

Natural Family Planning to Prevent Conception Is Contraception



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church,
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics,
The Protection of Saint Joseph, Patriarch of the Holy Family,
The Intercession of Saint Michael the Archangel,
and the cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

“God created man to his own image: to the image of God he created him: male and female he created them. And God blessed them, saying:
Increase and multiply, and fill the earth.”
(Genesis 1:27-28)

“I am supposing, then, although you are not lying [with your wife] for the sake of procreating offspring you are not for the sake of lust obstructing their procreation by an evil desire or an evil deed.”
(St. Augustine, *Marriage and Concupiscence*, 419-420)

Original version: 1/2002; Current version: 8/2016

Mary's Little Remnant
302 East Joffre St.
TorC, NM 87901-2878
Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us
(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	7
PROCREATION IS THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF SEXUAL INTERCOURSE	7
<i>Natural law and ordinary magisterium</i>	<i>7</i>
Bible	8
Church Father St. Hippolytus.....	8
Church Father St. Epiphanius of Salamis	9
Church Father St. Augustine.....	9
Church Father St. Caesarius of Arles	10
<i>Anti-Church Fathers, scholastics, and other non-Catholic sources</i>	<i>11</i>
Anti-Church Father Lactantius.....	11
Anti-Church Father John Chrysostom.....	11
Anti-Church Father Jerome	11
Invalid and heretical 1917 Code of Canon Law	11
<i>Nominal solemn magisterium (apostate Antipope Pius XI's Casti Connubii).....</i>	<i>12</i>
NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING TO PREVENT CONCEPTION IS CONTRACEPTION	13
<i>The sin of contraception is committed in the heart before the act.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Natural Family Planning to prevent conception is a deliberate plan and act</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>The fact that conception could still occur does not excuse from guilt</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Virtuous vs non-virtuous continence.....</i>	<i>16</i>
Some sinful and non-sinful reasons for not wanting to have children	16
<i>The Natural Family Planning heresy is a tradition of men that replaced the law of God</i>	<i>17</i>
APOSTATE ANTIPOPE PIUS XI CORRECTLY CONDEMNS ALL EXCUSES	18
APOSTATE ANTIPOPE PIUS XII TEACHES THE NFP HERESY	19
APOSTATE FR. BRIAN HARRISON'S NFP HERESY.....	22
Introduction	22
<i>Fallible and invalid teachings and decrees.....</i>	<i>22</i>
Apostate theologians allow husbands to sodomize their wives.....	22
Baltimore Catechism and Catholic Encyclopedia silent regarding sodomy	24
<i>His evidence is fallible and invalid.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Invalid and heretical decrees from apostate Roman Congregations</i>	<i>24</i>
1853 - Invalid and heretical response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary	24
1880 - Invalid and heretical response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary	25
1932 - Invalid and heretical response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary	27
The illusion of papal approval	27
Papal approval of all Roman Congregations' decrees is illogical	28
Presumed papal approval of Roman Congregations' decrees is illegal	29
Fr. Harrison sets up gnats against Mount Sion	29
<i>He uses modern science to defend his NFP heresy.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>He misinterprets Pius XI's Casti Connubii and denies sins of intent</i>	<i>30</i>
1. NFP robs conceptions from the fertile period	31
2. Contraceptive intent exists even when conception is not possible.....	31
<i>His heretical interpretation of periodic continence.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>He justifies intrinsically evil desires and acts</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>He knows the truth but does not believe it</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>He is a blind leader leading the blind into the pit of eternal hell</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Some of his other heresies and idolatries</i>	<i>35</i>

Summary

The primary purpose of sexual intercourse is procreation. Hence the belief that procreation is not the primary purpose of intercourse is heresy. And the desire that conception not occur during sexual intercourse is the mortal sin of contraception. The mortal sin of contraception is first committed in the heart before the act. The instant a spouse desires to have sexual intercourse while also desiring that conception not occur, he or she has committed the mortal sin of contraception in his or her heart even before any plan or act of preventing conception. Therefore, even when spouses have sexual intercourse when conception is not possible (such as in a barren or pregnant womb), they must still desire that conception would occur if it were possible and thus do nothing to prevent it. If spouses do not want to have children, then they must abstain from sexual intercourse until they do desire to have children.

The contraceptive method in which spouses have sexual intercourse only during the wife's infertile period and thus not during her fertile period in order to prevent conception is called Natural Family Planning (NFP) to prevent conception. This method can also be used for a good purpose; that is, to promote conception by charting the wife's fertile period and having sexual intercourse during that time. Hereafter in this book (unless otherwise noted) when I use the term NFP, I am referring to the NFP that is used to prevent conception.

From the information I have, no pope has solemnly condemned the contraception heresy. Hence this heresy has not been condemned by the solemn magisterium. However, this heresy is condemned by the natural law and the ordinary magisterium. And it would have been condemned by the solemn magisterium if Pius XI had been a true pope instead of an apostate antipope. He would have solemnly condemned the contraception heresy in 1930 in his encyclical *Casti Connubii* (On Christian Marriage). In that encyclical, he teaches that the contraception heresy is condemned by the natural law and by the ordinary magisterium.

Procreation Is the Primary Purpose of Sexual Intercourse

Natural law and ordinary magisterium

It is a natural law dogma and an ordinary magisterium dogma that procreation is the primary purpose for sexual intercourse between spouses. Hence the natural law and the ordinary magisterium condemn as intrinsically evil any desire, plan, or act to prevent conception during sexual intercourse. And the natural law and the ordinary magisterium and the solemn magisterium condemn abortion, which is a last resort to failed contraceptive methods and includes the mortal sin of murder if the soul is in the infant's body when aborted.¹ Abortion, like contraception, is motivated by the desire to prevent procreation as the result of sexual intercourse.

¹ See RJMI article "When Is the Soul Created within the Body?": Consequences of each opinion regarding abortion.

Bible

“And God created man to his own image: to the image of God he created him: male and female he created them. And God blessed them, saying: Increase and multiply, and fill the earth...” (Gen. 1:27-28)

Not only God’s chosen people but most pagans very highly valued children. Spouses who had children were considered blessed and those who had many children greatly blessed. Hence the fertile womb was considered blessed and the barren womb considered cursed:

“Blessed shalt thou be among all people. No one shall be barren among you of either sex, neither of men nor cattle.” (Deut. 7:14)

“And you shall serve the Lord your God, that I may bless your bread and your waters, and may take away sickness from the midst of thee. There shall not be one fruitless nor barren in thy land: I will fill the number of thy days.” (Ex. 23:25-26)

“To Aser also he said: Let Aser be blessed with children, let him be acceptable to his brethren, and let him dip his foot in oil.” (Deut. 33:24)

And spouses who had no children were considered cursed and shamed:

“These two things shall come upon thee suddenly in one day, barrenness and widowhood. All things are come upon thee, because of the multitude of thy sorceries, and for the great hardness of thy enchanters.” (Isa. 47:9)

Not all wives with barren wombs were cursed but were made barren to test their faith. However, all wives with barren wombs were shamed and prayed to God to open their wombs so that they could have children. And many times God answered their prayers and opened their wombs and gave them children, and very holy children, such as Sarah (mother of Isaac), Rebecca (mother of Jacob), Anna (mother of the holy prophet Samuel), the mother of the holy judge Samson, St. Anne (mother of the Blessed Virgin Mary), and St. Elizabeth (mother of St. John the Baptist):

“[Praise the Lord]...who maketh a barren woman to dwell in a house, the joyful mother of children.” (Ps. 112:9)

Fertile wombs and having many children were looked upon as a blessing while infertile wombs and having no children were looked upon as a curse or at least a shame, which is one proof of the dogma that procreation (the begetting of children) is the primary purpose of sexual intercourse. The contraceptive sinful mentality is the opposite in which fertile wombs are shunned and looked upon as a curse while infertile wombs are sought after and looked upon as a blessing.

Church Father St. Hippolytus

Church Father St. Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies*, 225: “[Christian women with male concubines], on account of their prominent ancestry and great property, the so-called faithful want no children from slaves or lowborn commoners, [so] they use drugs of sterility or bind themselves tightly in order to expel a fetus which has already been engendered.” (9:12)

Church Father St. Epiphanius of Salamis

St. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, 375: “They [certain Egyptian heretics] exercise genital acts, yet prevent the conceiving of children. Not in order to produce offspring, but to satisfy lust, are they eager for corruption.” (26:5:2)

Church Father St. Augustine

St. Augustine, *On the Morals of the Manicheans*, 388: “65. Lastly, there is the symbol of the breast, in which your very questionable chastity consists. For though you do not forbid sexual intercourse, you, as the apostle long ago said, forbid marriage in the proper sense, although this is the only good excuse for such intercourse. No doubt you will exclaim against this, and will make it a reproach against us that you highly esteem and approve perfect chastity, but do not forbid marriage, because your followers—that is, those in the second grade among you—are allowed to have wives. After you have said this with great noise and heat, I will quietly ask, Is it not you who hold that begetting children, by which souls are confined in flesh, is a greater sin than cohabitation? Is it not you who used to counsel us to observe as much as possible the time when a woman, after her purification, is most likely to conceive, and to abstain from cohabitation at that time lest the soul should be entangled in flesh? This proves that you approve of having a wife, not for the procreation of children but for the gratification of passion. In marriage, as the marriage law declares, the man and woman come together for the procreation of children. Therefore, whoever makes the procreation of children a greater sin than copulation forbids marriage and makes the woman not a wife but a mistress, who for some gifts presented to her is joined to the man to gratify his passion. Where there is a wife there must be marriage. But there is no marriage where motherhood is not in view; therefore neither is there a wife. In this way you forbid marriage. Nor can you defend yourselves successfully from this charge long ago brought against you prophetically by the Holy Spirit.” (c. 18)

St. Augustine, *Against Faustus*, 400: “You [Manicheans] make your auditors adulterers of their wives when they take care lest the women with whom they copulate conceive. They take wives according to the laws of matrimony by tablets announcing that the marriage is contracted to procreate children; and then, fearing because of your law [against childbearing]...they copulate in a shameful union only to satisfy lust for their wives. They are unwilling to have children, on whose account alone marriages are made. How is it, then, that you are not those prohibiting marriage, as the apostle predicted of you so long ago [1 Tim. 4:1–4], when you try to take from marriage what marriage is? When this is taken away, husbands are shameful lovers, wives are harlots, bridal chambers are brothels, fathers-in-law are pimps. (15:7)... For thus the eternal law, that is, the will of God creator of all creatures, taking counsel for the conservation of natural order, not to serve lust but to see to the preservation of the race, permits the delight of mortal flesh to be released from the control of reason in copulation only to propagate progeny. (22:30)”

St. Augustine, *Adulterous Marriage*, 420: “There are some lawfully wedded couples who resort to this last; for intercourse, even with one’s lawfully wedded spouse, can take place in an unlawful and shameful manner, whenever the conception of offspring is avoided. Onan, the son of Juda, did this very thing, and the Lord slew him on that account. Therefore, the procreation of children is itself the primary, natural, legitimate purpose of marriage. Whence it follows that those who marry because of their inability to remain continent ought not to so temper their vice that they preclude the good of marriage, which is the procreation of children. The

Apostle was certainly speaking of the incontinent where he said: 'I desire, therefore, that younger widows marry, bear children, rule their households, and give the adversary no occasion for abusing us. For already some have turned aside after Satan. So when he said: 'I desire that the younger widows marry,' he surely gave the advice to bolster their collapsing self-control. Then, lest thought be given only to this weakness of carnal desire, which would only be strengthened by the marital act, while the good of marriage would be either despised or overlooked, he immediately added: 'to bear children, rule their households.' In fact, those who choose to remain continent certainly choose something better than the good of marriage, which is the procreation of children. Whence, if the choice is continence, so that something better than the good of marriage is embraced, how much more closely is it to be guarded so that adultery may be avoided! For, when the Apostle said: 'But if they do not have self-control, let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn,' he did not say that it is better to commit adultery than to burn." (b. 2, c. 12)

St. Augustine, *Marriage and Concupiscence*, 419-420: "It is, however, one thing for married persons to have intercourse only for the wish to beget children,...it is another thing for them to desire carnal pleasure in cohabitation, but with the spouse only... For although propagation of offspring is not the motive of the intercourse, there is still no attempt to prevent such propagation, either by wrong desire or evil appliance. They who resort to these, although called by the name of spouses, are really not such; they retain no vestige of true matrimony, but pretend the honourable designation as a cloak for criminal conduct.

"Having also proceeded so far, they are betrayed into exposing their children, which are born against their will. They hate to nourish and retain those whom they were afraid they would beget. This infliction of cruelty on their offspring, so reluctantly begotten, unmasks the sin which they had practised in darkness and drags it clearly into the light of day. The open cruelty reproves the concealed sin. Sometimes, indeed, this lustful cruelty, or, if you please, cruel lust, resorts to such extravagant methods as to use poisonous drugs to secure barrenness; or else, if unsuccessful in this, to destroy the conceived seed by some means previous to birth, preferring that its offspring should rather perish than receive vitality; or if it was advancing to life within the womb, should be slain before it was born. Well, if both parties alike are so flagitious, they are not husband and wife; and if such were their character from the beginning, they have not come together by wedlock but by debauchery. But if the two are not alike in such sin, I boldly declare either that the woman is, so to say, the husband's harlot; or the man the wife's adulterer."²

Church Father St. Caesarius of Arles

St. Caesarius of Arles, *Sermon 1*, 522: "12. ...Who is he who cannot warn that no woman may take a potion so that she is unable to conceive or condemns in herself the nature which God willed to be fecund? As often as she could have conceived or given birth, of that many homicides she will be held guilty, and, unless she undergoes suitable penance, she will be damned by eternal death in hell. If a woman does not wish to have children, let her enter into a religious agreement with her husband; for chastity is the sole sterility of a Christian woman."

² PL 44, col. 423-424. B. 1, c. 15, s. 17.

Anti-Church Fathers, scholastics, and other non-Catholic sources

Even the unanimous consensus of the Anti-Church Fathers and scholastics condemns contraception (which includes the NFP heresy), even though they were apostates and thus their teachings are invalid:

Anti-Church Father Lactantius

Apostate Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, 307: “[Some] complain of the scantiness of their means, and allege that they have not enough for bringing up more children, as though, in truth, their means were in [their] power...or God did not daily make the rich poor and the poor rich. Wherefore, if any one on any account of poverty shall be unable to bring up children, it is better to abstain from relations with his wife.” (6:20)

Anti-Church Father John Chrysostom

Heretic John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Romans*, 391: “Why do you sow where the field is eager to destroy the fruit, where there are medicines of sterility [oral contraceptives], where there is murder before birth? You do not even let a harlot remain only a harlot, but you make her a murderess as well. ...Indeed, it is something worse than murder, and I do not know what to call it; for she does not kill what is formed but prevents its formation. What then? Do you condemn the gift of God and fight with his [natural] laws? ...Yet such turpitude...the matter still seems indifferent to many men—even to many men having wives. In this indifference of the married men there is greater evil filth; for then poisons are prepared, not against the womb of a prostitute, but against your injured wife. Against her are these innumerable tricks.” (Homily 24)

Heretic John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Matthew*, 391: “[I]n truth, all men know that they who are under the power of this disease [the sin of covetousness] are wearied even of their father’s old age [wishing him to die so they can inherit]; and that which is sweet, and universally desirable, the having of children, they esteem grievous and unwelcome. Many at least with this view have even paid money to be childless, and have mutilated nature, not only killing the newborn, but even acting to prevent their beginning to live.” (Homily 28:5)

Anti-Church Father Jerome

Apostate Jerome, *Letter 22*, 396: “13. ... You may see a number of women who are widows before they are wives. Others, indeed, will drink sterility [oral contraceptives] and murder a man not yet born, [and some commit abortion].”

Invalid and heretical 1917 Code of Canon Law

Even though the 1917 Code of Canon Law is invalid because it was promulgated and promoted by apostate antipopes, it does teach the truth regarding this dogma:

Invalid and heretical *1917 Code of Canon Law*: “Canon 1013. The primary purpose of marriage is the procreation and education of children. The secondary purpose is to furnish mutual aid and a remedy for concupiscence.”

A Practical Commentary on Canon Law, by apostate Revs. Woywod and Smith, 1957: “[Commentary on Canon 1013] There can be no controversy over the primary object of marriage. The perpetuation of the human race is willed by the Creator, who from the creation of mankind appointed the means for this purpose... The [RJMI: apostate] Holy Office condemned the opinion defended by some recent authors who deny that the procreation of children is the primary end of matrimony, and regard its secondary ends not subordinate to its primary end but independent of it (April 1, 1944; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXXVI, 103).”³

Any deliberate plan by man to frustrate the marital act by attempting to make conception impossible is a mortal sin against this primary purpose of marriage:

Invalid and heretical *1917 Code of Canon Law*: “Canon 1081. ... The matrimonial consent is an act of will by which each party gives and accepts the perpetual and exclusive right to the body for the performance of actions that of their nature pertain to the procreation of children.”

A Practical Commentary on Canon Law, by apostate Revs. Woywod and Smith, 1957: “[Commentary on Canon 1081] The Canon, in specifying the purpose for which the right to the body exchanged, also indicates what is lawful and what is unlawful in this matter for married persons. Whatever contributes to the procreation of children is licit, while whatever use of each other’s body impedes procreations is illicit.” (v. 1, p. 741)

Any plan by spouses to prevent conception when they engage in the marital act is illicit since it impedes procreation, it does not contribute to the procreation of children but works against it.

Nominal solemn magisterium (apostate Antipope Pius XI’s *Casti Connubii*)

If Pius XI had not been an apostate antipope, his following quote would have been infallible in which he defines that procreation is the primary purpose of marriage (sexual intercourse between spouses) and he condemns contraception:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “To take away from man the natural and primeval right of marriage, to circumscribe in any way the principal ends of marriage laid down in the beginning by God Himself in the words ‘Increase and multiply,’ is beyond the power of any human law. ... This is also expressed succinctly in the Code of Canon Law ‘The primary end of marriage is the procreation and the education of children’ ... Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose, sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious. Small wonder, therefore, if Holy Writ bears witness that the Divine Majesty regards with greatest detestation this horrible crime, and at times has punished it with death. As St. Augustine notes, ‘Intercourse even with one’s legitimate wife is unlawful and wicked where the conception of the offspring is prevented. Onan, the son of Judah, did this and the Lord killed him for it.’ Since, therefore, openly departing from the uninterrupted Christian tradition, some recently have adjudged it possible solemnly to declare another doctrine regarding this question, the Catholic Church, to whom God has entrusted the defense of the integrity and the purity of morals, standing erect in the midst of the moral ruin which surrounds her, in order that she may preserve the

³ *A Practical Commentary on Canon Law*, by the apostate Rev. Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M., LL.B.; revised by the apostate Rev. Callistus Smith, O.F.M., J.C.L. Imprimatur: + Francis Cardinal Spellman, D.D., Archbishop of New York, Nov. 14, 1957. Vol. 1, pp. 634-44.

chastity of the nuptial union from being defiled by this foul stain, raises her voice in token of her divine ambassadorship and **through Our mouth proclaims** anew: any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and **those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of a grave sin.**”

If Pius XI had been a true pope and not an antipope, then the bold, underlined words would have fulfilled the conditions of an infallible teaching regarding a doctrine of morals: 1) it applies to the Universal Church, “the Catholic Church”; 2) he is defining, proclaiming, a truth, “Our mouth proclaims”; 3) the topic deals with morals, “the Catholic Church, to whom God has entrusted the defense of the integrity and the purity of morals”; and lastly, 4) he binds Catholics to this teaching under pain of grave sin, “those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of a grave sin.”

Natural Family Planning To Prevent Conception Is Contraception

The sin of contraception is committed in the heart before the act

Spouses who use Natural Planning Family in an attempt to prevent conception during sexual intercourse are guilty of the mortal sin of contraception the instant they desire (intend) that procreation not occur during sexual intercourse and thus even before any plan or act to carry out their sinful intent. It is a dogma that all sin begins in the heart, in the intent:

“But the things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart, and those things defile a man. For from the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies.” (Mt. 15:18-19)

“Evil thoughts are an abomination to the Lord.” (Prv. 15:26)

Hence sin is first committed in the heart, and only then is the sinful act committed:

St. Augustine, *A Treatise against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, 420: “They are sins which are unlawfully done, spoken, thought, according to the lust of the flesh... They are committed, whether by acting or by speaking or, this is the easiest and the quickest, by thinking.” (b. 1, c. 27)

St. Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Rule*, 590: “Often, when means are abundant, and many things can be done for subordinates to admire, the mind exalts itself in thought, and fully provokes to itself the anger of the judge, though not breaking out in overt acts of iniquity. For he who judges is within; that which is judged is within. When, then, in heart we transgress, what we are doing within ourselves is hidden from men, but yet in the eyes of the judge we sin.” (c. 4)

In the Confiteor, Catholics say,

“I have sinned in thought, word, and deed.”

Jesus says,

“I say to you, that whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart.” (Mt. 5:28)

Likewise Jesus would say,

“I say to you, that whosoever desires that conception should not occur during sexual intercourse has already committed the mortal sin of contraception in his heart and thus even before sexual intercourse.”

And all the apostles and other Church Fathers teach that the sin of contraception is committed in the heart (in the intent), as well as in deed. St. Augustine sums it up well:

St. Augustine, *Marriage and Concupiscence*, 419-420: “I am supposing, then, although you are not lying [with your wife] for the sake of procreating offspring, you are not for the sake of lust obstructing their procreation by an evil desire or an evil deed...”⁴

The desire, the intent, that conception not occur during conjugal relations is when the mortal sin of contraception is first committed and thus even before spouses have sexual intercourse and even before any plan or act (or deed) to carry out their sinful desire, because “evil thoughts are an abomination to the Lord.” (Prv. 15:26) The intention, the desire, of the spouses that conception not occur during conjugal relations is the crux of the matter, the root of the mortal sin of contraception. Hence it does not matter what plan, method, or act the spouses choose for preventing conception during sexual intercourse, or even if they have no plan at all, since they are guilty of the mortal sin of contraception the instant they desire that conception not occur during sexual intercourse. In *Casti Connubii* apostate Antipope Pius XI teaches that all sexual intercourse between spouses must be “subordinated to the primary end [procreation].” Hence even when spouses have sexual intercourse when conception is not possible, they must still desire that conception would occur if it were possible. Whereas, the contraceptive intent desires to eliminate the primary end of sexual intercourse, which is procreation.

If a spouse answers “no” to the following questions, then he or she is guilty of the mortal sin of contraception: “Do you want conception to occur when you have sexual intercourse with your spouse?” And if conception is not possible because of an infertile or pregnant womb, “Would you want conception to occur if it were possible?”

Natural Family Planning to prevent conception is a deliberate plan and act

A sinful act is preceded by a sinful plan which is preceded by a sinful intent. All contraceptive methods are planned before the act of sexual intercourse. Spouses who use condoms or IUD’s during sexual intercourse plan ahead of time to use these devices. Spouses who have sexual intercourse only during the wife’s infertile period to prevent conception plan ahead of time either by charting the wife’s infertile periods (NFP) or by using birth control pills to suppress the wife’s fertile period and thus make her infertile.

When a sinful act is committed, sin is first committed in the heart, then by a sinful plan, and then by the sinful act. Every contraception method used by spouses is a deliberate plan and act to prevent conception and thus is mortally sinful:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “Any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of a grave sin.”

⁴ PL 44, col. 423-424. B. 1, c. 15, s. 17.

The act Pius XI is talking about is sexual intercourse. The natural power to generate life is frustrated either before sexual intercourse by planning to have sexual intercourse only during infertile periods (such as by birth control pills or NFP), or during the act of sexual intercourse (such as by using IUD's, condoms, or withdrawal), or after the act of sexual intercourse (such as by foams that kill the male seed). In every case the intention is exactly the same, to have sexual intercourse while attempting to prevent conception.

Just because Pius XI only mentions that the contraceptive act is mortally sinful, he does not mean to deny the dogma that the contraceptive *intent* (thought) is also mortally sinful. For example, a Church decree that says "Anyone who commits adultery is guilty of mortal sin" does not mean to exclude the mortal sin of adultery that is committed in the heart (the intent) before the act. Most decrees deal with manifest evidence that reveals what is in the hearts of men because it is from this evidence that sinners can be convicted with certainty. A man can desire to commit adultery with a married woman whom he knows he will never meet and thus not have any actual plan to commit the act of adultery with her, but he is nevertheless guilty of the mortal sin of adultery in his heart. Likewise, spouses who desire that conception not occur when they have sexual intercourse, although not doing anything to prevent it, are nevertheless guilty of the mortal sin of contraception in their hearts because of their evil desire, evil hope, evil wish.

The fact that conception could still occur does not excuse from guilt

Beware of the sinful excuse of the NFP heretics who say that NFP is not sinful and thus is good because even though the spouses did their best to prevent conception by having sexual intercourse only during the wife's infertile period, conception could still occur because they do not use any physical methods (such as condoms or withdrawal) during sexual intercourse. Hence they say that the act is still open to conception.

Firstly, if it were true that the spouses are open to conception, then why all the planning to prevent conception by only having relations during the infertile period?

Secondly, the sin resides in the *intention* of the spouses, not the fact that God may still grant conception in spite of their plan against it. It does not matter whether the act is open to conception or not. What matters is that the spouses, even if just by an evil desire, do not want conception to occur, which is the first mortal sin of contraception they commit in their hearts. They also sin by planning to prevent conception, and they sin again by acting upon that plan no matter if conception occurs or not.

The same thing can be said about an attempted murder. There is always a chance that the murderer will fail in murdering his victim for one reason or another. According to the NFP heretics, whether he fails in murdering his victim or he succeeds, he would not be guilty of murder because there was always a chance that the murder might not succeed.

Thirdly, just like NFP, spouses who use birth control pills do not use physical obstacles during sexual intercourse and thus it can be said that the act of sexual intercourse is still open to conception in the same way as NFP.

Fourthly, all contraceptive methods are open to conception because none are 100% successful in preventing conception. The success rates of preventing conception by some of the common contraceptive methods are as follows: birth control pills are 91-99% successful, condoms 82-98%, withdrawal 78-96%, diaphragms 88-94%, spermicide 72-

82%, and NFP 76-95%.⁵ Hence, according to these NFP heretics, all contraceptive methods are not sinful and thus are good because all are open to conception.

Virtuous vs non-virtuous continence

If spouses do not want to have children, then they must live chaste until they desire to have children. They must abstain altogether from the marital act during the infertile periods as well as the fertile periods. Apostate Antipope Pius XI refers to this as virtuous continence:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “IV. Vices Opposed to Christian Marriage: And now, Venerable Brethren, We shall explain in detail the evils opposed to each of the benefits of matrimony. First consideration is due the offspring, which many have the audacity to call the disagreeable burden of matrimony and which they say is to be carefully avoided by married people not through virtuous continence (which Christian law permits in matrimony when both parties consent) but by frustrating the marriage act.”

The sin of contraception is committed by spouses when two conditions are met: They desire to have sexual intercourse, while also desiring that conception not occur. Therefore, if spouses do not want to have children, they must abstain from sexual intercourse until they desire to have children:

St. Caesarius of Arles, *Sermon 1*, 522: “12. ... Who is he who cannot warn that no woman may take a potion so that she is unable to conceive or condemns in herself the nature which God willed to be fecund? As often as she could have conceived or given birth, of that many homicides she will be held guilty; and unless she undergoes suitable penance, she will be damned by eternal death in hell. If a woman does not wish to have children, let her enter into a religious agreement with her husband; for chastity is the sole sterility of a Christian woman.”

So-called chastity during the wife’s fertile period but not during her infertile period is not chastity but sinful lust. It is practiced in order to have sexual intercourse while attempting to prevent conception and thus is not virtuous continence but non-virtuous continence. True chastity for spouses who do not want to have children means to be chaste until they want to have children and thus during the infertile as well as the fertile periods of the wife.

Some sinful and non-sinful reasons for not wanting to have children

There are sinful and non-sinful reasons for spouses to not want to have children.

Some of the non-sinful reasons for spouses to not want children are as follows:

1. Because pregnancy would endanger the life of the wife.
2. Because they do not have the means to take care of a certain amount of children.
3. Because they want to space out the births of their children.

⁵ “Your Birth Control Choices,” by Reproductive Health Access Project, June 2016, website: www.reproductiveaccess.org.

Some sinful reasons for spouses to not want children are as follows:

1. Because they hate or despise children.
2. Because they are lazy and thus do not want to care for children.
3. Because they are selfish and thus do not want to spend time with children.
4. Because they are greedy and thus do not want to spend money on children.

The Natural Family Planning heresy is a tradition of men that replaced the law of God

Jesus condemned the evil Pharisees for making laws to break God's laws while not seeming to break them:

“And the Pharisees and scribes asked him: Why do not thy disciples walk according to the tradition of the ancients, but they eat bread with common hands? But he answering, said to them: Well did Isaias prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written: This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. And in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and precepts of men. For leaving the commandment of God, you hold the tradition of men, the washing of pots and of cups: and many other things you do like to these. And he said to them: Well do you make void the commandment of God, that you may keep your own tradition. For Moses said: Honour thy father and thy mother; and he that shall curse father or mother, dying let him die. But you say: If a man shall say to his father or mother, Corban (which is a gift), whatsoever is from me, shall profit thee. And further you suffer him not to do any thing for his father or mother, making void the word of God by your own tradition, which you have given forth. And many other such like things you do.” (Mk. 7:5-13)

Catholic Commentary on Mk. 7:5-13: “**Tradition of men:** The doctrines and commandments here reprehended are such as are either contrary to the law of God (as that of neglecting parents, under pretence of giving to God), or at least are frivolous, unprofitable, and no ways conducing to true piety, as that of often washing hands, &c. without regard to the purity of the heart.”

Catholic Commentary on Mk. 7:10-11: “**Corban (which is a gift):** This tradition of the Pharisees was calculated to enrich themselves by exempting children from giving any further assistance to their parents if they once offered to the temple and the priests that which should have been the support of their parents. But this was a violation of the law of God and of nature, which our Savior here condemns.”

Just as the evil Pharisees made laws to break God's laws while not seeming to break them, so also the NFP heretics make a law to break God's law against contraception while not seeming to break it. They eliminate the commandment of God that forbids contraception by making it seem that Natural Family Planning to prevent conception during sexual intercourse is not contraception because physical devices or techniques are not used during sexual intercourse. They deny the very heart of God's commandment by violating it in a most deceptive manner. The heart and letter of that law condemns the contraceptive intent (the desire of the spouses that conception not occur when they have sexual intercourse) even before any plan or act and even if there is no plan or act for preventing conception.

The ancestors of the Pharisees that Jesus condemned, the apostate Jews and their false religion of apostate Judaism as practiced by the Talmudic Jews, carried on these traditions of men to ridiculous and absurd proportions. One such teaching is that it is only murder if one directly kills another, such as by stabbing, shooting, or choking, etc. They teach that it is not murder if one locks a man in a room with no food or water and does not give him any. In this case, they teach, the man dies from thirst and starvation and not by the hands of any man; thus no murder was committed. This is a perfect parallel to the NFP heresy. This tradition of men teaches that it is only contraception when spouses use physical devices or methods during sexual intercourse to prevent conception and thus any other attempt to prevent conception is not contraception, such as birth control pills or NFP.

Apostate Antipope Pius XI Correctly Condemns All Excuses

The Catholic Church's dogmas (Her infallible teachings on faith and morals) can never change or be modified, abolished, or dispensed of. Hence these laws must always be obeyed and therefore there are no excuses when a Catholic violates them.

It is a natural law dogma and an ordinary magisterium dogma that contraceptive intents, plans, and other acts are intrinsically evil. Therefore, there are no excuses for spouses who violate this dogmatic law by a contraceptive intent, plan, or other act. Apostate Antipope Pius XI mentions and condemns some of the common excuses put forward by those who commit the mortal sin of contraception:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: "And now, Venerable Brethren, We shall explain in detail the evils opposed to each of the benefits of matrimony. First consideration is due the offspring, which many have the audacity to call the disagreeable burden of matrimony and which they say is to be carefully avoided by married people...by frustrating the marriage act. Some justify this criminal abuse on the ground that they are weary of children and wish to gratify their desires without their consequent burden. Others say that they cannot on the one hand remain continent nor on the other can they have children because of the difficulties, whether on the part of the mother [medical excuse] or on the part of family circumstances [poverty excuse]. But **no reason, however grave, may be put forward by which anything intrinsically against nature may become conformable to nature and morally good**. Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose, sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious."

One of the grave reasons brought forward by NFP defenders to justify its use is extreme poverty. But Pius XI specifically condemns this reason, as well as all reasons:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: "We are deeply touched by the sufferings of those parents who, in extreme want, experience great difficulty in rearing their children. However, they should take care lest the calamitous state of their external affairs should be the occasion for a much more calamitous error. No difficulty can arise that justifies putting aside the law of God which prohibits all acts intrinsically evil. There is no possible circumstance in which husband and wife cannot, strengthened by the grace of God, fulfill faithfully their duties and preserve in wedlock their chastity unspotted. This truth of Christian faith is expressed by the teaching of the [RJMI: invalid] Council of Trent: 'Let no one be so rash as to assert that which the Fathers of the Council have placed under anathema, namely, that

there are precepts of God impossible for the just to observe. God does not ask the impossible, but by His commands instructs you to do what you are able, to pray for what you are not able, that He may help you.”

Pius XI teaches that if spouses do not have the sufficient means to care for more children, or the wife’s life would be in danger by pregnancy, then they must be chaste until they desire again to have children:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “IV. Vices Opposed to Christian Marriage: And now, Venerable Brethren, We shall explain in detail the evils opposed to each of the benefits of matrimony. First consideration is due the offspring, which many have the audacity to call the disagreeable burden of matrimony and which they say is to be carefully avoided by married people not through virtuous continence (which Christian law permits in matrimony when both parties consent) but by frustrating the marriage act.”

(See in this book [Virtuous vs non-virtuous continence](#), p. 16.) All those who use Natural Family Planning to prevent conception commit the mortal sin of contraception. There is a natural law upon all men’s hearts, and the practice of NFP violates that law. Upholding this natural law and ordinary magisterium dogma, apostate Antipope Pius XI teaches that there are no exceptions and no excuses. No excuses, even if your priest or bishop said it can be used:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “We admonish, therefore, priests who hear confessions and others who have the care of souls, in virtue of Our Supreme authority and in Our solicitude for the salvation of souls, not to allow the faithful entrusted to them to err regarding this most grave law of God; much more, that they keep themselves immune from such false opinions, in no way conniving in them. If any confessor or pastor of souls, which may God forbid, lead the faithful entrusted to him into these errors, or should at least confirm them by approval or by guilty silence, let him be mindful of the fact that he must render a strict account to God, the Supreme Judge, for the betrayal of his sacred trust, and let him take to himself the words of Christ: ‘They are blind and leaders of the blind: and if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit.’”

Therefore, no kind of ignorance excuses from the guilt of mortal sin for those who believe in or practice contraception—both the blind confessor and the blind confessee fall into the pit.

Apostate Antipope Pius XII Teaches the NFP Heresy

One of apostate Antipope Pius XII’s many heresies was the NFP heresy. He was the first so-called pope who taught the heresy that Natural Family Planning can be used by spouses for certain reasons. He contradicted his predecessor apostate Antipope Pius XI’s correct teaching that all forms of contraception are intrinsically evil and thus no reason, no excuse, can be used to practice them.

On 10/29/1951, Pius XII taught that for certain grave reasons spouses could practice the NFP method of contraception:

Apostate Antipope Pius XII, “Address to the Italian Catholic Union of Midwives,” 10/29/1951: “36. It is possible to be exempt, for a lengthy period, and even for the entire duration of the marriage, if there are grave reasons, such as those which not infrequently occur in the so-called ‘indications’ of a medical, eugenic, economic, or

social nature. For this it follows that observing the non-fertile periods alone can be lawful from the moral point of view. Under the conditions mentioned it really is so.”

The underlined portion is where he has allowed excuses to be put forward (grave reasons) that would allow for the practice of the contraception method of NFP. These same reasons, along with all reasons, have been condemned by apostate Antipope Pius XI as intrinsically evil and against the natural law. Pius XI condemned every reason (excuse) that Pius XII allows:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI	Apostate Antipope Pius XII
<p>“No reason, however grave, may be put forward by which anything intrinsically against nature may become conformable to nature and morally good.” (<i>Casti Connubii</i>, 1930)</p>	<p>“There are grave reasons that allow for the observing of the non-fertile periods alone and that this can be lawful from the moral point of view.” (<i>Address to the Italian Catholic Union of Midwives</i>, 1951)</p>

Pius XI, then, proceeds to specifically condemn some of the common excuses brought forward by those who practice contraception—selfishness, danger to the wife’s life by pregnancy (the medical condition), and poverty:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “Some justify this criminal abuse on the ground that they are weary of children and wish to gratify their desires without their consequent burden. Others say that they cannot on the one hand remain continent nor on the other can they have children because of the difficulties, whether on the part of the mother or on the part of family circumstances.”

These are the very excuses, the “grave reasons,” that Pius XII now allows modern man to bring forward in order to break God’s moral law. The reason (excuse) of “difficulties...on the part of family circumstances” which was condemned by Pius XI is now allowed by Pius XII, which he refers to as the “economic” and the “social” reasons. And the reason (excuse) of “difficulties...on the part of the mother” which was condemned by Pius XI is now allowed by Pius XII, which he refers to as the “medical” reason.

There was much controversy over Pius XII’s NFP heresy that he taught on 10/29/1951. But instead of abjuring and repudiating it, he re-confirmed it the following month so that there would be no misunderstanding that he was allowing spouses to practice Natural Family Planning:

Apostate Antipope Pius XII, “Address to the National Congress of the Family Front and the Association of Large Families,” 11/26/1951: “Regulation of Offspring: 21. The Church knows how to consider with sympathy and understanding the real difficulties of the married state in our day. Therefore, in Our last allocution on conjugal morality, We affirmed the legitimacy and, at the same time, the limits—in truth very wide—of a regulation of offspring, which, unlike so-called ‘birth control’ is compatible with the law of God. One may even hope (but in this matter the Church naturally leaves the judgment to medical science) that science will succeed in providing this licit method with a sufficiently secure basis, and the most recent information seems to confirm such a hope.”

Pius XII refers back to his last allocution on 10/29/1951 when he taught the heresy of Natural Family Planning. He affirms that this may be practiced and then lies when he says it is not “birth control” and is moral. He also concedes to science what belongs to the

Church. No science can make moral what is immoral. He teaches that the regulation of offspring is accomplished by the new scientific technique called Natural Family Planning, and hopes that this technique can be perfected so as to guarantee 100% efficiency so that it would be absolutely impossible for spouses to conceive a child while engaging in the marital act. Pius XII is also guilty of modernism for teaching that what was condemned as immoral is now moral due to different circumstances for the “married state in our day.”

First, even if the circumstances were different, no excuse can be brought forward to deny a dogma of faith or morals, even at the cost of a Catholic’s life. The passing of time and changing circumstances never allow for the denial of one dogma of faith or morals, and those who teach otherwise are guilty of the heresy of modernism. “Till heaven and earth pass, one jot, or one tittle shall not pass of the law till all be fulfilled.” (Mt. 5:18) “Jesus Christ, yesterday, and today: and the same for ever. Be not led away with various and strange doctrines.” (Heb. 13:8-9)

Apostate Antipope Pius X, *Lamentabili Sane*, 1907: “Condemned propositions: #53. The organic constitution of the Church is not immutable. Like human society, Christian society is subject to a perpetual evolution. #59. Christ did not teach a determined body of doctrine applicable to all times and all men, but rather inaugurated a religious movement adapted or to be adapted to different times and places. #64. Scientific progress demands that the concepts of Christian doctrine concerning God, creation, revelation, the Person of the Incarnate Word, and Redemption be re-adjusted.”

Second, what is different about families in the 20th century than from the past? Have not past centuries had their share of plagues, famines, wars, and other catastrophes? In reality, modern men have fewer burdens than men of the past because of scientific advances in medicine, agriculture, and the ability to make the necessities of life available by faster and more efficient means of transportation and communication. So what is this fabricated family dilemma that Pius XII puts forward as a unique problem of “our day”? The true dilemma is that modern men are greedier, more covetous, more gluttonous, and more selfish than ever before:

“Know also this, that in the last days shall come dangerous times. Men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, haughty, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, wicked, without affection, without peace, slanderers, incontinent, unmerciful, without kindness, traitors, stubborn, puffed up, and lovers of pleasures more than of God: Having an appearance indeed of godliness, but denying the power thereof. Now these avoid.” (2 Tim. 3:1-5)

In order to maintain their sinful materialistic lifestyle, evil men must limit their families because children get in the way of fulfilling their evil lusts and their evil and inordinate passions. Apostate Antipope Pius XII is listening to the sinful groan of evil people who want to be liberated from the sweet yoke of Christ in order that they can sin and sin mightily. And he sympathizes with them in their quest to be liberated from God’s commandments. Not only does he sympathize with them, he aids and abets them by giving them a way to break God’s commandments while quelling their guilty consciences by pretending that the use of Natural Family Planning is not birth control.

Apostate Fr. Brian Harrison's NFP Heresy

Introduction

This chapter is a refutation of apostate Fr. Brian Harrison's heresy that Natural Family Planning is not a sin when used to prevent conception. The apostate Fr. Brian Harrison defends this heresy in his following article:

"Is Natural Family Planning a 'Heresy'?" [Hereafter NFPH] published in *Living Tradition*, January 2003, No. 103; Editor: Msgr. John F. McCarthy, J.C.D., S.T.D.; Associate Editor: Rev. Brian W. Harrison, O.S., M.A., S.T.D.

In this article, he responded to the first publication of my book *Natural Family Planning Is Contraception*. In the second version of my book, I included my refutation of his article, which is also in this version.

The apostate and Thucite Bishop Mark Pivarunus, in a letter dated February 18, 2002, uses the same evidence and arguments that Fr. Harrison does; hence, I will only refer to Fr. Harrison's more complete argument, much of which has already been refuted in the previous chapters of this book:

NFPH: "Perhaps the most outspoken and uncompromising proponent of this pseudo-traditional view is Mr. Richard Ibranyi, a prolific 'sedevacantist' writer whose booklets, bulletins and website articles ceaselessly denounce the 'apostate' Church of Vatican II and the 'anti-Popes' who lead it. Ibranyi has recently published a 32-page booklet whose conclusions are nothing if not forthright and unambiguous. He declares: 'All those who use Natural Family Planning commit mortal sin. There is a natural law upon all men's hearts and the practice of NFP violates the natural law. Pope Pius XI [in the encyclical *Casti Connubii*] teaches there are no exceptions and no excuses. No exceptions, even if your priest or bishop says it can be used.'"

Fallible and invalid teachings and decrees

All the so-called popes since Innocent II in 1130 onward were apostate antipopes, all the cardinals were apostate anti-cardinals, most if not all of the Roman Congregations were apostates, most of the bishops were apostates, and all of the priests from the time of apostate Antipope Pius X in the beginning of the 20th century were apostates. Hence all of their decrees and works are invalid, null and void. And many contain heresies, idolatries, and immoralities. (See RJMI books *The Great Apostasy* and *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church* and RJMI article "No Popes or Cardinals Since 1130.")

Apostate theologians allow husbands to sodomize their wives

For example, the apostate moral theologians and bishops taught that husbands can sodomize their wives as long as they finish the act the normal way so that procreation can occur. The worst mortal sin in regard to forbidden sexual activity between spouses is sodomy (also known as the sin of Sodom), which is one of the four sins that cry out to God for vengeance:

Penny Catechism (A Catechism of Christian Doctrine), 16th century: “**Q. 327.** **Which are the four sins crying to heaven for vengeance?** A. The four sins crying to heaven for vengeance are: 1. Willful murder (Gen. iv); 2. The sin of Sodom (Gen. xviii); 3. Oppression of the poor (*Exod.* ii); 4. Defrauding labourers of their wages (James v).”

Yet in spite of this dogmatic teaching on morals, the apostate, immoral Fr. Heribert Jone, in every edition of his book *Moral Theology* from 1929 onwards, teaches that a husband can sodomize his wife and his wife must allow it and neither commits mortal sin as long as he consummates his act naturally with the intention to procreate. And he heretically teaches that it is only sodomy if the husband spills his seed while sodomizing his wife:

Moral Theology, apostate Fr. Heribert Jone, 1951: “**I. Imperfect Sodomy**, i.e., rectal intercourse, is a grave sin when the seminal fluid is wasted: Excluding the sodomitical intention it is neither sodomy nor a grave sin if intercourse is begun in a rectal manner with the intention of consummating it naturally or if some sodomitical action is posited without danger of pollution...”⁶

Hence the pervert Fr. Jone says that rectal intercourse between a husband and wife is not a grave sin and not even sodomy as long as the husband does not spill his seed when sodomizing his wife. One must ask, then, “What is it?” and “What is the purpose of this filthy, perverted act?” It is sodomy, plain and simple! And the purpose is to mock God and to denigrate and disgrace the wife. Not only is this sodomitical act by the spouses contrary to nature and the natural law and cries out to God for vengeance, but it is also physically destructive to the health of both spouses.

However, Fr. Jone contradicts his above teaching within his same book. In Section 230 he gives the correct definition of sodomy as follows:

Moral Theology, apostate Fr. Heribert Jone: “230. – II. Sodomy. 1. Definition. Sodomy is unnatural carnal copulation either with a person of the same sex (perfect sodomy) or of the opposite sex; the latter of heterosexual sodomy consists in rectal intercourse (imperfect sodomy). Either kind of sodomy will be consummated or non-consummated according as semination takes place or not.”

Therefore whether the seed is spilled during sodomy or not, it is still sodomy but one is called consummated sodomy and the other is non-consummated sodomy. Hence in Section 230 he correctly teaches that a husband who sodomizes his wife but does not consummate the sodomy is still guilty of sodomy, which he correctly classifies as non-consummated sodomy. His teaching in this section contradicts what he teaches in Section 757 when he says that the husband’s non-consummated sodomy is not sodomy at all. The natural law alone tells even a pagan who never heard of the word of God that any form of rectal intercourse for any reason is intrinsically evil, as well as any kind of sexual activity outside what is necessary for procreation.

And many of the apostate theologians, at least since the 18th century, teach that a priest can counsel a penitent to commit the lesser sin of fornication to avoid the greater sin of adultery. These are the same kind of apostate theologians—who become bishops, write theology books, and man the apostate Roman Congregations—that the apostate, immoral Fr. Harrison and others use to defend the NFP heresy.

⁶ Section 757: “3. The Sins of Married People.”

Baltimore Catechism and Catholic Encyclopedia silent regarding sodomy

It is no coincidence that there is no mention of sodomy, let alone that it is one of the four sins that cries out to God for vengeance, in the heretical *Baltimore Catechism* Numbers 1, 2, and 3, and the heretical *Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism* (also known as *Baltimore Catechism Number 4*) that were promulgated in the 1880's by the perverted and apostate United States bishops. And in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* of 1913 there is no mention of sodomy as a grave sin that cries out to God for vengeance. The absence, in these so-called Catholic teaching instruments, of condemning this rampant sin that cries out to God for vengeance is one proof that the United States bishops were either sodomites themselves or condoned sodomy by not condemning or punishing the crime and the criminals. This should come as no surprise to those who honestly study the Great Apostasy which began in the 11th century, when sodomy was rampant among the clergy from that point forward. (See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy: "Sodomy (Homosexuality)."*)

His evidence is fallible and invalid

The apostate, immoral Fr. Harrison's main evidence that he uses to defend the NFP heresy is fallible and invalid. He uses decrees from the apostate Roman Congregations. All of these decrees are invalid, null and void, because they were promulgated by apostates who thus held no offices in the Catholic Church. And many of these decrees are heretical, idolatrous, and immoral. And even if these decrees were valid (which they are not), they would not be infallible because even valid decrees from the Roman Congregations are not infallible:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913, "Infallibility": "Proof of Papal Infallibility - The pope, of course, can convert doctrinal decisions of the Holy Office, which are not in themselves infallible, into ex cathedra papal pronouncements..."

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913, "Acts of the Roman Congregations": "(b) Authority of doctrinal decrees - Doctrinal decrees are not of themselves infallible; the prerogative of infallibility cannot be communicated to the Congregations by the Pope."

Fr. Harrison, I believe, would agree with this. Consequently, he would also have to believe that the decrees he refers to from the nominal Roman Congregations to defend the NFP heresy are likewise fallible, even though he would not admit that they are invalid.

Invalid and heretical decrees from apostate Roman Congregations

1853 - Invalid and heretical response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary

Fr. Harrison used a response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary (a Roman Congregation) in 1853 to defend the NFP heresy. His source is a moral theology book. This response is heretical because it defends the contraception heresy of Natural Family Planning:

NFPH: “Well, did Pius XI in fact teach this doctrine in his 1930 document? To answer that question, we first need to set *Casti Connubii* (CC) in its historical context, since that encyclical was by no means the first statement coming out of the Vatican on this subject...

“The first time Rome spoke on the matter was as long ago as 1853, when the Sacred Penitentiary answered a *dubium* (a formal request for an official clarification) submitted by the Bishop of Amiens, France. He asked,

“[Q.] ‘Should those spouses be reprehended who make use of marriage only on those days when (in the opinion of some doctors) conception is impossible?’

“The Vatican reply was,

“[A.] ‘After mature examination, we have decided that such spouses should not be disturbed [or disquieted], provided they do nothing that impedes generation.’

“[Quoted in J. Montánchez, *Teologia Moral* [Buenos Aires, 1946], p. 654, my translation.]”

“By the expression ‘impedes generation,’ it is obvious the Vatican meant the use of onanism (or *coitus interruptus*, now popularly called ‘withdrawal’), condoms, etc. For otherwise the reply would be self-contradictory and make no sense.”

What does Fr. Harrison mean when he says “the first time Rome has spoken”? Does he mean the pope teaching infallibly? No! But that is the impression he gives the reader. He means a response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary, which even if it were valid is fallible, which is beside the fact that it was invalid. And he says “the first time Rome has spoken was as long ago as 1853.” Well, 1853 is not so long ago considering that the Catholic Church and Her dogmas go back to AD 33. By implication, he admits that his teaching, his heresy, is a tradition of men that began in 1853 because it has no link with the tradition of the Catholic Church, which began in AD 33. Not one pope, apostle, or other Church Father, or even one Anti-Church Father or scholastic, taught the NFP heresy but instead condemned it. This response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary is just one more heresy of a mountain of heresies coming out of the apostate Roman Congregations during this time.

1880 - Invalid and heretical response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary

The apostate, immoral Fr. Harrison used another heretical response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary in 1880 to defend the NFP heresy:

NFPH: “The editorial notes in Denzinger indicate that this decision was made public the following year (1881) in the prestigious French journal *Nouvelle Revue Theologique*, and in Rome itself in 1883 in the Vatican-approved series *Analecta Juris Pontificii*.”

Bishop Pivarunus included an additional question that Fr. Harrison omitted. I will include both questions followed by the response:

“Q. ‘Whether it is licit to make use of marriage only on those days when it is more difficult for conception to occur?’

“[Bishop Pivarunus’ additional question] ‘Q. Whether the confessor may suggest such a procedure either to the wife who detests the onanism of her husband but cannot correct him, or to either spouse who shrinks from having numerous children?’

“A. ‘Spouses using the aforesaid method are not to be disturbed; and a confessor may, with due caution, suggest this proposal to spouses, if his other attempts to lead them away from the detestable crime of onanism have proved fruitless.’”

This response contains two heresies: 1) it teaches the NFP heresy; and 2) it teaches the heresy that a spouse can commit a lesser sin to avoid a greater sin—to use the NFP method instead of onanism (withdrawal).

If, as it seems, this response allows NFP only as a substitute for the husband’s obstinately sinful Onanism (withdrawal during the marital act by the husband), then this presents some serious dilemmas:

1. If the husband is not obstinate and repents of his sin of Onanism, then the spouses cannot use NFP, which is how this response would have to be interpreted. The only use of NFP, according to this response, would be if the husband obstinately commits the sin of Onanism. If not, the confessor cannot even suggest the use of NFP. Therefore, according to this response, NFP cannot be used for any other reason put forward by NFP defenders.
2. By implication this response condemns NFP as contraception by comparing it as a viable substitute for Onanism. The sinful purpose of both remains the same: the deliberate attempt to prevent conception when spouses perform the marital act. This response replaces one evil with another that it perceives as less evil. And this is the heresy that men can commit a lesser sin instead of a greater sin. Man cannot arrive at a good by the use of an evil means (Rom. 3:8). It is like a priest telling a single man to fornicate with an unmarried woman rather than with a married woman because there is no additional sin of adultery, which is precisely what the apostate moral theologians (such as Alphonsus de Liguori) and apostate Roman Congregations do teach. Likewise, priests telling spouses that they can use NFP instead of Onanism is like telling an alcoholic who drinks hard liquor that he will not sin if he gets drunk by using soft liquor, such as beer or wine. The purpose, getting drunk, remains the same in both cases. Whether spouses use NFP or Onanism, the goal is the same, to deliberately prevent conception during sexual intercourse.
3. This 1880 response appeases stiffnecked sinners by rewarding their obstinate disobedience to God and their confessors. If the obstinate sinner does not listen to the confessor, the confessor must pander to the sinner. Instead of punishing him, the confessor rewards him with another sinful contraceptive method. Since when do God and His representatives compromise faith and morals by appeasing obstinate sinners? The proper action for a good confessor in such a case is to forbid the wife to have relations with her husband, under pain of sin, until he repents of his sin and thus promises to no longer use Onanism. If the husband should force himself on his wife (rape her), then that is a reason for separation according to canon law. There are times when a spouse cannot prevent the other spouse from sinning during the marital act; in these cases, the

spouse that is sinned against does not sin. For instance, a husband can pretend he repented of his sin of Onanism and can promise his wife he will no longer use it; but he could still use it, and the wife would not be able to prevent it. Or one spouse may do something immoral previous to, during, or after the marital act; and the other spouse may be helpless to prevent it. In these cases, the spouse that is sinned against does not sin. Apostate Antipope Pius XI teaches this:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “Holy Church knows well that not infrequently one of the parties is sinned against rather than sinning, when for a grave cause he or she reluctantly allows the perversion of the right order. In such a case, there is no sin, provided that, mindful of the law of charity, he or she does not neglect to seek to dissuade and to deter the partner from sin.”

The 1880 response not only tells the wife not to dissuade or deter her husband from contraceptive practices but allows her to consent to another contraceptive method, NFP. To conclude, this 1880 response is fallible, invalid, heretical, contradictory, and does not even defend the current practice of allowing NFP to be used for any reason.

1932 - Invalid and heretical response from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary

The next apostate Sacred Penitentiary response in 1932, which Fr. Harrison uses to defend the NFP heresy, comes from a second-hand source, *Texta et Documenta, series theologica* (vol. 25 [1942], p. 95). Here is the question and response:

“‘Regarding the Exclusive Use of the Infertile Period’

“*Qu.* Whether the practice is licit in itself by which spouses who, for just and grave causes, wish to avoid offspring in a morally upright way, abstain from the use of marriage—by mutual consent and with upright motives—except on those days which, according to certain recent [medical] theories, conception is impossible for natural reasons.

“*Resp.* Provided for by the Response of the Sacred Penitentiary of June 16, 1880.”

By referring back to the 1880 response, this 1932 response only allows spouses to use NFP to substitute for the husband’s Onanism, which is still heretical. But it does not allow NFP to be used for all reasons, as is the current practice today.

The illusion of papal approval

The main point Fr. Harrison stresses to lend credence to this 1932 response is based upon his rash and illogical presumption that apostate Antipope Pius XI was definitely aware of this response and thus approved it:

NFPH: “The clearest proof that Richard Ibranyi’s interpretation of *CC* – namely, that it condemns NFP as just another form of contraception – is incorrect is the fact that Pius XI himself very obviously did *not* interpret his own encyclical that way. Only a year and a half after it was promulgated, the Sacred Penitentiary yet again issued a statement on periodic continence, dated July 20, 1932. (Quite possibly this was because someone, somewhere, was trying to give an Ibranyi-style rigorist interpretation to *CC*.) This time the ruling, which simply referred back to the same dicastery’s previous and positive response of half a century earlier, was eventually

made public in the Roman documentary journal *Texta et Documenta, series theologica* (vol. 25 [1942], p. 95)...

“Now, it would clearly be preposterous to plead that perhaps Pius XI ‘never knew’ about this 1932 decision, right up to his death seven years later! In all probability he was the *first* to know about it! Certainly, it was made right under his own nose in the Vatican, and would have been mailed out promptly to the bishops of the world for the benefit of their moral theologians teaching future priests in their seminaries! How could the only Catholic bishop in the world **not** to know of this ‘heretical distortion’ (in Ibranyi’s view) of his encyclical be the Bishop of Rome himself? Approved moral theologians everywhere continued to teach this settled and authentic doctrine about the legitimacy of NFP for just and grave reasons.”

If the 1932 question and response was mailed out to all of the bishops in the world and published in their books, how come there is only one piece of evidence in which it is found, which did not appear until 1942. Even if it were mailed out to other areas before that, it still does not prove that Pius XI knew about it.

The fact that the 1932 response was not made public until 1942 leads one to logically believe that Pius XI would have condemned it if, by chance, he had become aware of it. Hence the NFP defenders waited for the reign of the more liberal apostate Antipope Pius XII to make it public, knowing that he favored NFP. I have already presented the evidence against Pius XII in this book. (See in this book [Apostate Antipope Pius XII Teaches the NFP Heresy](#), p. 19.)

Fr. Harrison acknowledges that the 1932 question and response was not made public until 1942 in an unofficial journal published nearly three years after Pius XI had died. Yet Fr. Harrison assures his readers that Pius XI was certainly aware of it!

Papal approval of all Roman Congregations’ decrees is illogical

It is illogical to presume that a pope reads and thus personally approves all of the thousands, if not tens of thousands, of official decrees and responses from the Roman Congregations, along with all unofficial ones attributed to the Roman Congregations, found in the many books that publish them, along with reading all books in the world with imprimaturs, along with ruling the Church spiritually and temporally, along with sanctifying his own soul by prayer and meditation, along with sanctifying Catholics as the chief shepherd, and along with calling non-Catholics to conversion.

Apostate Antipope Pius X testifies to the impossibility of a pope’s inspecting every imprimatured book, even with the help of the Holy Office, and also testifies that there were many bad books that were given imprimaturs by either heretical or unvigilant bishops:

Apostate Antipope Pius X, *Pacendi Dominici Gregis*, 1907: “51. We bid you do everything in your power to drive out of your dioceses, even by solemn interdict, any pernicious books that may be in circulation there. The Holy See neglects no means to put down writings of this kind, but the number of them has now grown to such an extent that it is impossible to censure them all...”

The same logically applies to the Roman Congregations’ decrees and responses, and more so to the unofficial decrees and responses found in the many books that list them.

Presumed papal approval of Roman Congregations' decrees is illegal

The Church condemns as illegal Fr. Harrison's presumption that Pius XI certainly approved the 1932 response. Even official documents from the Roman Congregations are not "Acts of the Roman Pontiff"; therefore papal approval is not to be presumed. Before stating that a pope approves any decree or response from the Roman Congregations, the said pope must have personally confirmed it *in forma specificâ*, which rarely happens:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, "Acts of the Roman Congregations": "II. AUTHORITY, (a) In general - The authority of these decrees [official Holy Office decrees and responses] is...not absolutely supreme, for the Congregations are juridically distinct from the Pope and inferior to him; hence their acts are not, strictly speaking, acts of the Roman Pontiff. ...III. USE - ...These decisions are brought to the Pope for his consideration or approbation in all cases in which custom or law prescribes such procedure. Ordinarily this approval is not legally of such a character as to make these decrees 'pontifical acts'; they become such only by the special confirmation, termed by canonists *in forma specificâ*, which is seldom given."

Consequently, Fr. Harrison has no legal right to presume that a pope approved any official decree or response from the Roman Congregations unless he has proof that the said pope personally approved it *in forma specificâ*.

Lastly, if apostate Antipope Pius XI knew about the 1932 response and approved it, then he caved in and embraced the NFP heresy and thus added one more heresy to a mountain of his idolatries, heresies, and immoralities, and ended up contradicting his own correct teaching regarding contraception. Either way, all of his acts were invalid because he was an apostate antipope.

Fr. Harrison sets up gnats against Mount Sion

Because Fr. Harrison has no Church Fathers or even Anti-Church Fathers or scholastics to defend his NFP heresy, he appealed to three responses from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary, which are invalid, null and void. And even if they were valid, they are fallible. That is the highest authoritative evidence he rests his whole case on. He would have us believe that these fallible and invalid gnats can stand against Mount Sion, against the natural law and the ordinary magisterium. He also has these three gnats opposing what he believes to be a valid infallible teaching of Pius XI in his encyclical *Casti Connubii*, and thus his gnats oppose what he believes is a solemn magisterium dogma:

NFPH: "If we look at what Pius XI actually says in *CC*...the most solemn (and, in my judgment, infallible) passage of the encyclical..."

Indeed, if one honestly takes a look at what Pius XI taught in *Casti Connubii*, he will see that he condemns all forms of contraception, including Natural Family Planning. Hence the apostate, immoral Fr. Harrison has set up three gnats against Mount Sion; that is, against the natural law, against the ordinary magisterium, and against what he believes to be a solemn magisterium dogma defined by Pius XI.

He uses modern science to defend his NFP heresy

Fr. Harrison also uses modern science and medicine to defend the NFP heresy, which is yet another heresy because dogmas of faith or morals can never change no matter what science or medicine discover. He teaches that NFP is allowed because modern science and medicine have invented this new method of contraception unknown in the past and thus the Church Fathers never specifically condemned it:

NFPH: “Practically as soon as the first rudimentary methods of estimating the infertile period arose, with the advance of medical science in the mid-19th century, the See of Peter immediately and explicitly gave its blessing to this practice!”

Again, he is dishonest when he states that the See of Peter blessed NFP. The See of Peter did not bless it—three responses from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary blessed it. And at that time in the 19th century, the See of Peter could not have blessed it because there was no pope because all the so-called popes since Innocent II in 1130 were apostate antipopes.

Fr. Harrison, then, attributes the justification of the NFP heresy to modern science which developed another form of contraception, like birth control pills that it would later invent. Just because men have invented new ways to commit murder, such as with modern weapons that did not exist in the days of many of the Church Fathers, does not mean that men who commit murder with these modern weapons are not guilty because the Church Fathers did not specifically condemn murder by the use of these new killing methods. It is the same with NFP. Spouses commit the mortal sin of contraception no matter what weapon (method) they use in an attempt to prevent conception when they have sexual intercourse.

He misinterprets Pius XI’s *Casti Connubii* and denies sins of intent

What follows is Fr. Harrison’s liberal and illogical interpretation of a passage from Pius XI’s *Casti Connubii*:

NFPH: “The point comes through clearly in the most solemn (and, in my judgment, infallible) passage of the encyclical. After referring to the recent decision of the Anglicans to permit contraception (though without mentioning them by name), Pius XI declares:

‘The Catholic Church, to whom God has entrusted the defense of the integrity and the purity of morals, standing erect in the midst of the moral ruin which surrounds her, in order that she may preserve the chastity of the nuptial union from being defiled by this foul stain, raises her voice in token of her divine ambassadorship and through Our mouth proclaims anew: *any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately deprived of its natural power to generate life* is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of a grave sin.’

“The above is for the most part the standard English translation of this passage. However, I have used the words ‘deprived of’ at the point where that translation uses the words ‘frustrated in.’ This makes the Pope’s true meaning a little clearer. The Latin verb which he uses here is *destituere*. And as Latin dictionaries show, this verb, when used with the ablative, as in this case (*naturali sua...vi*), means precisely ‘to deprive of,’ ‘to strip’ or ‘to rob.’ In such constructions, the accompanying noun in the ablative case is that thing of which the rightful owner has been ‘deprived,’ or which has been ‘stripped’ or ‘robbed’ from him. Now, of course, you cannot

‘deprive’ anyone of something he never possessed to begin with. You cannot ‘rob’ a man with no money, any more than you can ‘strip’ him if he is already naked. Likewise, since conjugal acts carried out precisely in the infertile period do not, by the very nature of the case, have any natural procreative potential to begin with, it is obvious that they cannot be ‘deprived’ or ‘robbed’ of that potential.”

Fr. Harrison’s heretical and illogical interpretation fails on at least two points:

1. NFP robs conceptions from the fertile period

The use of Natural Family Planning robs the conceptions that would have occurred from conjugal relations during the wife’s fertile periods that were deliberately avoided. With the use of the contraceptive method of NFP, the “frustrating” or “depriving,” as Fr. Harrison interprets it, of conjugal relations of their natural power takes place when the spouses deliberately deprive (rob or frustrate) the fertile period by deliberately avoiding it with the purpose of only having conjugal relations during the infertile period so that conception does not occur. Thus, according to this plan, the fertile periods are deliberately frustrated, deprived of, or robbed of conjugal relations in favor of conjugal relations only during the infertile periods so that conception does not occur. Choose whatever similiar words you like, the motive is the same: to prevent conception during conjugal relations! NFP attempts to rob conjugal relations of its power to bring forth children, and this robbery takes much planning and plotting.

2. Contraceptive intent exists even when conception is not possible

According to Fr. Harrison, a man who attempts to rob someone does not sin if his victim has no money because, as Fr. Harrison says, “You cannot ‘rob’ a man with no money”; you cannot rob or deprive a man of something that he does not have. Fr. Harrison’s heretical theology ignores motive, which is the root of all sin. He ignores or denies sins of thought, sins of intent, which are always committed *before* the sinful act.

A man who attempts to rob someone who has no money (a man who is financially infertile) is still guilty of the mortal sin of stealing. And he was guilty of mortal sin in his heart, in his intent, even before he attempted to rob his victim, regardless if his victim has money or not. The intent was to steal, to rob, to deprive his victim of his money!

Likewise, spouses who have sexual intercourse with the motive to prevent conception are guilty of the mortal sin of contraception, regardless if the wife is infertile or not. And they were guilty of mortal sin in their hearts, in their intent, even before they had sexual intercourse regardless if they have sexual intercourse when the wife is infertile or not. The intent is the same, to prevent conception during sexual intercourse! Jesus says, “I say to you, that whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart.” (Mt. 5:28) Jesus, likewise, would say, “I say to you, that spouses who intend to prevent conception when they have sexual intercourse have already committed the mortal sin of contraception in their heart and thus even before the act of sexual intercourse.” (See in this book [The sin of contraception is committed in the heart before the act](#), p. 13.)

By Fr. Harrison’s heretical reasoning, no contraceptive method is mortally sinful when spouses have relations during the wife’s infertile period because, according to him,

one cannot be deprived or robbed of something that cannot happen. He wrote the following:

NFPH: “Likewise, since conjugal acts carried out precisely in the infertile period do not, by the very nature of the case, have any natural procreative potential to begin with, it is obvious that they cannot be ‘deprived’ or ‘robbed’ of that potential.”

The same, then, would apply to any contraceptive method (such as condoms) used during the wife’s infertile period because, according to Fr. Harrison, you cannot deprive or frustrate something that cannot happen. Therefore, according to him, the use of condoms or any other contraceptive method during the wife’s known infertile period is not contraception because conception cannot take place. He verifies this when he states in his next paragraph that only when contraceptive methods are used during the wife’s fertile period can the sin of contraception be committed, and this is what he has the audacity to believe that Pius XI teaches in *Casti Connubii*:

NFPH: “Hence it is clear that Pius XI’s solemn censure *cannot* be referring to NFP (periodic continence). He must be referring *only* to those conjugal acts which, if it were not for the unnatural intervention of one or both spouses, *would have retained* the said ‘natural power to generate life.’ In other words, the Pope’s condemnation applies exclusively to conjugal acts carried out during what the spouses understand to be the wife’s fertile period, but which they deliberately pervert (whether by ‘withdrawal,’ condoms, pills, or any other technique) so as to *deprive* them of that fertility.”

Therefore, according to Fr. Harrison, the sin of contraception is not committed if any of these contraceptive methods are used during the wife’s known infertile period.

His heretical interpretation of periodic continence

Periodic continence, as allowed by the Church, teaches that the only way spouses can legally avoid having children is by abstaining from conjugal relations during the infertile as well as the fertile period:

Apostate Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, 307: “[Some] complain of the scantiness of their means, and allege that they have not enough for bringing up more children, as though, in truth, their means were in [their] power...or God did not daily make the rich poor and the poor rich. Wherefore, if any one on any account of poverty shall be unable to bring up children, it is better to abstain from relations with his wife.” (6:20)

In other words, spouses must abstain from conjugal relations until they desire to have children:

St. Caesarius of Arles, *Sermon 1*, 522: “If a woman does not wish to have children, let her enter into a religious agreement with her husband; for chastity is the sole sterility of a Christian woman.” (1:12)

Pius XI confirms this teaching and refers to it as virtuous continence:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “IV. Vices Opposed to Christian Marriage: And now, Venerable Brethren, We shall explain in detail the evils opposed to each of the benefits of matrimony. First consideration is due the offspring, which many have the audacity to call the disagreeable burden of matrimony and which they say is to be carefully avoided by married people not

through virtuous continence (which Christian law permits in matrimony when both parties consent) but by frustrating the marriage act.”

Nowhere does Pius XI teach or even imply that virtuous continence means that the fertile period of the wife can be deliberately avoided in order to have conjugal relations only during her infertile period with the purpose of avoiding conception. He actually condemns it:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “Nor are those considered as acting against nature who, in the married state, use their right in the proper manner, although on account of natural reasons either of time or of certain defects, new life cannot be brought forth. For in matrimony as well as in the use of matrimonial rights there are also secondary ends, such as mutual aid, the cultivation of mutual love, and the quieting of concupiscence which husband and wife are not forbidden to consider, so long as they are subordinated to the primary end and so long as the intrinsic nature of the act is preserved.”

Hence Pius XI teaches that even when spouses have sexual intercourse during known infertile periods, such as in a barren or pregnant womb, they must still “subordinate” it “to the primary end,” which is procreation, and thus must still desire that conception occur if it were possible and thus do nothing to prevent it if it were possible. The NFP heresy teaches that spouses must only have sexual intercourse during known infertile periods with the intention of denying the primary end, which is procreation.

Yet, Fr. Harrison says that the Church Fathers, Pius XI, and the Catholic Church understand periodic continence in the heretical way that he does. He heretically believes that periodic continence applies to spouses who deliberately abstain from conjugal relations during the fertile periods while only engaging in conjugal relations during the infertile periods so as to avoid conception:

NFPH: “Never has the use of quotation marks around the word ‘traditionalist’ been more apt than in this case, because, as we shall see, there was never at any stage a Catholic ‘tradition’ – not even a lower-level, ‘non-infallible’ tradition – against the use of periodic continence. ... ‘periodic continence’ or Natural Family Planning (NFP)... refer to the identification and exclusive use of the naturally infertile period of the wife’s cycle for having conjugal relations...”

Yes, Church tradition does teach that spouses can engage in periodic continence and even encouraged it, but not the heretical definition of periodic continence put forward by Fr. Harrison. Not one Church Father or even Anti-Church Father or scholastic taught that periodic continence (periodic chastity) includes spouses abstaining from the fertile period while only having sexual intercourse during the infertile period. Instead, they condemn this as a mortal sin of contraception.

Fr. Harrison’s own words elsewhere condemn his belief. Even if one was not presented with the teachings of the Church Fathers regarding periodic continence, one can logically know that they could not have believed in periodic continence in the way Fr. Harrison does because, as he admits, the method of identifying the woman’s fertile and infertile period is a modern discovery:

NFPH: “Practically as soon as the first rudimentary methods of estimating the infertile period arose, with the advance of medical science in the mid-19th century...”

Therefore, he contradicts himself. How could the Church Fathers have understood periodic continence in the heretical way that Fr. Harrison proposes when, as he admits,

they did not even know about NFP and its new method of identifying the fertile and infertile periods. Even though the Church Fathers did not know about NFP, they nevertheless condemned it by teaching that any intent or act to prevent conception before or during sexual intercourse is the mortal sin of contraception.

To conclude, Fr. Harrison's periodic continence (or periodic chastity) is not continence or chastity at all but just a minor interruption of sexual intercourse in which the spouses can have sexual intercourse three weeks of every month, and month after month. And worst of all, the motive of this continence is not honorable but is lust and mortally sinful contraception and heretical. (See in this book [Virtuous vs non-virtuous continence](#), p. 16.)

He justifies intrinsically evil desires and acts

The apostate, immoral Fr. Harrison believes that two of the grave (just) reasons that allow for the use of NFP are health (endangering of the wife's life by pregnancy) and extreme poverty:

NFPH: "Married or engaged couples are often taught the legitimacy and the technique of the ovulation or sympto-thermal methods of NFP, but with little or no mention of that other part of the Church's teaching which insists that couples need 'just reasons' (*Humanae Vitae*, 16; *Catechism of the Catholic Church* [CCC], #2368) for using NFP if they wish to be free from blame before God.

"That is, we should be teaching that the temporal or worldly problems to be anticipated by another pregnancy and birth (mainly of health or poverty) need to be really *grave* in character before a married couple is entitled to conclude that they have a 'just reason' for them to use NFP."

Yet Pius XI teaches that no reason can be brought forward to allow for something that is intrinsically evil:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: "No reason, however grave, may be put forward by which anything intrinsically against nature may become conformable to nature and morally good. Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose, sin against nature, and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious."

Pius XI teaches below that no reason, not even extreme poverty, can justify a spouse's desire that conception not take place during conjugal relations:

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: "We are deeply touched by the sufferings of those parents who, in extreme want, experience great difficulty in rearing their children. However, they should take care lest the calamitous state of their external affairs should be the occasion for a much more calamitous error. No difficulty can arise that justifies putting aside the law of God which prohibits all acts intrinsically evil."

Pius XI, then, condemns Fr. Harrison's "extreme poverty" excuse as well as all excuses. Pius XI also warns that God will curse spouses for committing this mortal sin, and thus their problems will only get worse without God to help them. To their calamitous state (for example, extreme poverty), they would have added a calamitous error, mortal sin, and thus brought down God's wrath upon themselves. For Pius XI warns: "However, they should take care lest the calamitous state of their external affairs

should be the occasion for a much more calamitous error.” ([Apostate Antipope Pius XI Correctly Condemns All Excuses](#), p. 18.)

He knows the truth but does not believe it

The apostate, immoral Fr. Harrison knows the truth, and expresses it very well, but does not believe it:

NFPH: “Ignorant of this fact, not a few ‘traditionalists’ are now claiming that, from an orthodox Catholic viewpoint. . .married couples are always morally obliged either to engage in regular conjugal relations without any intention of ‘planning’ their family size (and so leaving that entirely up to God’s Providence); or, if they are really convinced there are grave reasons for avoiding another pregnancy, to abstain **totally** from conjugal relations for as long as that situation lasts, without making any attempt to identify, and make use of, the naturally infertile moments of the wife’s cycle.”

Yes, Fr. Harrison, true Catholics believe exactly that—since it is a dogma of the natural law and of the ordinary magisterium that the contraceptive intent and all contraceptive plans and methods, which include NFP, are intrinsically evil.

He is a blind leader leading the blind into the pit of eternal hell

The apostate, immoral Fr. Harrison wants his readers to believe three invalid and heretical responses from the apostate Sacred Penitentiary and his heretical and illogical twisting and wresting of *Casti Connubii*. If you believe him, then you are worthy of him. You are one of the obstinately blind sheep following your blind shepherd into hell (Mt. 15:14):

Apostate Antipope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930: “We admonish, therefore, priests who hear confessions and others who have the care of souls, in virtue of Our Supreme authority and in Our solicitude for the salvation of souls, not to allow the faithful entrusted to them to err regarding this most grave law of God; much more, that they keep themselves immune from such false opinions, in no way conniving in them. If any confessor or pastor of souls, which may God forbid, lead the faithful entrusted to him into these errors, or should at least confirm them by approval or by guilty silence, let him be mindful of the fact that he must render a strict account to God, the Supreme Judge, for the betrayal of his sacred trust, and let him take to himself the words of Christ: ‘They are blind and leaders of the blind: and if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit.’”

Some of his other heresies and idolatries

The apostate, immoral Fr. Harrison holds not only the NFP heresy but also other heresies and is an idolater also. What follows is a list of only some of his crimes:

1. He is an idolater for not condemning scholasticism and the desecration of Catholic places with images of devils, idols, false gods, false religions, pagans, and heretics.

2. He is an apostate for defending the Vatican II Church and not denouncing its leaders as apostates and antipopes.
3. He is an apostate for believing that Moslems worship the true God.
4. He is an apostate for believing that the Old Covenant has not ended.
5. He is a heretic for denying the Salvation Dogma.

For the evidence, see RJMI refutation *Against Fr. Brian Harrison*.