup>.

"Man can reach orgasm in two minutes. On the other hand, it is frequent that the woman needs about ten to fifteen minutes of active stimulation to attain the same result. This is because her voluptuousness is much more psychic than physiological. It is necessary to arouse her sexuality in a slow gentle manner, without violence or brusqueness, until she is ready to completely give herself in the act of love<sup>2872</sup>.

That is why man should not be rough, inconsiderate, impatient. He must not demand what he has not been able to make her wish. A woman also takes longer to cool down after an orgasm, therefore it is convenient to continue to be attentive with her, caressing her for a while<sup>2873</sup>.

It is conceivable that she will reach several successive orgasms (three or four), lasting from one to five minutes. It is essential that the man not separate during this period, if he wants to give the woman the pleasure he wishes. The woman must be left with the impression that she is loved for herself, that she is not an object which is abandoned after being used. Some testimonies of profound

<sup>2871</sup> Dr. J. DOMÍNGUEZ: *Felicidad sexual*, VI, 1, c, 1. Ed. Ultra. Nueva York. 1971

<sup>2872</sup> DR. A. WILLY: *Enigma de la Sexualidad*, 5, 1, 1. Barcelona

<sup>2873</sup> EFRÉN QUINTANILLA: *La Vida Sexual*, XVII, 4. Ed. Everest. León. 1974

love in the postlude have capital importance. A conjugal relation is an act of love. It is born of love and gives the couple an intensification of that love. But it is necessary that it be a “giving” love, a generous love in which the attention to the “you” will predominate over the search for self satisfaction<sup>2874</sup> If tenderness is not present in the conjugal bed, it is very probable that the act would be unsatisfactory.

The husband **cannot forget** of his wife’s rights. If he leaves her unsatisfied it will be torture for her and will end hating the conjugal act. The marriage act must be satiated with tenderness. To prolong the love at this moment is one of the things most appreciated by a woman. Tenderness ennobles sensuality without extinguishing it. When this is missing, the conjugal act is enormously poor. The psychic union of love is worth much more than all of the sensitive satisfactions.

The conjugal act must be the **expression of love** between the spouses. Overwhelming the woman, with the pretext of a husband’s rights, without any consideration to the ones she has as a woman, can be a grave sin. Also, in marriage it is sin to consider a person as an instrument or just a means of satisfaction. The woman must not be brutally possessed, but delicately conquered.

Pope **John Paul II** has said: “ The husband that treats his wife without love, but only as a means of satisfying an instinct, commits adultery with his own wife”<sup>2875</sup>.

It is ideal the orgasm **be simultaneous**. That is why the man must dominate himself and not ejaculate until such a time as when he senses that the woman is approaching an orgasm.

“The first coitus is a delicate moment. The young man, almost always hyper excited, may have little patience, when with a woman who has not awakened sexually. It is exceptional that losing the virginity be truly painful. If the husband does it in a very tender and loving way, which is normal in the first days of marriage, the woman will not have any pain. The small hemorrhage which is frequently produced when the hymen is torn, has no consequences, however, it is convenient to let the tissue heal for three to five days, abstaining from having intercourse during this brief period. It is truly a sacrifice for the husband, but it will be appreciated by the wife.”<sup>2876</sup>.

Nowadays there is an excessive preoccupation with sexual technique and the mechanics of the orgasm. This makes the coitus to be less spontaneous in an act where love should pour forth, and what results is a contrary effect to what was envisioned. “There is an inverse relation between the number of books so how to do “it” read by one person, and the pleasure felt by the persons involved. That is why sexologists are worried over the excessive anxiety on the emphasis placed on reaching an orgasm. This technical preoccupation robs a woman of that which she most wants at that moment: spontaneity.” Dr. **Dr. May** in his book, “*Love and Will*” says: “It is not surprising that contemporary techniques towards the mechanization of sex, have a lot to do with the problem of impotence. The distinctive characteristic of a machine is that it can do all the movements, but it does not feel.”

“In the sexual relation, love is the principal matter, not the technique. The worry over the sexual mechanics and waste love and convert it into a sullen caricature. On the other hand, love and mutual generosity will get, by their unsuspecting route, results which are far superior to those of the “technical” This preoccupation for the “**sexual techniques**” is based on the concept that man is no more than a developed animal, and, therefore, the most important of his sexual relations, is the physical pleasure that they may produce. All of this is an absurd idea and very sad about human nature and conjugal love.

Out of this absurd idea is born the maniac and obsessive anxiety to search for results each time more artificial. Anxiety and mania that so many times lead to a blind alley of sexual abhorrence or of sexual aberrations.

<sup>2874</sup> GAUDEFROY: *Estudios de la Sexología*, XI, 4, B, c. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2875</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 2002 (18-X-80)6

<sup>2876</sup> GAUDEFROY: *Estudios de la Sexología*, XII, 2, 2. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

“This is like the attitude of the chef who spent his time studying and laboriously planning .each dish, with the anxiousness of always attaining the maximum pleasure in his food. In reality, he enjoys eating much less than the average person.

The same thing happens in conjugal life, the “techies” are wound up in anxieties and artificial worries, while normal spouses love each other free of any worry, without having the anxiety of attaining maximum physical pleasure tarnish its spontaneity, its happiness and its pleasure when mutually giving each other, these factors are much more important to the absolute fullness of sexual happiness. Once again say that there is no better technique for a sexual adjustment than true mutual love, consideration to the other, and the desire of each one to make the other happy. In sex, we repeat what occurs in many other aspects of life: it is better to give than to receive. Here, this has a special signification, because, essentially, the sexual act is a gift<sup>2877</sup>.

Conjugal love is not a simple adventure of passionate enjoyment. The physical enjoyment must be a servant to tenderness. The sentimental union must precede the union of the bodies: therefore this will turn into an expression of a love that already exists in their hearts<sup>2878</sup>.

The conjugal act must always be **saturated with tenderness**. If this act “is not born of love it goes against proper order<sup>2879</sup> The genital encounter will truly be authentic if among the spouses there is a constant and concrete attitude of mutual love, demonstrated openly through the most diverse situations in life. It is necessary, truly, to remember that the sexual union, to be in consonance with human nature, cannot be reduced solely to the search of voluptuous sensations, but it must express above all, a complete fusion between man and woman, simultaneously penetrating their bodily and spiritual capabilities<sup>2880</sup>.

Love is not the same as desire. Love is in the soul and desire is in the body. Matrimonial love must be total; in body and soul.

**Decalogue of the wife:**

- 1.- The home will be what you make of it. This must be the great work of your life.
- 2.- You have the responsibility for the complete administration of the assets. Be prudent and with a great common sense.
- 3.- That your good taste and your worries – more than your money- make your home the warm refuge for all in you family.
- 4.- Try to always be the bride for your husband. And that it be noticed not only in your words, but also in your presence.
- 5.- Never forge, that before your children and of course your parents, is your husband.
- 6.- That your words, your cheer and your calm be succor and balm for all who form your home, or approach it.
- 7.- The first duty towards your children is called tenderness. On this, as a base, is where you and your husband will have an easier time in exercising the difficult and delicate art that is called education.
- 8.- Do not shout, nor loose your temper You will be better obeyed if you tell your children anything and all with calm.
- 9.- Put special care in the order and administration of the home: in the time of meals, and in a prudent economy.
- 10.- Finally, if you have the blessing of having faith, seek you support in God, as in He you will find the strength and grace that you need to carry out your lovely mission in life.

**Decalogue of the husband:**

- 1.- Solve your life – at least in the fundamental- before constituting a family.

<sup>2877</sup> ROBINDON: *Educación sexual y conyugal*, 3ª, V, Iss. Ed., Mensajero. Bilbao

<sup>2878</sup> PAUL VI: *Humanae Vitae*, n° 13

<sup>2879</sup> FERIN-PONTEVILLE: *Amor y fecundidad*, IV, 4. Ed. ELER. Barcelona. 1964

<sup>2880</sup> GIACOMO SANTORI: *Compendio de Sexología*, 1º, IX, 6 Ed. FAX. Madrid. 1969

- 2.- Your work is important, but do not let it absorb you in such a way that it robs time away from yours.,
- 3.- Good humor, a permanent serenity of the spirit, is the greatest gift that you can offer your wife and children.
- 4.- Your wife must be your best friend and confidant. And you should have with her the same attention, than you did when you were courting her.
- 5.- Respect her field of work. Few things are more ridiculous and damaging as a fussy and nosy husband who is into what pertains to a woman's doings.
- 6.- If your wife is in condition to work, and is caring properly for the home- let her.
- 7.- As to the children, do not forget that education is an art. A delicate and difficult art, composed by a little bit of science, a lot of common sense and above all, much love.
- 8.- The example is the key to education. You must earn respect and obedience by your example.
- 9.- Be a man in all, but keep in mind that this is perfectly compatible with the showering of affection that your family needs.
- 10.- And if you have the blessing of having faith, that **Christ** be the light and happiness of your life in the fulfillment of your duties of father and husband.

### **Decalogue of the marriage and the home:**

- 1.- Before your profession, even before your own children – and precisely for their own good – is your love as spouses, for which you need to find “your time”.
- 2.- Responsible paternity, yes, but if the Lord should give you a large family, accept it as the greatest of gifts.
- 3.- That your home be open always to friends and family**
- 4.- That in your home there is always a place of honor – as in your heart – for those who gave you life.
- 5.- Respect each other's field of action.
- 6.- With your children be energetic in the essential, and flexible in the accidental.
- 7.- Do not dramatize simple things. Simplify tragic things.
- 8.- Beauty, good taste and order should be a characteristic of your home.
- 9.- That a simple and authentic religiousness maintain a healthy spirituality in your home.
- 10.- Accept your situation. As said by **Quoist**: “If you cannot build the dream castle, build a cabin. But you will not be happy in your cabin as long as you keep dreaming of your castle”<sup>2881</sup>

**f) Procreation of children:** “The Lord has deigned to heal the spouse's love, elevate it and perfect it, through the special gift of grace and charity. Such a love, associated both with the human and the divine, will carry the spouses to a complete and free deliverance of each other, attested by sentiments and acts of tenderness impregnating their whole life. This overshadows, by far, the purely erotic inclination which, cultivated with egoism, will not flourish and will wither and die.”<sup>2882</sup>

Since the Second Vatican Council, there are no more talks about the primary and secondary purposes of the conjugal act..

“Through the union of the spouses, the double end of marriages is realized: the welfare of the spouses and the transmission of life. These two significations or values of marriage cannot be separated without altering the spiritual life of the spouses, nor putting in jeopardy the welfare of the couple's goods and the future of their family.”

As such, the conjugal love of the man and the woman is subject to the double demand of fidelity and fecundity<sup>2883</sup>

<sup>2881</sup> LUIS RIESGO and CARMEN PABLO: *Lo que Dios ha unido*. EAPSA. Madrid. 1976

<sup>2882</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*: Constitución sobre la Iglesia en el Mundo Actual, n° 49

<sup>2883</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2363

“Thus, the marriage and conjugal love are ordered through their own nature to the procreation and education of the children.”

“Of course, children are the most excellent gift of marriage and greatly contribute to the well-being of their parents. In the duty of transmitting human life and education, which must be considered as a self mission, the spouses know that they must be as cooperators in the love of God-Creator, and as his interpreters. That is why, with human and Christian responsibility they will with docile reverence to God fulfill their obligation, and in mutual understanding and effort they will obtain a rightful judgment, looking after their own welfare as that of the children, already born or to be born, discerning the circumstance of the moment and of the state of life, material or spiritual, and finally, taking into account the good of their own family, of society and the church. This judgment, in the final account, must be taken personally by the spouses before God. Christian spouses must take into account in their way of being that they may not proceed in their own free will, but must always be guided by their conscience, which must be adjusted to the Divine Law itself, be docile to the Magisterium of the Church, who authentically interprets it, in the light of the Gospel. Said divine law, shows the full sense of conjugal love, protects it and impulses it to the true human perfection. This way, the Christian spouses, trusting in the Divine Providence and fomenting the spirit of sacrifice, glorify the Creator and perfect themselves in **Christ**. When with generosity, human and Christian sense of their responsibility comply with their mission of creation. Among the spouses that so comply with the mission that God has trusted them with, are those who have a special mention, those who in agreement, accept with magnanimity a larger family to educate it dingly. Marriage is not only for the procreation, but the indissoluble nature of the link of the people and the good of the children require that the love of the spouses be orderly manifested, that it progress and mature. That is why, with the descendants, so strongly desired, should not arrive, the marriage continues to stand, as does intimacy and participation during live as a whole, and it keep it fundamental value and indissolubility<sup>2884</sup>.

Pope **John Paul II** says: The body of the man and of the woman are not only for procreation, but must express mutual love, in a reciprocal giving that should reflect the union of the spirits and the intimate communion of the persons, images of God.<sup>2885</sup>

This loving functionality of the sexual activity is inseparable of the act itself, so if it is lacking, the sexual exercise is not above the zoological level. Therefore, the essential element of the ethical care of the sexual exercise, is that his one portray the loving significance that qualifies it as a human action. The purely biological exercise of human sexuality is contrary to the rational and spiritual nature of man. Under this consideration, sexual activity can be ethically hampered: both in and out of the marriage due to a double effect, not always coincidental, because it is deprived of its loving communication –pleasure without love-- and by not doing it in a natural manner, not finalizing what the sexual mechanism tends to do in conformity with the plan established by God in the biological order of the sexes<sup>2886</sup>.

Frigidity in a woman who does not reach an orgasm in the conjugal act with the husband, is not a rare occurrence. This has an easy solution after consulting with a physician. The solution could be that the woman not be content with being passive, letting him do everything. If she participates in the sexual game, she could remedy her problem.

The child must be loved and wanted, from the moment that his conception is known. According to **Maria Cogollos**, a child psychologist, the hormones from a pregnant woman which are transmitted to the fetus depend on her state of mind. Through them, , the child finds out if he is loved and wanted or rejected. Many psychiatrists and psychologists speak of this “endocrine dialogue” in which the child is made aware of the state of humor that his mother has towards him. This influences the postnatal behavior of the child.

<sup>2884</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*: Constitución sobre la Iglesia en el Mundo Actual, n° 50

<sup>2885</sup> YA Newspaper, 24\_VII-80. pg.16

<sup>2886</sup> Libro básico del creyente hoy, XXV, 1. Ed. PPC. Madrid. 1970



The Second Vatican Council, after discussing responsible paternity and revaluing the function of love in marriage says that: “the matrimonial love is frequently profaned by egoism, hedonism and the illegal practices against generation<sup>2887</sup>

**g) Family planning:** All children must be the fruit of love and of responsible paternity<sup>2888</sup>.

**Paul VI**, in the encyclical *Humanae vitae*, says: In the mission of transmitting life, the spouses are not free to proceed arbitrarily, as if they could in a completely autonomous form, determine the licit ways to follow, but must norm their conduct to the creating intention of God, manifested in the very nature of the matrimony and its acts, and continuously taught by the church. The church, when demanding than man observe the norms of the natural law interpreted by its constant doctrine, teaches that any matrimonial act must be open to the transmission of life<sup>2889</sup>. “All in all, those who for some reason do not arrive at this ideal, “do not be discouraged” as said by **Paul VI**, but go to the mercy of God with perseverance and humility<sup>2890</sup>.

Sometimes there are reasons to **limit the number of children**, or to space them<sup>2891</sup>. It is not prudent that the woman become pregnant after reaching forty years of age.

The natural methods for the regulation of birth are moral<sup>2892</sup>.

The difference between natural and artificial methods in family planning is that in the artificial ways, physical methods are utilized (condom, IUD), chemicals (spermicidals) or hormonal (the pill) to frustrate conception. On the other hand, the natural methods are limited to elect the non fertile days, in which there is nothing immoral.

Although natural methods have made great and promising progress, they are disdained by many. For many it is humiliating that the church be right on this matter, would be prophetically authentic when it was accused of being old fashioned and retrograde<sup>2893</sup>. And let us not forget that there are many great financial interests in the artificial methods, while the natural methods are totally free.

**Dr. German Knaus** (Austrian) and **Dr. Yussaku Ogino**, (Japanese), simultaneously discovered in 1923 that the ovulation of the woman takes place thirteen days before the beginning of her menstruation, with a fluctuation of two days on either side, the length of the cycle notwithstanding. As the ovum lives about 24 hours, a woman can know her period of fertility<sup>2894</sup>. A technification of this method is to find out the day of the ovulation by drawing a chart of the basal temperature of the woman. The special thermometers for this purpose include a booklet explaining the usage. As the sperm remains alive in the uterus for about two days, the total fertile days are reduced to three every menstrual cycle.

For some time now there is an apparatus called OVULATOR<sup>2895</sup>. Which by observing the crystallization of the saliva, indicates the fertile and sterile days of the feminine cycle. Now days, with the work being done of fertilization “in vitro”, this concept has once again been brought up, which is given a 90% trustworthiness.<sup>2896</sup>

In 1975 **Dr. Billings** (Australian) published a book which is now in its twentieth edition in four languages. **Billings** has discovered a method to regulate the birth which is very simple, natural, healthy and cheap (no instruments or products), morally licit, and it seems, the safest of them all. It is

<sup>2887</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Gaudium et Spes*: Constitución sobre la Iglesia en el Mundo Actual, n° 47

<sup>2888</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2367

<sup>2889</sup> PAUL VI: *Humanae Vitae Encyclical*, n° 10 s

<sup>2890</sup> PAUL VI: *Humanae Vitae Encyclical*, n° 25

<sup>2891</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2368

<sup>2892</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2370

<sup>2893</sup> ANDRE LEONARD: *La moral sexual explicada a los jóvenes, IV, 4, 19*. Ed. Palabra. Madrid. 1994

<sup>2894</sup> ANA MERCEDES RODRÍGUEZ and M<sup>a</sup>. TERESA GUTIERREZ. *Regulación natural de la natalidad, I*. Ed. Ciudad Nueva. Madrid. 1992

<sup>2895</sup> Manufactured by Orcosan, S. A., Av. Castilla n° 32, nave 27. – 58850 – San Fernando de Henares.

<sup>2896</sup> ABC Newspaper, 12-X-88, pg. 54

based on the observation of the vaginal mucus<sup>2897</sup>. The experience of the World Health Organization, according to the statistics carried out in five countries, gives the Billings method a 99% success rate<sup>2898</sup>. It is practiced nowadays by over fifty million couples in the world<sup>2899</sup>. The Syntothermic Method, which is the combination of the Billings Method with other parameters, can reach 99.2% or sureness, according to the results of the WHO in the report *Biologic of Fertility Control by Periodic Abstinence* (Technical Report 369/67), if the *Learning Package of Family Fertility*, WHO, 78; is adequately taught.

**Dr. Billings**, Dean of the School of Medicine in Melbourne University (Australia), was in Madrid in 1984 and affirmed: "My method is effective, in at least 99% of the cases. It is more effective than the IUD and the condom. And it has the convenience of being a natural, simple and cheap method. Without the psychic inconveniences of the vasectomy or the tying of the tubes.<sup>2900</sup> Also, it does not have the inconveniences of the pill. The birth control pill produces cancer of the uterus, as said by the *Royal College of General Practitioners*, after 20 years of investigation.<sup>2901</sup>

In the September 1989 issue, *The Lancet*, one of the most important medical journals in the world, states that women who take birth control pills present a 75% higher risk rate for breast cancer than women who do not<sup>2902</sup>. And in the same magazine, 344(1994),1390 it is also said that the ingestion of oral contraceptives doubles the risk of uterine cancer.

In the "International Vademecum of Pharmaceutical Specialties" which is in the hands of all Spanish doctors it is said that "it has been demonstrated that women who take oral contraceptives have cardiovascular alterations in a higher proportion than those who do not". It is with reason that **Dr. Benigno Blanco** says: "the tobacco consumer is warned that tobacco is harmful to your health, but the user of oral contraceptives is not informed about the risks she is taking"<sup>2903</sup>.

In the daily news report of October 25, 1995, several stations reported that the birth control pill had caused an embolism in several women who used it. The Federal Medical Institute of Berlin informs that the birth control pill "Diane" from the Schering Laboratories can produce liver cancer. This pill has been used by millions of women in Spain<sup>2904</sup>.

The combination of the method discovered by **Dr. Ogino** with that of **Dr. Billings** is the safest of all known<sup>2905</sup>.

*Humanae vitae* has presented spouses with "an ideal of Christian conjugal ethic, to whose realization the faithful must progressively go towards and which very often requires a great effort. So much so, that in some cases, doubt may arise as to the grave guilt of the spouses on the lack of fulfillment of their duty in specific cases. What can happen, because of human frailty, is that the spouses, even though well intentioned, not respond to the demands of a fertile love, according to the Christian norm. Not because of this must they consider it a futile effort and withdraw from the sacraments. On the contrary, "if sin should surprise you still, do not dismay, but go before God with humble perseverance to his mercy which is granted in the sacrament of penitence"<sup>2906</sup>.

Pope **John Paul II** has said on 22 November 1981, in his *Familiaris Consortio*: "The church is surely aware of the multiple and complex problems that today, in many countries, are affecting spouses in their commitment to responsibly transmit life. It also knows the grave problem of the

<sup>2897</sup> Dr. JOHN BILLINGS: *Regulación natural de la natalidad*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1975

<sup>2898</sup> YA Newspaper, 25-VI-85, pg. 33

<sup>2899</sup> WOOMB Bulletin: 14-X-1994

<sup>2900</sup> YA Newspaper, 31-V-84, pg. 41

<sup>2901</sup> MONTAÑÉS Newspaper, 12-VIII-89, pg.34

<sup>2902</sup> YA Newspaper, 22-III-90, pg. 15

<sup>2903</sup> FAMILIA CRISTIANA Magazine, 3(III-95) 10

<sup>2904</sup> ABC Newspaper, 18-VIII-1994, pg. 60

<sup>2905</sup> INGRID TOBIACH: *La Alegría de ser Mujer*, III, 9. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander. 1977

<sup>2906</sup> PAUL VI: *Humanae Vitae Encyclical*, n°25

demographic growth, as is shown in various parts of the world, with the moral implications that it brings.

The church believes, however, that a profound consideration of all aspects of such problems offers a new and stronger confirmation of the importance of the authentic doctrine about the regulation of birth, as once again proposed in the Second Vatican Council and in the *Humanae Vitae* encyclical.

That is why, together with the elders of the Synod, I feel the duty of sending an invitation to the theologians with the purpose that, by joining their forces with the structure of the Magisterium, would agree to shed light with greater strength on the biblical fundamentals, ethical motivations and personal reasons of this doctrine. In this way it will be possible, in the context of an organic exposure, to make the doctrine of the Church in this important chapter be truly accessible to all men of good will, facilitating its comprehension each time more luminous and profound; in this way, the divine plan can be each time more fully realized, for the salvation of man and the Glory of the Creator. Also, in the field of conjugal moral the church is and acts as teacher and mother.

As a teacher she does not tire of proclaiming the moral norm that must guide the responsible transmission of life. In such norm, the church is not truly the arbiter nor the author. In obedience to the truth that is **Christ**, whose image is reflected in the nature and dignity of the human person, the church interprets the moral norm and proposes to all men of good will, without hiding the demands of perfection and radicalism.

“As mother, the Church makes herself close to many couples who are in difficulty in this very important point in moral life, it knows its situation well, and at times truly tormented by all types of difficulties, not only individual, but also social, it knows that many couples find difficulty, not only for the concrete realization, but also for the comprehension of the inherent values of the moral norm.

But the one and only Church is at the same time mother and teacher. That is why, the church never ceases to invite and cheer, so that the conjugal difficulties can be resolved without ever falsifying nor compromising the truth.. Truly, it is convinced that there cannot be true contradiction between the divine law for the transmission of life and that of favoring the authentic conjugal love. Because of this, the concrete teachings of the church must always be united and never separated of its doctrine. I repeat, therefore, with the same persuasion of my predecessor: : Not undermining in any way the healthy doctrine of **Christ** is a form of eminent charity towards the souls<sup>2907</sup>

**8.- UNCTION OF THE SICK.** Is also called **last rites** as it is the last sacrament that the Christian receives before departing from this world. With it, he receives an increase in grace to victoriously overcome the last battle of life. It is a sacrament by which, with the unction of the consecrated oil and the prayer of the priest, the faithful are granted, who have reached the age of reasoning, being gravely sick and having repented of their sins, at least by attrition, the health of the soul<sup>2908</sup>, and of the body if so convenient<sup>2909</sup>.

In case of need, any other vegetable oil may be used: linseed, sunflower, peanut, cotton, etc. Even though the appropriate one be olive oil<sup>2910</sup>.

When one is in **danger or death**, a priest must be notified to obtain the proper spiritual help of the moments, that is to say, so that he confess him, give him the Holy Viaticum and the Unction of the Sick<sup>2911</sup>. One must not wait for the sick to be extremely ill<sup>2912</sup>, with the danger that. When the priest arrives he no longer be lucid nor calm to make a good confession. No one dies for having called a priest early. On the other hand, many die in sin for not having called the priest on time

<sup>2907</sup> JOHN PAUL II: *Familiaris consortio*. n° 31 & 33

<sup>2908</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1520

<sup>2909</sup> Council of Trent. DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*. n° 909 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2910</sup> Apostolicae Sedis Act 65(1973)5-9

<sup>2911</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 2299

<sup>2912</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1514

Charged with **enormous responsibility** are those that seeing their relatives, friends, neighbors, etc., in danger of death, do not notify the priest on time in order to assist them. It could be that many will condemn themselves for a misunderstood love of their families<sup>2913</sup>. They may be afraid that the sick one may be frightened by receiving the spiritual help, and are not afraid that he may present himself to God's court with his soul in sin. As if in the case of a house on fire, one does not want to tell the neighbors who are asleep, in order not to frighten them. What a strange form of charity! Besides, even if the ill does get frightened, this fright will be temporary, and a lengthy experience has shown that patients when they confess and communicate remain very calm. It is natural! A Catholic in danger of death is always happy to receive the assistance of a priest. Some people enjoin their families to notify them in time when the moment arrives to receive the Last Sacrament. On the other hand, what a great remorse must they feel if when they are guilty of having let a sick person die without spiritual help! On the contrary, what a great relief must those feel, they who had the sick do a good confession before dieing! And what a great gratitude will that soul keep for them throughout all eternity! But, he who has been condemned because the persons around him did not want to call the priest on time - what feeling will that soul keep towards them?

I remember the time I went to visit a patient who knew was very ill. When I was left alone with him, he told me: "What happiness I have felt, father, when I saw you come in through that door! I was wanting to call you, but I did not dare so not to worry the family" When I was leaving, the family said: "We are grateful father that you have come. We had been wishing it, but we did not dare to tell the patient, so that he wouldn't get scared!"

What do you think? Both sides wanting to call the priest; and for an absurd fear on their part, a patient was going to die without confession! What folly! On the other hand, after confession, what ease of mind for all!

On the other hand, it is known that **one of the effects** of the unction of the sick is to give the patients body health if it is convenient.

If to give the unction to the sick you wait for the situation to be irreversible, then, recovery of health will be almost a miracle, and the unction of the sick, in itself is not miraculous.

The unction of the sick must be done when the patient is **still conscious**.

To receive the unction, the patient must be gravely ill, but it is not necessary that he be in danger of death<sup>2914</sup>. It is sufficient that the illness be such, that it be a real threat<sup>2915</sup>, because of illness of old age<sup>2916</sup>.

The unction of the ill can be administered again, if, having recovered health, they are ill again.<sup>2917</sup>

Extreme unction can be administered to the very old, even though they are not ill, as old age in itself is an irreversible and incurable illness<sup>2918</sup>.

This sacrament must be received in a state of grace<sup>2919</sup>. That is why, when he who is going to receive the anointment of the sick is in a lucid state, he must previously confess. . . But if there is a danger that when the priest arrives, he has lost consciousness, he must do an act of contrition.

<sup>2913</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 3ª, I, n°179. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2914</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 3ª, I, n°181d. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2915</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1515

<sup>2916</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Sacrosantum Concilium: Constitution on the Holy Liturgy*, n° 73

<sup>2917</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1004, 2

<sup>2918</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología Moral para Seglares*, 2º, 2ª, V, 400, 4º, c.. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>2919</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 315. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

The danger of death must be in the person's body. That is why the last rites cannot be administered to a criminal before he is executed, nor to soldiers before battle.<sup>2920</sup>

If need be, the last rites can be given to the **recently demised**, as death is the separation of the soul from the body, and it is difficult to determine the precise moment of said separation.

Apparent death does not always coincide with the true death.

"Death does not come suddenly. It is a gradual process from life to apparent death, and from this to true death"<sup>2921</sup>.

There are cases known of coming back to life after a clinical death, without the intervention of any miracle.

The only sign of true death is the decomposing of the cadaver.

When this is present with unequivocal characteristics, the true death is absolutely certain<sup>2922</sup>. There is only one sign of absolute death : the putrefaction<sup>2923</sup>.

The last rites must be administered to the ill, even if the patient has not been able to confess, as it is **sufficient to have an act of contrition**, so that with this sacrament his sins be forgiven, including the grave ones.

Today, the church allows the incineration of corpses<sup>2924</sup>.

The ashes of the bodies must be stored with due respect..

So long as the ecclesiastical or civil legislation do not call for something else, I suggest that the best place for these ashes is in a family niche.

---

<sup>2920</sup> LEO. J. TRESE: *La fe explicada*, 3º, XXIII. Ed. RIALP. Madrid. 1981

<sup>2921</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación*, 3ª, I, nº188 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2922</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación*, 3ª, I, nº190 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2923</sup> MICHEL: *Los misterios del mas allá*, II, 33. Ed. Dinor. San Sebastián.

<sup>2924</sup> New Code of Canon Law, nº 1176, 3

## THE EVER AFTER

**98.- HE WHO MORTALLY SINS AND DIES WITHOUT REPENTING OF HIS MORTAL SINS, GOES TO HELL.**

1. “Always live as though you are to die”, as it is very certain that sooner or later, we shall all die.

In the entrance of the El Puerto de Santa Maria cemetery, one can read: “ *Hodie mihi, cras tibi*” which means “Today it is my turn, tomorrow it will be yours”. This is evident. Although we do not know when, or how, or where, but whoever is wrong in this trance, will not be able to rectify in all of eternity. That is why it is so important to die in the grace of God. And as life, so shall death be: bad life, bad death; good life, good death. Although sometimes there are last minute conversions, these are few, and they do not always offer guarantees. Normally is that each one is to die in accordance as to how **he has lived**.

Even though it is possible that at the eleventh hour God will illuminate the soul in a special way as to its eternal salvation, whosoever should lean on this hope, in order to continue to live a licentious life, breaking God’s commandments at will, will be exercising an incredible temerity, and would be exposed to, almost surely to eternal condemnation<sup>2925</sup>.

The death of **Voltaire** is impressive. He died during the night of May 30 to 31, 1778, aged eighty four years. He was a non pious man and a blasphemer. At the hour of his death he requested a priest, but his friends did not accede. He died with terrible manifestations of desperation, drinking his own urine, as is told by the Marquise of **Villate**, in whose house he died<sup>2926</sup>.

“With death mans state of a traveler comes to an end, and the time arrives in which he will be immutable for all eternity. After death there is no possibility of changing the destiny that man had at the time of his death. After death no one can gain or lose merit. The state of life has finished for the soul, and has entered in to the end state<sup>2927</sup>.

There are persons who live this life as if it were **definitive and for always**. This is a mistake. We must live this life, thinking of the other, the eternal one, which is really the definitive one. That is why we must live this life to the fullest trying to do good as much as possible.

In death, the soul separates from the body<sup>2928</sup>. The body goes to the sepulcher, and there it turns to dust. The soul, on the other had, the essence of the person continues to live.

At the instant of death God judges us<sup>2929</sup>. Death is followed immediately by the individual judgment<sup>2930</sup>.

The New Testament speaks about immediate retribution after the death of each one<sup>2931</sup>.

It is **a dogma of faith**<sup>2932</sup> that those who die in a state of mortal sin, go to hell immediately after death; and to heaven, the souls of all saints,<sup>2933</sup> after they suffer the purification, those that should

<sup>2925</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARÍN, O.P.: *¿Se salvan todos? 2ª, VIII, 3, 4*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2926</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación, 3ª, I, n° 192* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2927</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación, 3ª, III, n° 168* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2928</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1016

<sup>2929</sup> CANDIDO POZO, S. I.: *Teología del mas allá, 3º, VIII*, Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2930</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 530*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2931</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1021

require it. "Each is accountable to God for himself"<sup>2934</sup>. "God will grant to each in accordance with his works"<sup>2935</sup>. **Paul says:** "We shall all stand trial before the court of **Christ** to receive payment for what we did"<sup>2936</sup>.

If we have died in peace with God, without mortal sin. The soul is destined to be eternally happy in heaven; but if we have died in mortal sin, it is destined to be eternally unhappy in hell.

**John** says: "Those who have done good, will resuscitate to life, and those who have done wrong to condemnation"<sup>2937</sup>.

Materialistic man is defeated by death. Only God gives us eternal life. Faith and fidelity to God is the supreme way of living in this life and to wait with hope for eternity.

## 99.- HELL IS THE ETERNAL TORMENT OF THOSE WHO DIE WITHOUT REPENTING OF THEIR MORTAL SINS.

1.- Hell is the **total of all evil** without the inclusion of any good. The existence of eternal hell is a dogma of faith. It is defined in the Fourth Council of Lateran<sup>2938</sup>. Following **Christ's** teachings, the church warns the faithful of the sad and lamentable reality of eternal death, also called hell.<sup>2939</sup> ..

*"God wants all mankind to be saved"*<sup>2940</sup>

But man can say "no" to the saving plan of God, and electing hell by living with his back to Him. Sin is a work of man, and hell is the fruit of sin. Hell is the consequence that a sinner has died without having asked forgiveness for his sins<sup>2941</sup>. The same way that being suspended from an academic course is a consequence of the student not knowing.

**Jesus Christ** speaks fifteen times about hell in the Gospel, and in fourteen of them, he says that there is fire in hell<sup>2942</sup>. And in the New Testament, fire is mentioned 23 times. Although this fire is of different characteristics of fire on earth, as it torments the spirits<sup>2943</sup>, **Jesus Christ** has not found a better word to describe this torment of hell, and thus repeats it. The Sacred Congregation of the Doctrine of Faith, on May 17, 1979, said: "that even though the "word" fire is only an "image", it should be treated with full respect"<sup>2944</sup>.

In hell, there is another torment that: "is the most terrible of all the punishments"<sup>2945</sup>. According to **Saint John Chrisostomos**, it is a thousand times worse than fire<sup>2946</sup>. **Saint**

<sup>2932</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 3ª, II, n°205,3,X,n°455*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2933</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 530s* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2934</sup> ROMANS. 14:12

<sup>2935</sup> ROMANS. 2:6

<sup>2936</sup> CORINTHIANS, 5:10

<sup>2937</sup> John, 5:29

<sup>2938</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 428ss and 531*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2939</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1056

<sup>2940</sup> Timothy I, 2:4

<sup>2941</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 1033

<sup>2942</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 3ª, IV, n°230*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2943</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 531* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2944</sup> ECCLESIA Magazine, 10-VIII-79

<sup>2945</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 3ª, IV, n°320*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2946</sup> SAN JUAN CRISÓSTOMO: Homilía in Mat. XXIII, 7s, MIGNE: Patrologia Griega. 47,290ss.

**Augustine** says that there is no torment that we know that could compare<sup>2947</sup>. Theologians call it “punishment of harm”. It is a terrible anguish, it is a sort of supreme desperation that tortures the condemned, who seeing that because of his fault he lost heaven, will not be with God and has condemned himself for ever. The Bible places in the mouth of the condemned a terrible cry “I am mistaken”<sup>2948</sup>. Now, as we do not properly understand heaven or hell, we do not understand this, but then we shall see its full horror<sup>2949</sup>.

We must not confuse hell, with the hell to where Christ descended after dying. We pray in the Apostles Creed “He descended into Hell”. Here, hell is the place of the dead, as is said in Canon IV of the mass. It was the *Sheol* for the Jews. There Christ went to announce the redemption. We also call the place of the dead “the limbo of the just”<sup>2950</sup>.

If one who has been condemned, after tasting hell, could come back to earth to do merits and therefore liberate himself from hell, What would he do?. How would he treasure merits. Well, we can still do it, without having tasted hell.

**Jehovah’s Witnesses** deny the existence of hell based on the fact that **Christ** sometimes used the word “*sheol*” which means tomb. But the word *sheol* means hell in the theological sense. Because if the souls of the just are liberated from *sheol* by God, this cannot be considered a common address for all the dead<sup>2951</sup>. But the Catholic doctrine on the existence of hell does not base itself on the metaphoric words that **Christ** could have used in some occasion, but on the doctrine which he developed repeatedly in his teachings, such as is stated in the Gospel..

As **Arístides R, Vilanova** pointedly says: “hell is full of non believers”<sup>2952</sup>.

2. Hell is the negation of love and the failure of our liberty<sup>2953</sup>. Hell is the eternal condemnation. It is the **definite failure** of man. “He who, with full conscience of his acts, rejects the word of **Christ** and the salvation that it offers; or who, after accepting it, obstinately behaves against its law, or he who lives in opposition to his conscience, they shall not reach their destiny of well-being, and will remain estranged from God for ever”<sup>2954</sup>.

To some, who have not studied religion in depth, think that God, being so merciful will not send us an **eternal punishment**. However, that hell is eternal is a dogma of faith<sup>2955</sup>. But we must take into account that God does not send us to hell<sup>2956</sup>; it is we, who freely chose it. He sees with disdain that we reject Him through sin, but he has made us free and does not want to curtail the freedom which is consequence of the intelligence which he has given us. **Jesus Christ** clearly taught us God great mercy. But also tells us that hell is eternal. **Christ**

<sup>2947</sup> Saint Augustine: City of God, XX, 22, XXI,9s. MIGNE. Patrologia Latina, 40,285

<sup>2948</sup> Wisdom, 5:6

<sup>2949</sup> HERIS, O.P.: *El Infierno*, III, 9. Ed. Criterio, Buenos Aires

<sup>2950</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, nº 633

<sup>2951</sup> CANDIDO POZO, S. I.: *Teología del mas allá*, 2ª, III, 7, 2, H. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2952</sup> ARÍSTIDES R. VILANOVA: *Toda la verdad sobre la Sabana Santa*, 2ª, XII, 3. Fundación Pío X.

<sup>2953</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference, 8º EGB, XVIII, 4. Edice. Madrid. 1983

<sup>2954</sup> Pontifical Secretary for the non Christians: *Presentation of Christian Faith*, 2ª. 35- Ed. PPC. Madrid

<sup>2955</sup> Cardinal RATZINGER: *Eschatology*, III, 7, 1. Ed. Herder. Barcelona. 1980

<sup>2956</sup> JOSE ANTONIO SAYES: *mas allá de la muerte*, VI, 4. Ed. San Pablo. Madrid. 1996



affirmed the existence of an eternal punishment, amongst other things, when he spoke of the final judgment: “He will tell those on the left. Withdraw from me, damned, to the eternal fire prepared by the devil”<sup>2957</sup>. And then goes on to add that the evil “will go to the eternal punishment and the just will go to eternal life”<sup>2958</sup> ..

It is a **dogma of faith** that there is a hell for those sinners who die without repenting. Although God is merciful, he is also fair. The Holy Scripture says: “ As great as my mercy has been, so will be my justice”<sup>2959</sup>. And his mercy can not oppose his justice.

Although God’s justice is not inexorable, it is sweetened through his mercy, and is always inclined to take into account all extenuating circumstances<sup>2960</sup>

As God is merciful, he always forgives he who repents of his sin; but as he is just, he can not pardon he who does not repent. Justice demands the repair of the violated order. Therefore, he who free and willingly sinned and dies without having repented of his sin, deserves a punishment. And this punishment should last as long as the fault is not repaired through repent; as the moral faults cannot be repaired without repenting. It would be a monstrosity to pardon he who does not want to repent. **Thomas** says: that God cannot forgive the sinner if he does not previously repent <sup>2961</sup>. Now then, as death puts an end to life, repenting can no longer be possible<sup>2962</sup>, because after death there will be no possibility of repenting<sup>2963</sup>.

After death you cannot rectify. Death will irrevocably set the soul.<sup>2964</sup>

After death one cannot gain anything, with death the time of making merits is ended<sup>2965</sup>.

The sinners’ fault who died without repenting will remain non-repairable for ever, as the punishment will be **forever**.<sup>2966</sup>

It is not possible to repent in hell, as it is not possible to sin in heaven<sup>2967</sup> The blessed ones in heaven feel so attracted by the love of God, that the attractiveness of sin leaves them indifferent<sup>2968</sup>.

God is infinitely just and cannot remain indifferent to the evil that is done in this world. How can they; the thief, the murderer, the selfish and the junkie, remain the same in the other world, as do the honest, the charitable with the whole world? Evidently there must be a punishment for so much injustice, crime and evil that goes unpunished in this world. Fear of hell is not **the best motive** to serve God. It is much better to serve Him by love, as a her that he is to us. But we are so miserable that sometimes the love of God will not suffice, and it is convenient that we must take into account the eternal punishment, because it is a reality that **Christ** tells us so that we may avoid it.

Irresponsible lips have been heard to say: “Today’s youth is not interested in the religion of fear or insecurity.” It all depends: being fearful of unreal things, is for idiots,; but to

<sup>2957</sup> Matthew, 25:41

<sup>2958</sup> Matthew, 25:46

<sup>2959</sup> Ecclesiastes, 16:12s

<sup>2960</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Se Salvan Todos?*, 2ª, II. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2961</sup> Saint Thomas: *Summa Theologica*, III,86, 2. Ed. BAC. Madrid.

<sup>2962</sup> MICHEL: *Los misterios del mas allá*, 1,2,2; V, 2,3. Ed. Dinor. San Sebastián.

<sup>2963</sup> CANDIDO POZO, S. I.: *Teología del mas allá*, 3ª, VII, 3. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2964</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Se Salvan todos?*, 2ª, VIII, 3,2. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2965</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, nº 778 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2966</sup> GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, O.P.: *La Vida Eterna*, 3, II. Ed. Rialp. Madrid

<sup>2967</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Dios y su obra. Apéndice 3º. B, 4. nº690. Ed. BAC. Madrid*

<sup>2968</sup> JOSE ANTONIO GALINDO: *La libertad en San Agustín*, AUGUSTINEUS Magazine, 35 (1990)308s

close your eyes to real dangers is to be imbecile. In the same way: to look for fictitious security is for idiots, but to deject real security and prefer insecurities, is for imbeciles.

The concept of eternity counterpoints the concept of time, which supposes a before and an after. Eternity supposes an unlimited duration, an interminable permanence<sup>2969</sup>. An image that will allow us to understand eternity is the painting of a clock which shows nine o'clock. No matter how long we wait, it will never indicate nine-oh-five.

3.- We must **frequently** ask God that He protect us from the necessities of life. God has in hand all of the happenings of our life and governs them with loving providence. God is always present in our lives. He helps and protects us continuously. But many persons only remember Him when they need Him. The same thing happens with the air, we only remember it exists when we cannot breathe.

We know that **God is Good** and cares for us, although sometimes we do not understand His providence. Let us trust Him who is up above and can see more. The one who is on the summit can show the better way uphill than the one who is below, who cannot see that the way he believes to be the best is interrupted by a chasm hidden by some boulders. A good father will remove his son from being a "bellboy" so that he can learn a trade. He will momentarily have a smaller income, but as a "bellboy" will only learn to deliver letters and to close doors, and when because of his age, he must leave the job, he will be a useless man. Learning a trade is on the long run a better deal. God guides us as a Father does his children.

Hell exists. Not because God wants it, who does not, but because a free man **can** opt against God. It is not necessary that it be an explicit action. You can deny God implicitly, with the works of your life. If we deny the possibility of man to sin, we hinder the freedom of man. If man is not free to say NO to God, he is also not free to say YES. The possibility of opting for God includes the possibility of rejecting him.<sup>2970</sup>

The great mystery of hell is that even though God wishes the salvation of all men, we are capable of condemning ourselves. **God has created us free** and wants us to behave as such. To deny the possibility of condemning ourselves is to deny the liberty of man. It is to annul man. To affirm that hell exists is taking the freedom of man seriously. God offers salvation, He does not impose it. Hell is God's respect to your last will. If you freely elected sin, so long as you do not retract yourself, God will respect you. And as with death your freedom is no more, you will not change eternally.

#### 4. The problem of "Evil" presents itself.

Evil is a mystery that is beyond human understanding. It should suffice us to realize that God knows how to draw "good" from "evil"<sup>2971</sup>. In example, so that the sinner recognizes his fault and repents; so that the just expiate their faults in this world and thus earn greater glory in heaven, and give good example to their brethren with their patience; so that men can live removed from material and earthly things, as life on earth is a time of trial and not of rewards, etc.

<sup>2969</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la salvación*, 2ª, III, n° 152. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2970</sup> JOSE LUIS RUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *La otra dimensión: escatología cristiana*, VIII, 3. Ed. Sal Térrea. Sant.

<sup>2971</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church, n° 312

It is difficult sometimes to console the parents of a deceased angelical child. But we must not forget that God is a very loving Father, and does not allow anything that is not for our well being. God knows the future well, and knows if this angelical creature is going to persevere in this manner or if it is going to cause great harm itself and to its parents. It could be that the angelical death of today might be quite different tomorrow.

Let us trust that God's plans are always in our greater benefit.

It could be that in a certain case, we do not understand the goodness that God extracts from evil. But **Paul** tells us that "for those who truly love God, everything cooperates for towards goodness."

In his infinite wisdom he subordinates an inferior goodness to a superior goodness, the material goodness to the spiritual, the physical to the moral, the profane to the religious, the earthly to the celestial, because we are not made for the earthly, but for the heavenly, not for the time, but for eternity.

Without denying the problem of evil, here are a few clarifying ideas.

Evil is the lack of proper goodness. For a stone is not "at fault" if it cannot see, but I would be. On the other hand, it is not bad for me not to have wings, but it would be for an eagle. That is why **Thomas** says the "evil" is not merely the lack of goodness, but the lack of proper goodness of a given creature.

Hell is the **only absolute evil**. All other maladies are relative; for some yes, for others, no; in one sense yes, and in another, no. An earthquake would be bad for me, if I have lost my house and some loved ones; but it is not bad for our earth, which has gained more stability in its mass. A sickness is a malady for me, in the sense that it makes me suffer, but it could be good if through it I sanctify myself and am more meritorious for heaven.

In man, a physical ailment produces pain, and the moral malady is produced by sin. The physical malady is a consequence of the Laws of Nature. The moral malady is consequence of the erroneous use of human liberty. To avoid moral malady, God would have to remove liberty from man. Every free man is **capable of sinning**. And a man without freedom would cease to be man. The freedom to be good or bad is what makes being good so meritorious. And to obtain merits for eternal life, is the reason for which God has put us on earth. **Paul** says: "We know that God converge all things for the good of those who love Him<sup>2972</sup>."

If God were to impede man from doing evil, he would violate his liberty.

God has His reasons to allow evil. To us, it is sufficient to know that God has Providence, although we may not know its roads. Faith gives us the certainty that God would not permit evil if he did not make the goodness come out of the evil.

Evidently God could have made a world with other physical laws. But any imaginable world is perfectible. In order not to be surpassed **one must be God**, who is the only one who is omni perfect. God has thought that this world is sufficiently good for man to live in, and to earn eternal glory, which is the purpose for which he has been created.

But, above all, the answer to pain is **Christ**, who He wanted to be first to encourage us to suffer. As the mother first tastes the soup for her child, who does not want to eat, in order to encourage him. Human suffering, individually or collectively, sometimes only has one answer: **Christ** crucified.

---

<sup>2972</sup> Romans, 8:28

Redemption of humanity has been made by pain. That is why many saints have loved pain. Calvary has become the ideal goal, who according to **Paul** “that he did not want to glorify himself of anything that was not the cross of **Christ**”<sup>2973</sup>.

And through a strange paradox, to suffer for the love of **Christ**, is an ineffable consoling fountain. **Paul** also said: “I am overjoyed in the midst of my tribulations”<sup>2974</sup>.

That is because all sacrifice carried out in love loses all its hardness.

It is even converted into happiness when you truly love. And besides, the hope of glory. The pain will pass, the tribulations will end, suffering will extinguish itself for ever. And all of this will be substituted by a sublime and incomparable glory, which will never end. That is why **Paul** says: What do the bitterness and tribulations of this earth have to do if we compare them to the immense glory which awaits us in eternity<sup>2975</sup>.

A Christian does not remain passive in front of pain either his or others, and tries to avoid it at all costs with the licit means at his reach.

When human resources have ended, when Science and Love have been declared impotent, a Christian still has a refuge. To him, heaven is not empty. In it, dwells a god, who is good, wise and omnipotent, of whom all happenings in life and all phenomena in the universe depend. A God that knows our miseries and hears our pleas for help, and can, if he sees fit, to succor and console us.

And when the prayer is not heard immediately, the true Christian does not dismay. He knows how to accept, with serene resignation, the inscrutable designs of God, who is the most loving of the Fathers.

5.- All things have pro's and con's. Electricity brings us many goods (illumination, telecommunication, motors, etc.); but it can also cause a fire through a short circuit, and kill by electrocution. Notwithstanding the dangers that electricity supposes, that is not a reason to not have electricity at home. The world that God has created has many good things, but sometimes there are adversities and challenges. These are consequences that the world is a being in evolution. Thy dynamic of evolution causes contrasts and conflicts. Sometimes things occur that we do not understand. But it is absurd to try to understand God in the human form. It is like if an animal would like to try to understand the human philosophical ideas: it is impossible. It is logical that sometimes, am does not understand the way of God. For us, it is sufficient to know that God is Father, and that he allows suffering for our good. In the same manner that a mother injects a child when needed, even though it may hurt him.

God lets the laws of nature act and the freedom of man, and does not move them as the chess player moves the pieces.

It should be, however, a consolation for us to know that, in heaven, the ones who have suffered more with Christian resignation. It is consoling to know that suffering is temporary, but the prize for having suffered for God's love, is eternal. In heaven we shall bless god for those sufferings for h we have merited eternal glory.

Let us not fool ourselves with the **apparent triumph** of some bad ones. In first place, because the triumph of the bad is limited to this life, where experience shows us that one has not triumphed completely, and free from bad. But above all, because he who sins is a

---

<sup>2973</sup> Galatians, 6:14

<sup>2974</sup> II Corinthians, 7:14

<sup>2975</sup> II Corinthians, 4:17

failure for eternity, where failure is complete and irreversible. Only the one who triumphs is saved.

## 100.- HEAVEN IS THE HAPPINESS WITH WHICH GOD ETERNALLY REWARDS THOSE WHO HAVE DIED IN A STATE OF GRACE<sup>61</sup>

1.-Heaven is the **sum of all goods**, without any evil.

“The church has defined the existence and eternity of heaven as a dogma of faith”<sup>2976</sup>

“Heaven is primarily a “state”. It is a way of being. Space is for material things. Spirits, to exist do not need of a place. But it is also necessary to suppose that heaven is located some “place” even though we don’t know where that is.”<sup>2977</sup> There is no other solution but to say, that, in one way or another, heaven is a place of glory<sup>2978</sup>. In heaven, the good live eternally happy with GOD. This is the only way to be completely happy.<sup>2979</sup>

For **Plato**, happiness is in loving beauty, and for **Aristotle**, in knowing the truth. And as the Supreme Beauty and Truth are in God, he who cherishes God in is true happiness. And this is heaven<sup>2980</sup>. That is why **Saint Augustine** says: “You made us Lord, for thee; and our heart is anxious until it rests in thee”

2.- God has made man for heaven. That is why here on earth no man can find that complete happiness which he seeks. **Goethe** stated of himself: “I have been portrayed as a man most favored by fortune. But deep down, it was not worthwhile, and I can say at my seventy five years of age, that I have not had four weeks of true happiness. It has been the eternal rolling of a stone wishing to change places.”<sup>2981</sup>

Rich and poor, high and mighty, poor and destitute, all men. in their moments of sincerity, recognize that they do not find a happiness that quenches their thirst, even if they have had all and enjoyed all. This is because “the fundamental aspiration of man cannot be satiated with the possession of an object, man cannot attain full happiness in a subject-object relationship, but in a you-me relationship, in other words, in a relationship with a person”<sup>2982</sup>.

The greatest happiness in this world is in love. Not precisely in the love-lust, but in the spiritual love. Love gushes forth in the presence of the good, of the beautiful. In heaven, the possession of the Infinite Good –God- will give us, through love, an unsurpassed happiness.

Now what we know of God, as said by **Paul**, is a caricature<sup>2983</sup>. But when we shall know him in heaven as he is, what warrants to be loved and how much he loves us, his love will make us immensely happy.

“Only in God will man find the truth and joy which he searches unceasingly”<sup>2984</sup>

<sup>61</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterium Of The Church*, n° 842 Ed. Ed. Herder. Barcelona. Barcelona

<sup>2976</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN: *Teología de la Salvación*, 3ª, VII, n° 327 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2977</sup> KARL Rahner, S. I.: *Escritos de Teología*. I, pgs. 243-252. Ed. Taurus. Madrid

<sup>2978</sup> JUAN MANUEL IGARTUA, S. I.: *La Resurrección de Jesús*, 3ª, IV, 1. Ed. Mensajero. Bilbao, 1989.

<sup>2979</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1035

<sup>2980</sup> LUIS MARIA GONZALO: *La Felicidad*, III. Ed. Palabra. Madrid. 1990

<sup>2981</sup> STAUDINGER: *Vida Eterna*, II, 1. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>2982</sup> J. ALFARO, S. I.: *Persona y Gracia*. GREGORIANUM Magazine, n° 41 (1960) 7s

<sup>2983</sup> Corinthians, 13:12

<sup>2984</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 27

No matter how many times an astronaut explains the sensation of weightlessness that he experiences in space, you cannot understand it as he, and as such, a sinner may not comprehend **Saint Theresa** when she speaks of the happiness in the love of God.

It is hard to understand the happiness of heaven with our worldly mentality. It is like talking to a blind person of colors, or to a deaf of the beauty of music. As **PAUL** said: "Eye has not seen, ear has not heard, nor has it dawned on the mind what God has prepared for those who love Him"<sup>2985</sup>.

The only complete happiness, true and definite is in heaven. That is why eternal salvation is the most important problem that man has to resolve in this life. It is a difficult matter, but we are interested that it be resolved well. If I should fail, it is me who will suffer for ever.

In heaven we will know all that interests us about our family, friends, etc. Including all the marvels of science of all branches of human knowledge<sup>2986</sup>. And as one cannot suffer in heaven the blessed do not suffer seeing their loved ones suffer., as they see the goods that follow that suffering. But without doubt, they will ask God to succor their needs and give them strength and submission to be able to bear all.<sup>2987</sup>

**Jehovah's Witnesses** claim that only 144,000 were saved, as that is the figure that is quoted in the Apocalypses.<sup>2988</sup> But anyone who has studied the Bible a bit, knows that the numbers stated in the Bible have a symbolic value. They do not pretend to be exact. As when we say "I have told a thousand times", what we mean to say is "I have told you many times"; and when saying "I have been waiting a couple of hours", you really mean a long time, and not 120 minutes.

There are several symbolic numbers, such as 7, 12 and 40. Seventy times seven. Forty days of fasting. Twelve apostles. The twelve tribes of Israel.

The 144,000 are 12,000 for each one of the 12 tribes of Israel. Twelve is the sign of plenty and one thousand is a multitude. That is why Apocalypses says a few lines down that "it was a multitude so large that no one could count them"<sup>2989</sup>. And **PAUL** says: "For God wants all to be saved"<sup>2990</sup>. And **Jesus Christ** enjoined the Apostles: "Go out to the world and proclaim the Good News to all creation...the one who believes and is Baptized will be saved."<sup>2991</sup>

This doctrine of **Jehovah's Witnesses** has been so contested that they themselves are looking for another interpretation of the text and are now admitting that many more are saved<sup>2992</sup>.

"And those who through no fault of their own, are not Christians, but have been faithful to the voice of their conscience, will partake in the eternal happiness with the Lord, as the invisible action of the Holy Spirit in their hearts, will join them in the Paschal Mystery of **Jesus Christ**"<sup>2993</sup>. **Thomas** says: that he who does not know the true religion, but is not guilty of it, and has tried to live his life in accordance with his conscience doing good and avoiding evil, as per his own accord, one must believe with absolute certitude that God will find a way to illuminate him before he dies so that he may be saved<sup>2994</sup>. The Second Vatican Council states that: "Those who guiltlessly do not know the Gospel of Christ and his church, but try to obey their conscience can attain eternal salvation. The Divine Providence does not deny the necessary help to salvation to those who without guilt ignore the express knowledge of God, and try to lead a life of rectitude"<sup>2995</sup>.

<sup>2985</sup> I Corinthians, 2:9

<sup>2986</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 3ª VII, n.346. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2987</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 3ª, VII, n° 348. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>2988</sup> Apocalypses 7:4

<sup>2989</sup> Apocalypses 7:9

<sup>2990</sup> Timothy, 2:4

<sup>2991</sup> Mark, 16:15s

<sup>2992</sup> G. HERBERT, S. I.: *Los Testigos de Jehová, su historia y su doctrina*. V. 5. B. 1ª. Ed. PPC. Madrid

<sup>2993</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conscience: *This is our Faith*, 2º, I, 11, 2, e. EDICE. Madrid. 1986

<sup>2994</sup> SAINT THOMAS: *De veritate*, 14, XI, 1.

<sup>2995</sup> Second Vatican Council: *Lumen Gentium: Constitución Dogmática sobre la Iglesia*, nº 16

On the other hand, he who has been schooled in the Catholic religion and rejects the Catholic Church, cannot be saved<sup>2996</sup>. (See 39.1)

3. In order to save oneself and gain heaven, it is necessary to serve God and to **keep all commandments**. This is hard work, as our inclinations towards sin are very strong, and the devil – who is envious of us and who wants to condemn us with him- lays out all sorts of traps and temptations for us to stumble on. However, we can defeat the devil and our own passions. “Everything is possible for him who prays”. If I earnestly and continuously ask the Lord and the Virgin, if I confess and communicate frequently, and try to get away from the opportunity to sin, it is a certainty that I will be saved. We have at hand the necessary and sufficient means to reach salvation: whoever puts them into practice will conveniently save himself. In order to not go wayward from salvation, it is very convenient to renew oneself through Spiritual Exercises.

Also, there are three things that are **very effective** in order to attain a good death: communicating every First Friday of the month, all First Saturdays, and every night pray three Hail Mary’s to the Holiest Virgin, which are a means of eternal salvation. Although naturally, all devotions are worthless if we do not have a sincere desire to serve God and do good. It is necessary to **constantly ask** for our eternal salvation. Who asks to be saved, with insistence and full heart, is true that he will be saved, and on the contrary, who does not ask for it, will not be saved, ordinarily speaking. As **Saint Alfonso Mario de Liguorio** says: “The whole matter of salvation depends on prayer, if thou does not pray, thy condemnation will be true”<sup>2997</sup>

4.-The mystery of **predestination** consists of the coordination of Wisdom, Kindness and Justice of God with our liberty. For us the coordination of these four things is a mystery. But we understand that God can coordinate it. We shall try to shed some light on it.

Sometimes you hear the question: “If God is good, why does he create me knowing that I will condemn myself? He would have done me a favor by not creating me”. You are wrong. By not creating you, he does not do you a favor. If you do not exist, he cannot do you favors. On the other hand, by creating you, he gives you the entry ticket to heaven, which is an immense favor. Should you break the ticket it is not God’s fault, it is only yours. He has already done enough by purchasing that ticket paying for it with his life. Are you to doubt of his goodness?

If God were not to create those who are to condemn themselves, he would harm the possible descendants of such men, who could be excellent, saving themselves and be eternally happy. We can all have in our ancestors’ one who had condemned himself. If in order for him not to be condemned, God did not create him, we would have therefore not have been created, and would be deprived of the eternal happiness we wish to achieve. If you want to condemn yourself, it would not be a reason for God to deny eternal happiness to your descendants (generally speaking) who would be desirous to be saved and be eternally happy<sup>2998</sup>.

Moreover, if God were only to create those who are to be saved, then men, sure of their salvation at the eleventh hour, would be unconcerned to do good works. The risk of condemnation is a stimulant to do good. This increases the eternal award. And God considers that this is sufficient motive to allow others to voluntarily go on the road to perdition.

It is true that God could send us death taking advantage of a moment in which we are in a state of grace, or before we are able to reason, if we are never to have a good moment. But God plans to give each one a determined amount of life, and He does not change it. If God were to subordinate the time of death for each one of us to the time we are in a state of grace, as this depends on the will of man, it would be man who, in some fashion, would determine the time of death. And it is improper for God to subordinate himself to the whim of the creature.

<sup>2996</sup> Second Vatican Council: Lumen Gentium: Constitución Dogmática sobre la Iglesia, nº 14

<sup>2997</sup> SAN ALFONSO M<sup>a</sup> DE LIGORIO: *Del Gran medio de la Oración. 1<sup>a</sup>, I.* Ed. Perpetuo Socorro. Madrid

<sup>2998</sup> JOSE SABATER: *Dios es así XXVI* Ed. Paulinas. Madrid.

All in all, **it is useful** to ask God for the healing of a gravely ill person. As God knew that there would be requests for said person, he could from all eternity, considering those prayers, determine the most convenient time of death.

We must trust all that God does or allows is in **our favor**. It is for his love of us, although sometimes, because of our limited understanding we do not comprehend God's plans.

"The Divine Providence is God's ordering, through his love and wisdom, of all creatures till their last day<sup>2999</sup>".

"God wants all men to be saved"<sup>3000</sup> and gives all the required graces for it<sup>3001</sup> if they do not voluntarily reject it<sup>3002</sup>. What's more, if you need a million, He will give you five million. **Jesus Christ** said: "I have come so that you may have supernatural life, have it abundantly<sup>3003</sup>". That is to say, that with the grace He gives you, you are assured of salvation. If you do not save yourself, it is because you do not want to. God has wanted you to put forth some effort. If you do not want to do it, the blame is exclusively yours. It cannot be God's in any way, as with what He has given you, you have more than enough to save yourself.

Why does God leave this in our hands? Because without freedom there is no merit, and without merit there is no salvation.

Man is essentially rational. A rational being is necessarily free<sup>3004</sup> Being free implies self determination in the election of good and bad, therefore to be responsible. To be responsible, one must be free<sup>3005</sup>. This is what makes the necessary merit of salvation possible, and at the same time, the guilt of evil which takes you to condemnation. If God were to suppress freedom, He would suppress man. What God would have elected another order of things in which less would be condemned? I agree! And why has He chosen this? We do not know. He has not revealed it. It is a mystery. What is certain is that in the order of all free men it is logical that some abuse their freedom, and that in the current order of things which we are presently living, whoever sincerely wants to be saved, with God's help, will save himself. No one is condemned but by his own fault<sup>3006</sup>. God call all to salvation; but each one's answer is personal and free. And God respects that freedom.

Let us summarize the Doctrine of the Church on predestination:

- 1.- God wants all men to be saved<sup>3007</sup>.
- 2.- Christ died for all men without exception<sup>3008</sup>
- 3.- God will not deny to anyone the necessary and sufficient graces to save oneself.<sup>3009</sup>
- 4.- No one condemns himself without blame<sup>3010</sup>
- 5.- We can all save ourselves, as God does not ask for impossibles, do whatever you do, and ask whatever you can't, he will help you so that you may<sup>3011</sup>.
- 6.- well said prayer and devotion to Mary are pledge to eternal salvation.

We can all be saved, as God wants it that way<sup>3012</sup>. That is why he has placed us in this life. This will of God is not absolute, which does not admit exception; but conditioned, that is, with the

<sup>2999</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 321

<sup>3000</sup> Timothy, 2:4

<sup>3001</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 1ª, V, n° 108*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3002</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Se salvan todos?, 2ª, III, 3, 3ª* BAC

<sup>3003</sup> John, 10:10

<sup>3004</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 1ª, V, n° 45*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3005</sup> Dr. MELCHOR ESCRIVA *Medicina de la personalidad, VIII*, Ed. Sal. Terrae. Santander. 1985

<sup>3006</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 318* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>3007</sup> Timothy, 2:4

<sup>3008</sup> Corinthians, 5:15

<sup>3009</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 1ª, V, n° 19*. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3010</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 321*

<sup>3011</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 804*



condition that the sinner repent of his sins. To save ourselves, he gives us sufficient means, such as grace and the sacraments. It is sufficient that we wish to use them and cooperate with the grace that God gives us, obeying his commandments.

**101. - Purgatory** is the suffering of the souls who are not condemned for having died in mortal sin, but must be cleansed, of any vestige of sin, before entering heaven<sup>3013</sup>.

The existence of purgatory is a **dogma of faith**<sup>3014</sup>. It is defined in the councils of Lyon and Florence<sup>3015</sup>. Also at the Council of Trent<sup>3016</sup>.

In the second book of the Maccabees (12:43-46) it is said that with alms in favor of the dead these will be set free of their sins. This confirms the existence of the purgatory. This is so clear that the Protestants, in order to deny the existence of the purgatory are forced to deny the authenticity of this text. The church, however, from the beginning, since the III Council of Carthage (cannon 47), has held this text to be an inspired one<sup>3017</sup>.

**Paul** states that there is purification after death<sup>3018</sup>. And supposes that it is possible to help the dead<sup>3019</sup>. As those in heaven do not need it, and in hell this is no longer possible<sup>3020</sup>. **Paul** refers to the souls in purgatory. **Paul** also speaks of those whose works were not perfect, and says: "He shall be saved, but as he whose passes through fire"<sup>3021</sup>. He refers no doubt to purgatory, as hell is eternal.

Talking about sin against the Holy Spirit, **Jesus Christ** says that "will not be forgive, either I this age or in the age to come"<sup>3022</sup>. This means that there are sins that are forgiven in the other, that is to say in purgatory<sup>3023</sup>; as in heaven it is not necessary and in hell, it is not possible. **Christ** said: hell is eternal<sup>3024</sup>.

**Christ** says that we shall be accountable for any unjustified word<sup>3025</sup>, in other words, even the smallest failure. But no one comes out of hell<sup>3026</sup>, and it does not seem fair to be in hell for all eternity as a result of minute faults. There are sins that are not to be for death<sup>3027</sup>. On the other hand, the Apocalypses states that in heaven anything soiled will not enter<sup>3028</sup>.

Therefore there must be a way to purify oneself of the small faults which do not merit eternal hell, but with which, one cannot enter into heaven. That is the purgatory.

"Thos who die in the grace and friendship of God, but imperfectly purified, even though they are certain of their eternal salivation, suffer a purification after their death to obtain the necessary sanctity to enter into the kingdom of God"<sup>3029</sup>

<sup>3012</sup> Timothy, 2:3s, Corinthians, 5:15, John, 3:17

<sup>3013</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1030

<sup>3014</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 693* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>3015</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 464 & 693* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>3016</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n°840* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>3017</sup> SAN FRANCISCO DE SALES: *Meditaciones sobre la Iglesia, 3ª, II, 5.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3018</sup> Corinthians, 3: 10-15

<sup>3019</sup> Timothy, 1:16ss

<sup>3020</sup> SAN FRANCISCO DE SALES: *Meditaciones sobre la Iglesia, 3ª, II, 2.* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3021</sup> Corinthians, 3:13ss

<sup>3022</sup> Matthew, 12:32

<sup>3023</sup> MAX MEINERTZ: *Teología del Nuevo Testamento. 1ª, III,3.* Ed. FAX. Madrid

<sup>3024</sup> Matthew, 25:41

<sup>3025</sup> Matthew, 12:36

<sup>3026</sup> Matthew, 18:8; 25:41,46

<sup>3027</sup> John, 5:16

<sup>3028</sup> Apocalypses, 21:27

<sup>3029</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1054

The worst suffering in purgatory is seeing the delay of being with God, which is anxiously awaited.

The suffering in purgatory is just as great as in hell, but with the hope that it will end and then the eternal glory will come. This suffering diminishes as the end comes near<sup>3030</sup>.

We all must be very devoted to the souls in purgatory. Those who are there suffer greatly until the time comes to go to heaven. They cannot merit anything for themselves<sup>3031</sup>; but from this world we can abbreviate their suffering, offering masses, prayers and good deeds in their name<sup>3032</sup>.

We must preoccupy ourselves above all for our deceased relatives, which may, still be in purgatory<sup>3033</sup>. Whoever does not succor the souls in purgatory should also be forgotten upon his death.

If I can, through masses, prayers, etc. etc., release a soul from purgatory, I will have, forever a **grateful soul**, who will be interested in my things and will help in my needs<sup>3034</sup>

2. Some good people, conscious of the needs of the souls in purgatory, and of how much we can help them from here by offering aid<sup>3035</sup>, do what is called a “**vow of souls**” which calls for renouncing of all satisfactory values that we may reach to offer it in benefit of the deceased, pledging that we will pay in purgatory for all our sins<sup>3036</sup>.

This act earns us a great merit before God. The church calls it “A heroic act of charity” and **Jesus Christ** cannot leave it without reward, as he said, “Fortunate are the merciful, for they shall find mercy”<sup>3037</sup>. As if with this we find the mercy of a good death, what more could we want?

To make this vow, there are no special prayers to be made. It is sufficient to make an offering from the heart. But if you so desire, the following prayer can be said:

“I offer you O Lord, for the souls in purgatory, all of the good deeds of my entire life, and all that are offered for me after my death. I offer them to you together with the merits of **Jesus** and **Mary** and in her hands I deposit them so that she applies them in accordance with her will. Please accept this offering, and help me live and die in your Holy Grace. Amen.

It is convenient and advisable to often renew this offering. Although it is called a vow, it is not necessarily a vow, which may oblige under the penalty of sin; it can be dissolved at any time at the will of he who made it.

The excellence of the vow of souls can be drawn from the great number of noble and dignified people in science and sanctity who have done it<sup>3038</sup>

<sup>3030</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Se Salvan Todos?*, 2<sup>a</sup>, IX, 4, d. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3031</sup> WALTER MACKEN: *El Purgatorio*. PALABRA Magazine, n°244 (XI-85)36

<sup>3032</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia*, n° 464, 693 Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>3033</sup> GUSTAVO THILS : *Santidad Cristiana: 3<sup>o</sup>, III, 2, 4*, Ed. Sígueme. Salamanca

<sup>3034</sup> OTTO ZIMMERMANN, S. I.: *Teología ascética*, n° 112. Seminario Metropolitano. Buenos Aires

<sup>3035</sup> FELIPE CALLE, O.S.A.: *Razona tú Fe*, XXXVI, 4, Ed. Religión y Cultura. Madrid.

<sup>3036</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación*, 3<sup>a</sup>, VI, n°312, 6<sup>o</sup>, Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3037</sup> Matthew, 5:7

<sup>3038</sup> EDUARDO FERNANDEZ REGATILLO, S. I.: *Las Indulgencias*, n° 420-424. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander

## 102.- HEAVEN AND HELL SHALL NEVER END AS THEY ARE ETERNAL/

1. It is not possible to sin in heaven, nor is it possible to repent in hell<sup>3039</sup>, as they are eternal,

## 103. – THERE SHALL COME A DAY WHEN THE WORLD SHALL END

1. **Jesus Christ** spoke of the end of the world several times during his life<sup>3040</sup>. What we do not know is, when that day will come. **Jesus Christ** said that no one knows the day in which the world will end<sup>3041</sup>

## 104.- THEN THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD SHALL COME<sup>3042</sup>, AND THE FINAL JUDGMENT FOR ALL MEN<sup>3043</sup>.

“God will give life to your mortal bodies”<sup>3044</sup>.

1. The resurrection of the dead is **dogma of faith**. It is defined in the IV Council of Lateran.<sup>3045</sup> We shall all be presented “*before the tribunal of Christ to receive the prize of punishment for what we have done in this life*”<sup>3046</sup>. “*Those who have done good shall rise to live, and those who have done evil will rise to be condemned*”<sup>3047</sup>. “*Those of the left will go to the eternal torment, and the just to eternal live*”<sup>3048</sup>. “*There will be a resurrection of both the good and the sinners*”<sup>3049</sup>.

“All men will stand with their bodies on the day of the final judgment before the tribunal of **Christ** to give account of their actions”<sup>3050</sup>.

**Christ** is the head of the Mystical Body. The resurrection of the Head, who is **Christ**, is pledge of the resurrection of the whole body, which is us.

When the end of the world arrives, all of the dead will resurrect with the same body<sup>3051</sup> that they have now<sup>3052</sup>, so not to die again. The just will have their bodies: glorious and perfect, and without the imperfections that we now have<sup>3053</sup>. This is a miracle. Although it is difficult to comprehend<sup>3054</sup>, we know that it will happen this way, as it is a dogma of faith.

<sup>3039</sup> Spanish Episcopal Conference: *Esta es nuestra fe, 2ª, I, 11, d.* EDICE. Madrid

<sup>3040</sup> Luke, 21:33

<sup>3041</sup> Matthew, 24:36; Mark, 13:32

<sup>3042</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1016

<sup>3043</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1040

<sup>3044</sup> Romans, 8:11

<sup>3045</sup> DENZINGER: *Magisterio de la Iglesia, n° 429.* Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>3046</sup> Corinthians, 5:10

<sup>3047</sup> John, 5:29

<sup>3048</sup> Matthew. 25:26

<sup>3049</sup> Acts, 24:15

<sup>3050</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1059

<sup>3051</sup> MICHEL: *Los misterios del más allá, VIII, 1.* Ed. Dinor. San Sebastian

<sup>3052</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 999

<sup>3053</sup> SAINT AUGUSTINE: *Ciudad de Dios, XX. 19ss*

<sup>3054</sup> ANTONIO DUE, S. I.: *El hombre ante Dios y la ciencia, IV, 5.* Ed. Escelicer. Cádiz.

“It would be daring to say that it is impossible for God to give the resuscitated body properties that are already found in the elements which constitute matter in our laboratories. No one has the right to deny God that possibility. The only thing God cannot do is the absurd or the contradictory. This is not absurd nor contradictory; this has a basis in today’s science”<sup>3055</sup>.

In accordance with the opinion of a large number of theologians and of Holy Fathers, we will resuscitate in plenitude of life, with the characteristics of human nature in their most vibrant and perfect state of development<sup>3056</sup>. And without the defects we had in this life<sup>3057</sup>. But this, even though it is a reasonable theological opinion, is not dogma of faith<sup>3058</sup>.

“Resuscitating with the same body” means recovering the same life in all its authentic human dimensions, not losing all of that which now constitutes and makes man unique<sup>3059</sup>. We shall resuscitate with **our own body**, but perhaps not with the same matter, which has changed repeatedly throughout life with metabolism. I am still the same one, but not the same. Identity of the person, not of the molecules. I am the same person, but not the same matter. I shall resuscitate; the atoms that form my body are inconsequential.

“Maybe the idea of our resurrection will seem more incredible to some, because they have an erroneous idea of it. They believe that God will wander picking up atoms that one day formed part of a certain organism, that they are dispersed throughout the world, and once found he will be able to form the body again. But what makes it be the same man it is not that he have the same body, but that he be the same person. It is a fact, that throughout our life, we have renovated all of the atoms that form our body, and yet we continue to be the same person. Resurrection is not a problem of a rigorous corporal identity, but of a personal identity”<sup>3060</sup>.

Nowadays, the church permits the **cremation of remains**<sup>3061</sup>, in view of the difficulty of space in the cemeteries of the larger cities. There is no problem for God at the time of resurrection.

The destiny of these ashes can be varied. As long as the civil or church authorities do not order differently, it is allowable to deposit the urn with the ashes at a family niche, commit them to the sea, having previously made sure that the container holding the ashes will allow the dispersal of the same. They should always be treated with utmost respect, as this is the church’s wish.

**2. Jehovah's Witnesses** confuse resurrection on the final day, with a short term resurrection. In a book they published in 1974 titled “*Es esta vida todo lo que hay?*” on page 165 they say that “many people alive today shall never die”, and that “thousands of millions of people who are now dead will soon live again. Think of the joy of being able to have the company of dear friends and loved relatives, hear their familiar voices and see them in good health”. Tricked by this lie, a woman in Quintana de la Serena (Bajadoz) a woman, who had her husband in a tomb, would not close her door at night hoping that he

<sup>3055</sup> MANUEL M<sup>a</sup> CARREIRA, S. I.: Doctor en Ciencias Físicas. Profesor en la Universidad de Cleveland: *El Hombre, centro del Universo*. A.D.U.E. Madrid.. 1983

<sup>3056</sup> STAUDINGER: *Vida eternal, IV, 1*. Ed. Herder. Barcelona

<sup>3057</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *Teología de la Salvación, 3<sup>a</sup>, IX, n<sup>o</sup> 447* Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3058</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *El misterio del mas allá, IV*. Ed. Rialp. Madrid.

<sup>3059</sup> JOSE LUIS REUIZ DE LA PEÑA: *La otra dimensión, VI, 13, D*. Ed. Sal Terrae, Santander. 1975

<sup>3060</sup> JUAN LOPEZ PEDRASZ, S. I.: *Cuando se está perdiendo la fe, VI, B, 1*. Ed. Sal Terrae. Santander, 1975

<sup>3061</sup> New Canonic Code Law, 1176, 3

would show up at any moment; and in Caravaca de la Cruz (Murcia), a lore says that after a woman's husband died, he asked her for a new suit for him to wear after he came back from the sepulcher. Is it fair to deceive simple people in this manner?

**Jehovah's Witnesses** talk about a second opportunity after death. But **Jesus Christ** never spoke of that second possibility, he always taught that death defines the eternal destiny of all men. Therefore we are constantly warned to be prepared: "So stay awake, for you do not know the day nor the hour"<sup>3062</sup>.

**3. Resurrection** has nothing to do with **reincarnation** of Hinduism or of Buddhism.

In Spain we have suffered the invasion of other religions which has caused a tremendous confusion in the many ideas of the Catholic. One of them is the reincarnation of the dead in an animal or in another person. This is totally unacceptable for a Catholic<sup>3063</sup>.

The bible says: "Humans die only once"<sup>3064</sup>.

"There is no reincarnation after death"<sup>3065</sup>.

Man is essentially the son of God, which demands that he be able to know and love him, and this would not be possible if he were to reincarnate into a frog or a lizard. Nor in another man, as each person is responsible for his own actions and no one can bear the responsibility of another persons deeds. Each one of us is total and exclusively responsible for his own deeds. The responsibility of our human person only lasts as long as our cognizant time between birth and death. We are not paying for the sins of others, nor will any one else pay for the sins of which we are responsible.<sup>3066</sup>

**105.-** In what has been said up to here, is what is needed to believe to be saved.

1. He, who trusting God's word- believes in the truths that the church teaches as revealed by Him, is said to have faith. The Catholic must believe all which **God has revealed** and the church proposes to be believed. The church summarizes it in the "Creed", also called the "Apostolic Symbol", as it is a summary of the teachings of the Apostles.

We must believe the truths of faith, because God, who cannot be fooled nor does He want to fool us, and he teaches them to us through our Holy Mother the church, divinely assisted by Him. God does not reveal directly to each one the truths that we must believe, but has made the church a depository of these truths and has enjoined her to teach them.

The Christian knows that **God cannot be wrong** because he is infinite wisdom, and he cannot fool you as he is the total truth. That is why it has faith in God. Faith consist of a submission of the human mind to the supernatural truths or mysteries revealed by God.

**106.-** Faith is as necessary as good deeds.

1. Who does not obey the commandments cannot be saved. "The dead shall be judged in accordance with their works"<sup>3067</sup>. **Christ** said: "not all who call me Lord, Lord, will enter into the

<sup>3062</sup> Matthew 25:13; 24:42s; Mark, 13:35ss; Luke, 12:35-40.

<sup>3063</sup> CANIDO POZO, S. I.: *Teología de más allá Apéndice*, 3.8 Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3064</sup> Hebrews, 9:27

<sup>3065</sup> New Catechism of the Catholic Church n° 1013.

<sup>3066</sup> CANIDO POZO, S. I.: *Teología de más allá 3ª, VII*, 5.Ed. BAC. Madrid . 1980

<sup>3067</sup> Apocalypses, 20:13

kingdom of heaven; but the one who does the will of my heavenly father"<sup>3068</sup>. And, "If you want to enter eternal life, keep the commandments"<sup>3069</sup>. "If you love, you will keep my commandments"<sup>3070</sup>.

**Paul** speaks of those who "*Profess knowing God, but deny him with their deeds*"<sup>3071</sup> **Paul** insists that the believer will be judged for his deeds<sup>3072</sup>. "*Faith without deeds is dead*"<sup>3073</sup>. Through deeds one sees faith. "*a person is acknowledged by works, not by faith alone*"<sup>3074</sup>.

2. But to save oneself you also need faith. Faith is the root of all justification<sup>3075</sup>. To be saved, one needs the state of grace, and without faith the state of grace is not possible: "without faith it is not possible to please God"<sup>3076</sup>. Therefore without faith one cannot be saved.<sup>3077</sup>

We have the obligation to believe all of the truths that the church orders to obey<sup>3078</sup>. **Jesus Christ** told the apostles, when sending them to preach to the whole world: "Go therefore and make disciples from all nations, teach them to fulfill all that I have commanded you."<sup>3079</sup> "He who believes will be saved, and he who does not believe will be condemned"<sup>3080</sup>.

**A.M.D.G.**

---

<sup>3068</sup> Matthew, 7:21

<sup>3069</sup> Matthew, 19:17

<sup>3070</sup> John, 14:15

<sup>3071</sup> Titus, 1:16

<sup>3072</sup> Corinthians, 5:10

<sup>3073</sup> James, 2:26

<sup>3074</sup> James, 2:24

<sup>3075</sup> James, 2:24

<sup>3076</sup> Hebrews, 11:6

<sup>3077</sup> ANTONIO ROYO MARIN, O.P.: *La fe de la Iglesia, 1ª V*, 36. Ed. BAC. Madrid

<sup>3078</sup> CÁNDIDO POZO, S. I.: *La fe. VI*. EDAPOR. Madrid. 1986

<sup>3079</sup> Matthew, 28:19s

<sup>3080</sup> Mark, 16:16

## PARA LA CONTRA PORTADA

George Loring hails from Boston, MA, and is currently residing in Spain.

His studies in Engineering have motivated him to involve himself in the relationship existing between the Shroud of Turin and Faith.

A charismatic international speaker, well known in New York, Miami, Sacramento, San Diego, etc. etc., has, over the past 8 years, delivered conferences at the Los Angeles Convention Center.

He also has been a speaker at the Eternal Word Television Network (EWTN) where he taped 40 presentations, each one running one half hour.

As a scientist, he has devoted over 40 years to the study of the Shroud of Turin.

---