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It has been said that when one person dies, the death is considered a tragedy. When millions die, it is considered a statistic. The fact is that close to 40 million people worldwide are infected with Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS). In 2003 alone, HIV/AIDS associated illnesses caused the deaths of 2.9 million people. Since the first AIDS cases were reported in 1981, over 20 million people have died with HIV/AIDS. Regardless of what has been said, the reality remains, there have been over 20 million tragedies caused by HIV/AIDS.

The AIDS crisis has become an epidemic, with over two-thirds of the people presently infected inhabiting Africa. The debate rages as to what the answer is to overcoming the outbreak. While much of secular society commits allegiance to the condom, the Catholic Church, has stood firmly against the popular notion of condoms and boldly invites the world to respond to the clarion call of faithfulness to Love in fighting the HIV/AIDS battle with a truer weapon of virtue. At the heart of disunity, stands a fundamental difference in the anthropological understanding of the human person. Revealed by an adequate anthropological illumination, condoms have no place in this raging battle against HIV/AIDS.

HIV/AIDS has been recognized by the Bush administration as posing a threat to national and global security. In response to the global crisis, $15 billion over a five year time span will be spent for AIDS relief in Africa and the Caribbean, which is triple the amount that was previously spent to fight the disease. The spending for this five year plan began in 2004. There are fourteen countries that will be receiving the most aid: Botswana, Namibia, Mozambique, Zambia, Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Cote d'Ivoire, Rwanda, South Africa, Haiti, and Guyana. These countries account for
half of all AIDS infections worldwide and 70% of all infections in Africa and the
Caribbean 1. Indeed, it is tremendous news that money is being spent to aid the
people at the mercy of HIV/AIDS. The plan, however, arouses certain debate as to how
the money will be spent regarding the programs and education that will be promoted.

Much of the implementation will, undoubtedly, be geared towards youth,
ranging from ages 15-24 years, who constitute half of all new cases of HIV infection
worldwide. With approximately five million new cases a year, infection has been
outpacing a response.2 This implementation is not an area of common ground for AIDS
activists. There exists a variety of interventional plans in the battle against AIDS. As
responsible, global citizens, there exists a tremendous responsibility to ensure that the
best possible interventions gain support in implementation. Too many times throughout
history, well intentioned people have caused unintended destruction. So the challenge
is made, what is the best implementation in this battle against HIV/AIDS? The beginning
of such discovery finds its origin at a very basic but essential question of anthropology.

Contrasting Anthropologies

Any number of the many ethical positions stem from an underlying anthropology.
That is, the understanding or misunderstanding of what it means to be human will,
logically, directly impact the intervention proposed to resolve the issue at hand, in this
case the issue being the threat of HIV/AIDS. For many people, there exists a gap
between the issue of AIDS and the discussion of anthropology. For those who would
ponder the practical necessity of this discussion, the logical flow of explanation
provided by this discussion should be evident enough in bridging this apparent gap. It
is the belief of the author that in this historical moment, modernity presents three most popular contrasting anthropologies, the first of which to be discussed is Cartesian Dualism.

Dualism may be summarized as a philosophy in which “material bodies and brains are neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for our conceptual abilities. Immaterial minds are all that is required” 3. Cartesian Dualism, perhaps obviously, comes from the thoughts of Rene Descartes. A dualistic note rang out from his notorious, Cogito-ergo-sum (“I think therefore I am). Until his point in history, it was classically, philosophically understood that the mind was called “soul,” referring to a spiritual and immaterial reality that was indivisible, the embodied soul constituting a fully human person. Descartes doubted the credibility of his own senses. He therefore doubted the existence of anything material because he could only come to “know” the outside world through his senses. In his doubt, the one entity he was sure existed was his doubting mind. For his mind to doubt, it must first exist. This mind was viewed by Descartes to be a separate entity from the body. In this anthropology, existence was only known when Descartes was able to doubt that he existed. Descartes placed thinking before being. He projected his understanding upon all of man and defined man as a thinking thing. The dignity of the human person, under this philosophical “order,” is contingent and dependent upon the ability of the person to think, to be aware of his existence. The body, according to Descartes, is not essential to being human. The body is a kind of machine, even if not considered evil in itself. The body controls the intellect and the intellect is finite. The mind, however, consists of thinking, understanding, and will. The mind has an infinite ability to will. Further, imagination contains no necessary role in understanding. He believed that imagination was
unnecessary for him to be able to think. Descartes disengaged the consciousness of self from reality and perched himself outside of being. Consciousness became the meaning of self.

Cartesian duality paints a picture in which the human person is made of two divisible entities, mind and body. The mind is not the brain. Descartes claims that the body is divisible as in the case of a person losing a limb. The mind, he considers indivisible. The mind is honored with precedence, credibility, and essentiality. For Descartes, it could be said that the soul is in the body the way dirt is in the carpet.

Whereas Descartes viewed personhood and reality with essentiality of the immaterial mind/soul, Materialism directly opposes Dualism. Coakley states, “Even if Cartesian mind/body dualism is supposedly decried, other disjunctions and contrasts may replicate it. In materialist philosophy of mind, for instance, the 'body' may be everything else except the brain...” 4. Coakley suggests that the philosophy of Materialism, despite its direct opposition to Dualism, finds its potentiality in the very conception of Dualism. Machuga affirms this origin when referring to Cartesian Dualism as he states, “...with the exception of immaterial minds, everything else was mere matter in motion.”5 Once the human person is “split,” there exists the ability to deny either half of the distinguished “parts.” Machuga summarizes the defining terms of Materialism as “Material bodies and brains are both a necessary and sufficient condition for our conceptual abilities. Immaterial substances don’t exist.”6 Contrary to the existence of soul, Materialism directly opposes any such notion making its stance on solid, earthly, material ground of an exclusively material reality, thereby denying the existence of God or any discussion of spirituality in terms of an invisible and supernatural
Materialism undertakes the quest to rationalize every event occurring in the universe as having purely materialistic origin.

Remnants of materialistic thought can be traced back through history to the 4th century in ancient Greece to the protagonist, Democritus, who taught that nothing comes from nothing, thereby concluding that everything comes from a combination of a division of parts (atoms). The "soul" can be explained by materialists as consisting of a kind of vapor consisting of tiny, fiery atoms that mobilize throughout the entire body. The Socratic School quelled this fiery notion in a philosophy reacting to Materialism. However, the seed of Materialism has taken route once again in this present time, maintaining a certain momentum from the Enlightenment and bearing its poisonous fruits in the ethical constraints that flow from it, to be discussed in the following section.

The difference between materialistic discussion of Ancient times and that of the Enlightenment is that with the Enlightenment came a denial of any mystery in even the material itself. Science becomes the bearer of all truth. It is easy for one to question the reason for such discussion, considering the thesis statement’s production of AIDS and condoms as the major topic of focus. For this purpose the reader is reminded of the purpose of this philosophical, anthropological foundation as being entirely necessary as each flows to a contradicting conclusion of intervention against HIV/AIDS.

The final anthropology to be discussed is Hylomorphism, in which “material bodies and brains are a necessary but not sufficient condition for our conceptual abilities. Immaterial intellects are also required.” In the recognition of invisible and visible reality, Hylomorphism proclaims the human person to consist of a unified entity of soul and body. Supernatural reality also submits to the possible existence of a Creator.
Classically, the soul is incomplete without the body.

The unity of soul and body is so profound that one has to consider the soul to be the “form” of the body; i.e., it is because of its spiritual soul that the body made of matter becomes a living, human body; spirit and matter, in man, are not two natures united, but rather their union forms a single nature. 

This understanding of the human person has been preserved by the Catholic Church in the midst of the ever-changing times, submitting to the timelessness of Truth. Although primarily preserved and recognized by the Catholic Church, other well-respected, non-Christian thinkers such as Leon Kass recognize this anthropology. In 2001, Dr. Leon Kass was appointed by President Bush to the President’s Council on Bioethics. Kass is a prime example for any person claiming that being Catholic is a pre-requisite to accepting Hylomorphism as an anthropology. Kass is Jewish.

Also worth noting, Hylomorphism is the only anthropology presented in this paper that recognizes the formal backing of religiosity, as understood by secular society. With this affiliation may come the false argument that faith and reason are contradictory in their nature. The reader, however, is reminded that faith is inescapable. Materialism, though in denial of a supernatural reality, still requires faith in matter and space and also, perhaps an even greater faith in the denial of a supernatural reality. Faith may embrace mysteries inexplicable by reason, yet still supported by reason. Paradoxes, not contradictions, unite the worlds of faith and reason.
Contrasting Ethical Views

Logically, the sequential order follows that from anthropology flows certain ethical conclusions. Cartesian dualism, generally, will lead to one of two views of ethical principle. As clarified from the view of Descartes, the body may not be seen as an evil entity in and of itself, thereby implicitly rendered and falsely affirmed as, simply, unimportant. If the body holds no necessity in its existence to the essence of being human then it does not matter what the body endures, as the person is separate from the body. This foundation may build upon it a seemingly justifiable Utilitarian ethical world view.

Utilitarianism, as defined by The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, is “the philosophical doctrine that considers utility as the criterion of action and the useful as good or worthwhile.” From a Utilitarian perspective, the claim to fame proposes that the greatest good be accomplished for the greatest number of people. The ultimate goal is happiness. Happiness is measured in terms of pleasure versus pain. The ethicists who would normally converse in terminology regarding “right” and “wrong” morph these terms to synonymously be understood in terms of pleasure and pain, respectively. Utilitarianism seeks to avoid any dialogue of metaphysical analysis or teleological perspective. The question of the “good” is sought to be recognizable and attainable without any question of the nature for which the “good” is good for. Any mention of morality and conscience submits this knowledge to the origin of human experience, namely that of pleasure or pain to produce respective moral or immoral actions. The experience of pleasure and pain are confined to the senses of the body. From a Cartesian Dualistic anthropological view, certainly it is unimportant what
happens to the body. Pleasure is acceptable, not necessarily imperative, but it is not seen as having any real affect on the person, who is separate from the body. Therefore, any physical action has no real ramification towards the person.

Utilitarianism seeks to maximize pleasure and minimize pain. HIV/AIDS causes pain. Mastery of self in not having sex if one has HIV/AIDS or desires to avoid HIV/AIDS also causes pain. In order to maximize the pleasure achieved through sex, while avoiding the pain of contracting HIV, the use of a condom is proposed. The use of a condom deals only with the mechanism of body, separate from the person and thereby justifiable because of its not affecting the person according to Dualism. This ethical view directly challenges the dignity of the human person as human dignity is recognized only so long as it is convenient and consistent with the “good” for the greatest number of people. In other words, the inherent dignity of the individual human person is not actually recognized.

Again stemming from Cartesian Dualism buds Manichaeism in which the body is believed to be evil in its very nature. The body, at times, is even discussed as being an imprisonment of the mind/soul, which is considered to be the imprisonment of the person because the person is only the immaterial mind/soul. Consistent with Descartes, the body is not necessary for the person to exist. Oversimplified, the verdict is...anything good for the body is bad. Further exploration of this belief is not considered necessary by the author. This simple summary is enough to understand the basic principle and conclusion, not to mention it is far from a popular belief in modern thought, which drastically focuses on what is “good” for the body, without understanding the inadequacy this poses for the human person to be seen.
From the anthropological proposition of Materialism, the understanding of the human person is reduced to the physical existence. Every Materialist is implicitly atheistic, not that this end, in itself, is all that important to any Materialist. There is no intentional order to the way things exist. Because the human person is believed to be an exclusively physical being and God cannot, within this philosophy, exist, any dilemma encountered would need to be dealt with from an entirely physical approach. Perhaps, already too much has been assumed. For in order for a dilemma to exist, a problem must first exist. For a “problem” to exist, there must be something that is supposed to be happening that is not happening. If something is supposed to be happening, then intention needs to exist, which is not recognized as existing in the philosophy of Materialism. That is to say, the universe, according to Materialism, consists only of atoms and the void of space in which the atoms move. Space is the only incorporeal thing that is recognized to exist. Nothing in the universe has intention. Matter is matter. The organization of any such matter is entirely accidental.

Human experience negates the philosophy, a test of credibility to be further explored later in this discussion. The laws that exist in this country have no basis according to this philosophy. The dignity of the human person does not, cannot exist in this mode of thought. Human dignity is contingent upon the understanding that the human person is made in the image and likeness of the Creator. There is no place within Materialism to even mention such a notion of Creator. Granted...then there is no place within Materialism to mention such a notion of human dignity. Dignity, to a Materialist, is nothing more than a necessary illusion, which again begs the question of why it would be considered necessary, since teleology does not exist. Furthermore,
even if human dignity could be considered possible within this paradigm of thought, with it would come a sense of meaning, thereby contradicting the fundamental accidental nature that is the cornerstone in this philosophical foundation.

Discussing ethics from a Materialistic perspective, if truly consistent, is virtually impossible. Ethics imply that there is right and wrong. At best, Materialists may recognize that while right and wrong do not exist, except in a person’s mind, the illusion is necessary for there to exist the illusion of order in the world. Every explanation provided by Materialism begs the question, “why?” In a world of only matter and space, there can be no answer to why. Like the empirical science it places its faith in, it is left to explain the “what” of the material realm without any hope of ever discovering the deepest why that makes a person human.

None of this is a condemning of science. Science, indeed, has been proven a very useful tool, but it must not be confused as the end all be all and the source of all truth. Science always reduces the subject studied to “thing.” In order to know reality in terms of science, one must objectify it, i.e., kill it.

In this connection, L. Kolokowski has made the interesting observation that the way in which the natural sciences deal with nature is actually a form of necrophilia. They dissect it as though it were a dead object and, in this form, are able to control it. If we apply this thought also to the human sciences, we might conclude that their way of dealing with human beings is likewise a kind of necrophilia. The fact that a similar way of dealing with faith and God must of necessity lead to a God-is-dead theology need hardly be elaborated.9

Whereas Utilitarianism attempts to deny metaphysical or teleological discussion, Hylomorphism suggests an ethic boldly recognizing that “the good” cannot begin to be
discussed without first discovering the nature of the subject for which the good is proposed. In other words, before one may speak of what is good for a human person, one must first understand what a human person is, thereby having the necessary knowledge to determine if something or some intervention, i.e. using condoms to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS, is indeed good or bad.

Everyday, people recognize the inherent nature of material forms. For the sake of conversation, the form of sunglasses will exemplify what is meant. What does a person look for when shopping for a good pair of sunglasses? Some common themes would be the capability of the glasses to rest securely on the face, covering the eyes. Most would have parts that go over the ears. However, there are certain sunglasses that are held secure via a nose pinch piece or straps that go around the head. Another characteristic of good sunglasses would be their ability to block ultraviolet rays. Perhaps, for most people, style would be another characteristic. So these characteristics reveal the nature of good sunglasses. This way of thinking is experienced everyday in people’s lives. The nature of a good chair, desk, apple, hammer, dog, cat etc. could be understood through a similar process of recognition. In the same sense, human beings also have a nature. Human beings, however, present an infinitely more complex and mysterious nature than those of sunglasses. In and through this complex mystery, there exists an objective form of human nature. However, before the depths of this nature may be explored, the battle cry of Relativism waged upon the suggestion of an objective human nature will first be engaged and conquered.
Relativism

In the etymological sense, it [referring to Relativism] has to do with relation, from the Latin, “refero,” to refer or carry back to. Relativism implies reference to many, not to one: there is no universal truth, only many different truths.

It is important to see that the origin of relativism actually lies in the sin of Adam, in his refusal to obey: his failure to accept being bound to another, which is to say, his premature assertion of his own creative capacity. In the most radical sense, relativism is a refusal of being a creature and thus making oneself the creator. Insofar as you act in the way that Adam did, you’re removing the source of truth from the Other and in that act seeking to become the source yourself. The first point, then, especially if we’re going to talk about America, is that the problem of relativism is finally the problem of God, because it’s a problem of what is ultimately the single, overarching measure of things.

In ontological terms, Adam’s sin consists in the replacement of the idea that “the true and the good and the beautiful are first given with being” with the notion that “things become true and good and beautiful insofar as they are the product of human agency.” You can see how this flows from what Adam did, because Adam refused to accept the given-ness of things, of being bound to this order: That is, according to this false understanding, truth is no longer something I first receive. The good and the beautiful are no longer in the first place things that happen to me and elicit my response, but rather things take on their value first by being projections of human freedom, products of human freedom, products or objects of human choice. Truth becomes something we first make; and if we have that view, it’s going to be relativistic, by definition, precisely because truth then is no longer relative to the single ultimate source and measure of truth.

From the origin of Adam to the “Cogito” (I am) of Descartes, the focus of modern philosophical thought stresses all focus on the subject with the rejection against the objective. The recognition and attention to the subject is not necessarily a bad thing, as will be discussed in the next section. Relativism, however, sprouts from this
exclusive subjectivity. Responding to the claim of an objective understanding of human nature, many people rebel in thought and act, both in the name of “freedom.” The recognition of the human person in terms of his/her human nature implies certain right actions and wrong actions for human people. Clearly expressing this example are the laws held in this country and throughout much of the world, declaring that it is wrong to kill an innocent human being because of his/her inherent dignity. Clearly, any person rebelling against this law, thereby believing that he/she has the right to kill an innocent human being is irrational and their principle of thought ought to be objectively recognized as wrong. Again, however, the statement declaring the injustice of killing an innocent human person begs the question of what makes a human person a human person, thereby affirming the original submission proposed in this discussion of the necessary recognition of anthropology.

Relativism seeks to escape the “confines” of objective Truth by denying its existence. In dealing with the challenge of AIDS, condoms are viewed as a viable option for people who decide that it is good for them. Relativism seeks to claim that no objective Truth exists. Common phrases such as, “to each their own” or “whatever floats your boat,” when communicated to a moral situation, may be viewed as symptoms of Relativistic thought. The claim rejecting objective truth holds inherent contradiction as it, in itself, is a statement of objective Truth, flawed though it is. Analogously, it is a philosophy desperately trying to stand, only to realize that it has no legs to stand on.
Phenomenology and Human Personhood

The purpose of this paper is not to discount modernity or to condemn the modern person. The purpose of this paper is to reveal the invitation of the Truth to fullness of Life, thereby directly affecting the interventions for HIV/AIDS victims and prevention of disease. In fact, modernity, in some respect, has done the world a favor in turning the attention to the subject. From Descartes through modern philosophers including former Pope John Paul the Great, subjectivity is a critical dimension of being. In fact, it was recognized by John Paul the Great as perhaps the most critical dimension. His great work in life boldly invited every individual person to receive the Truth of faith through the person’s personal experience, in a philosophical proposal of phenomenology. Here is a sample of his entry into the topic:

Today more than ever before we feel the need - and also see a greater possibility - of objectifying the problem of the subjectivity of the human being....The antinomy of Subjectivism vs. Objectivism, along with the underlying antinomy of idealism vs. realism, created conditions that discouraged dealing with human subjectivity - for fear that this would lead inevitably to subjectivism. These fears, which existed among thinkers who subscribed to realism and epistemological objectivism, were in some sense warranted by the subjectivistic and idealistic character - or at least overtones - analyses conducted within the realm of 'pure consciousness.' This only served to strengthen the line of demarcation in philosophy and the opposition between the ‘objective’ view of the human being, which was also an ontological view (the human being as being), and the ‘subjective’ view, which seemed inevitably to sever the human being from this reality.

Today we are seeing a breakdown of that line of demarcation.... I am convinced that the line of demarcation between subjectivistic (idealistic) and objectivistic (realistic) views in anthropology and ethics must break down and is in fact breaking down on the basis of the experience of the
human being. This experience automatically frees us from pure consciousness as the subject conceived and assumed a priori and leads us to the full concrete existence of the human being, to the reality of the conscious subject.11

Regardless of which anthropological or ethical view is being discussed, there exists a necessary phenomenological recognition in the rational credibility of the respective philosophy presented. Each and every philosophy is affirmed or rejected by the subjective experience of the human person.

Before he was elected Pope, Benedict XVI recognized the challenge to create a synthesis of faith and modernity. Along with John Paul the Great, Pope Benedict XVI believes this synthesis is made by doing a phenomenology of faith and explaining it metaphysically. This comes about through a description of interior experience of self-governance, self mastery and self-gift as the meaning of anthropology which is the Christian because self-gift is the revelation of Jesus Christ as the meaning of man.12

This provides the way to absorb the insight of subjectivity of the whole of modern thought and give it Christian realism - a metaphysical realism. “The ultimate meaning of Being is the “I” that is the act of self that is Christian faith. The real description of man is not “individual substance of a rational nature” but “the only earthly being God has willed for itself (freedom), who finds himself (experiences his “I”) on the occasion of giving himself (transcending himself)” (Gaudium et spes, #24). When this is done on the occasion of ordinary work, the person experiences the divinization (quid divinum our Father refers to) of becoming “another Christ.” The dynamic that makes this possible is grace. But grace is the affirmation of the self by the Divine Person. It is the love of Christ crucified (given us in the Mass). Affirmation is the relation that gives one identity according to the Trinitarian model of personhood, and corroborated by personal psychological and familial experience. There is no self without being affirmed by another. Once affirmed (by love/grace) the self is empowered to exercise the freedom of mastering self, to
get possession of self and therefore be able to make the gift - which in turn affirms the next person into identity empowering him to self mastery, etc. (the apostolate).

Hence Christian faith and modern thought become a single piece and there is a deepening of experience and knowledge of Revelation (as one becomes more and more Christ, one experiences and becomes conscious of His presence = identity with self). The reflection back on this consciousness becomes theology.

Practically, this can then be lived out as the true Christianization of the temporal order without imposing theocracy. Christianity is proposed not imposed. On the contrary, it establishes seculariti as the autonomy of the loved person freely mastering self (self-determining) to make the gift in sexuality and social milieu...This is the “new evangelization” and the creation of a “new civilization of love.”

Recall that Hylomorphism, in recognition of mystery, proposes the existence of paradox, which is not contradiction. The paradox of Christianity reveals the mystery of self-knowledge coming from the deliberate gift of oneself for another. All throughout, the human person is being discussed as soul and body creating one, indivisible person.

Now going back to the original question of the paper regarding best intervention against HIV/AIDS in the human person and the proposal of condoms, hylomorphism’s proposal of soul/body unity establishes that the inclusive physical personhood cannot act without affect on the entirety of the person.

Sex can no longer be viewed as an exclusively biological act, having no affect on the person. Sex, like sunglasses has an inherent nature. The nature of sex is unifying. This is evident enough in the mechanics of sexual intercourse. The psychological trauma caused by rape and broken hearts from one night stands affirms the invisible nature of sex. Certain people would like to take a stance of exclusive materialism in the
realm of sex because it is convenient for the justification of conscience in their achievement of orgasm without any sacrifice or responsibility. If this were the case, if sex were mere biological/physiological mechanics at work, then rape would not exist. Rape implies that a person did not will the sexual relations forced upon him/her. This lack of consent affirms the belief that, unlike other animals, human beings possess freedom. The human experience continues and will continue to affirm the Truth proclaimed by the Church.

Though the Church conveys insight into the interiority of personhood through the story of Genesis and Adam and Eve, the same concept of interiority and human personhood may be revealed in the more concrete character of Helen Keller. William Percy writes,

What is naming? Is it an event which we can study as we study other events in natural history, such as solar eclipses, glandular secretions, nuclear fusion, stimulus response sequences? Let us take a concrete example. A father tells his two-year-old child that this, pointing to a certain object, is a ball. The child understands him, and whenever his father speaks the word, the child looks for the ball and runs to get it. But this is not naming. The child’s understanding is not qualitatively different from the understanding which a dog has of the ‘ball;’ it can be construed in terms of response conditioning, sound waves, neural impulses, brain patterns. It is, in other words, a sequence of happenings, which takes place among material beings and is, in this respect, not utterly different from a solar eclipse, glandular secretion, or nuclear fusion.

But one day the father utters the word ‘ball’ and his son suddenly understands that his father does not mean find the ball, or where is the ball, but, rather, this is a ball - the word ‘ball’ means this round thing.

Something has happened. We may quarrel about the good and bad of it - some saying with the Polish semanticists that
what has happened is a major catastrophe for the human race, some saying with Helen Keller that what has happened is nothing less than the discovery of the world and the coming to oneself as a person - but beyond any doubt, something has happened.

Naming brings about a new orientation toward the world. Prior to naming things, the individual is an organism responding to his environment: he is never more nor less than what he is; he either flourishes or he does not flourish. A tiger is a tiger, no more, no less, whether he is a sick tiger or a flourishing tiger. But as soon as an individual becomes a name-giver or a hearer of a name, he no longer coincides with what he is biologically. Henceforth, he must exist either authentically or inauthentically. An organism exists in the biological scale of flourishing-not-flourishing; a person exists in the normative scale of authentic-inauthentic. The scales are not the same. A person may flourish biologically while, at the same time, living a desperately alienated and anonymous life, or a person may be sick biologically and, at the same time - perhaps even as a result of it - live authentically. In the joy of naming, one lives authentically.

Again, speaking of Helen Keller, Percy writes,

We walked down the path to the well-house, attracted by the fragrance of the honeysuckle with which it was covered. Someone was drawing water and my teacher placed my hand under the spout. As the cool stream gushed over one hand, she spelled into the other the word water, first slowly then rapidly. I stood still, my whole attention fixed upon the motion of her fingers. Suddenly I felt a misty consciousness as of something forgotten - a thrill of returning thought; and somehow the mystery of language was revealed to me. I knew then that ‘w-a-t-e-r’ meant the wonderful cool something that was flowing over my hand. That living word awakened my soul, gave it light, hope, joy, set it free! There were barriers still, it is true, but barriers that could in time be swept away.

I left the well-house eager to learn. Everything had a name, and each name gave birth to a new thought. As we returned to the house every object which I touched seemed to quiver with life. That was because I saw everything with the strange, new sight that had come to me. On entering the door I remembered the doll I had broken. [She had
earlier destroyed the doll in a fit of temper.] I felt my way to the hearth and picked up the pieces. I tried vainly to put them together. Then my eyes filled with tears; for I realized what I had done, and for the first time I felt repentance and sorrow.

....before, Helen had behaved like a good responding organism. Afterward, she acted like a rejoicing symbol-mongering human. Before, she was little more than an animal. Afterward, she became wholly human. Within the few minutes of the breakthrough and the several hours of exploiting it Helen had concentrated the months of the naming phase that most children go through somewhere around their second birthday. 14

Like this excerpt from Helen Keller, the story of Genesis in the Bible tells of Adam, the first man, being commissioned by God to name the animals. Naming is very significant. In naming, the inherent meaning in creation is recognizable. "What’s lost in modernity is the sense that reality as such is a gift, that the good and the true are first inherent in things by virtue of their creation by God; that meaning bears a religious sense, a movement from and toward the transcendent." 15

It may be said that whatever touches the biological nature of sex touches the person and value of man. In this truth, the Church recognizes the great unifying power, inherent to sex, proclaiming it to communicate eternal life as manifested by the necessity of indissolubility that is Marriage. The Church acknowledges that in people’s freedom, they may make of themselves a gift to one another, forming a covenant with one another in and through God. The marital embrace of sexual intercourse consummates and manifests the already existing unity accomplished in the words spoken at the altar. From this, one may see the immorality of premarital sex. It communicates a unity that does not exist without the formal union of man and woman. This summary, again, oversimplifies the truth of marriage. However, for the sake of
maintained focus on the question at hand, the controversy of condoms even in acceptance of marriage continues.

**Controversy within the Church**

Nowhere in the Catechism of the Catholic Church, does it explicitly say that condoms cannot be used for the prevention of HIV/AIDS. The catechism states;

> Periodic continence, that is, the methods of birth regulation based on self-observation and the use of infertile periods, is in conformity with the objective criteria of morality. These methods respect the bodies of the spouses, encourage tenderness between them, and favor the education of an authentic freedom. In contrast, ‘every action which, whether in anticipation of the conjugal act, or in its accomplishment, or in the development of its natural consequences, proposes, whether as an end or as a means, to render procreation impossible’ is intrinsically evil: Thus the innate language that expresses the total reciprocal self-giving of husband and wife is overlaid, through contraception, by an objectively contradictory language, namely, that of not giving oneself totally to the other. This leads not only to a falsification of the inner truth of conjugal love, which is called upon to give itself in personal totality….The difference, both anthropological and moral, between contraception and recourse to the rhythm of the cycle...involves in the final analysis two irreconcilable concepts of the human person and of human sexuality.16

Clearly, the Catholic Church proclaims the evils of contraception in light of the contradiction that it is to the totality of gift that husband and wife are to each other.

The Catholic Church, guided by the Holy Spirit, sees through the cognitive paradigm of Traditional Natural Law, in which Faith is embraced first fundamentally, thereby allowing for freedom of mystery, while reason follows, holding true through its instrumentality in bringing to light understanding of the mystery of Faith. The Catholic Church proclaims
that we understand Divine Love in light of the body. Pope John Paul the Great wrote abundantly on the Theology of the Body. That is to say, people understand God through the body!

The highest-ranking official of the Vatican to suggest the legitimacy of condoms is Cardinal Georges Cottier, the theologian to the pontifical household. Clarifying from the start, while speaking to the Italian press agency Apcom in February, that his thoughts shared on this topic remain his “strictly personal” opinion, he is not speaking for the Holy See. Cardinal Cottier believes that under the very limited circumstances such as when people are “prisoners” of unusual circumstances and the condoms are used solely for the purpose of HIV/AIDS prevention, there may be legitimacy to their use. He stated that “along with life, there is the risk of also transmitting death” if the sexual partner is HIV-positive from which he concluded that “one must respect the defense of life,” adhering to the command, “Thou shall not kill.” He acknowledged that the condom is not the most effective means of overcoming the epidemic when he said, “It diminishes the danger contagion, but that danger remains.”

Bishop Kevin Dowling was one of the first to call on the Church to reconsider her absolute ban on the use of condoms in 2001. Dowling is a South African Bishop whose nation is most severely enslaved in the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Following his call, the local bishops of South Africa acted by virtually endorsing condom use in marriages where one or both spouses are HIV/AIDS infected. The argument of double effect may seem applicable to the situation in which one spouse is infected, as will be addressed shortly. However, in the circumstance of both spouses being infected with HIV/AIDS, it would not be necessary to use contraception given Catholic teaching on Natural Family
Planning. The couple may share in the intimacy of sexual intercourse during the infertile periods of the woman if they do not wish to conceive. Because they are both infected, it would be unnecessary to make an argument that they should be allowed to use condoms as the Catholics arguing for condoms are presenting their use as a means to preventing HIV/AIDS, not pregnancy. Shortly after Bishop Dowling’s statement, he restated his view on condom use as an instrument to combating HIV/AIDS. Dowling proposed that the use of condoms in very limited circumstances may be viewed as “the lesser of two evils.” The South African Bishops condemned the use of condoms for unmarried couples, suggesting that the unrestricted use of condoms would only lead to greater promiscuity. Still the discussion continues.

In late July, the Southern African Bishops’ Conference released a statement saying the promotion of condom use to combat HIV/AIDS was an “immoral and misguided weapon against the disease.” However, still left open was the option for married couples to decide for themselves how to defend against the disease when one of them is already infected. Dowling explained that the process of moral education would be slow. “We must promote a prevention strategy where people will be challenged if they are not going to follow essential values for prevention, then at least they must take account of their responsibility as a human being in sexual activity not to transmit death and use a condom to prevent it.” The final statement from the Southern African Bishops’ Conference, released July 30, stepped back from Dowling’s appeal to the lesser evil principle and said that the promotion of condoms for AIDS prevention, especially by governments, “is a matter of deep concern for us in the Church.” The statement emphasized that condoms do not guarantee protection against AIDS and
that they “change the beautiful act of love into a selfish search for pleasure, while rejecting responsibility.”

Those Catholics advocating condom use as a means to HIV/AIDS prevention are presenting their argument within the parameters of double effect. The principle of double effect is credited to the thoughts of Thomas Aquinas. According to the principle of double effect, an action that is good in itself, which has two effects, an intended and otherwise not reasonably attainable good effect, and a foreseen, but merely permitted poor effect, may licitly be performed so long as there is a due proportion between the intended good and the permitted evil. “At the level of principle, the Church’s teaching is that the only legitimate sexual activity is between husband and wife, and must always be open to life,” said Redemptorist Fr. Brian Johnstone. “Therefore contraception is always wrong.”

“The issue here, however, is one of pastoral application. Does the use of a condom where one partner is infected and the other isn’t, and the intent is to prevent disease, necessarily constitute contraception?”

Those Catholics advocating the use of condoms for the prevention of HIV/AIDS argue that the act of having sexual intercourse within marriage while one spouse is infected with HIV/AIDS without transmitting the virus to an uninfected spouse or an innocent child who might be conceived through the act is certainly a good act in itself. This is only possible, however, with the use of some barrier to the infection, the condom. As a result of the condom’s use, procreation is rendered impossible. The only time procreation could be possible would be when the condom was ineffective in preventing the virus’ transmission. Recall that “every action which, whether in
anticipation of the conjugal act, or in its accomplishment, or in the development of its natural consequences, proposes, whether as an end or as a means, to render procreation impossible’ is intrinsically evil.” Clearly the unintended evil is the rendering of procreation impossible. The intended good of preventing HIV/AIDS would be accomplished as immediately as the unintended evil of rendering procreation impossible. Further, Catholics condoning the use of condoms may follow through with the well thought out clause that condoms can only be used morally at the time when the couple would not conceive naturally anyway according to the woman’s cycle, following more closely to the Church’s teachings of Natural Family Planning. Still, the same unintended evil of rendering procreation impossible persists. It would seem justifiable under the principle of double effect to consider the use of condoms for the prevention of HIV/AIDS morally acceptable. This, however, is not the case.

The principle of double effect clearly states that an action that is good in itself, which has two effects, an intended and otherwise not reasonably attainable good effect and a foreseen, but merely permitted poor effect, may licitly be performed so long as there is a due proportion between the intended good and the permitted evil. Certain questions must then be asked. What is the goal? Is sexual intercourse an act that must be performed between a married couple to express Love, or is sexual intercourse a very special gift from God that is a most sacred way of making a gift of oneself to his/her spouse to show Christ’s Love for His Church? St. Paul wrote,

> Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ. Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church, his body, and is himself its Savior. As the Church is subject to Christ, so let wives also be subject in everything to their husbands. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved
the Church and gave himself up for her, that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the Church to himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that she might be holy and without blemish. Even so husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself (Ephesians 5:21-28).

For husbands to love their wives with the fullest love, that is, with Christ’s Love, sacrifice is vital. How does Christ Love the Church? Christ says, “This is my Body, given up for you” (Luke 22:19). Christ was crucified. Christ died to Himself, and in dying He experienced the Resurrection, the Christian paradox of Life through death. When a husband and wife come together in sexual intercourse, each of them lays down his/her life for the other. “This is my Body, given up for you.” When a husband and wife come together in sexual intercourse, they make a gift of self in knowledge that each is good, is a gift, for the other. There are times when a husband and wife will freely choose to make a gift of self by abstaining from sexual intercourse not out of ignorance of Love, but because of Love. This is real sacrifice and this is real Love. If sexual intercourse is considered an absolutely necessary act to showing Love, then the goal is to prevent the transmission of HIV/AIDS in sexual intercourse. It is understood that sexual intercourse is necessary for a couple to consummate marriage for the marriage to be valid. However, if it would not be loving to have sexual intercourse without a condom, then it would not be loving to have sexual intercourse. The love they are seeking to share would not be marital love, which is intimate, exclusive, and indissoluble, joining a man and woman’s life for each other’s good and the procreation and education of children. Sexual intercourse is necessary for this kind of love. From this goal of preventing HIV/AIDS infection within sexual intercourse, condoms would be necessary.
This goal is not the correct goal, however. Recall St. Paul referring to Christ’s Love for the Church. Recall Jesus’ example of Love, dying and rising. The goal is not to prevent the transmission of HIV/AIDS in sexual intercourse. The goal is to prevent the transmission of HIV/AIDS. There is another way to preventing HIV/AIDS. In fact, there is only one way of fully preventing HIV/AIDS transmitted through sex...that is, abstaining from sex.

Upon hearing this, so many cringe and conclude that the Church is too harsh and insensitive towards the person infected or married to an infected person or that the Church is not being realistic. Some make the argument that people are going to do it anyway, so they may as well be “protected.” The Church is not being insensitive. The Church understands the high calling and sacrifice that this is. She responds to Christ’s Love in the Good News she preaches. Lowering the bar of morality is not an option. Truth is truth, regardless of what people say. It is not determined by the Church, only discerned, discovered, and proclaimed. At a 2000 Vatican conference on AIDS, Camillian Fr. Felice Ruffini, undersecretary to the Pontifical Council for Health Care Workers, said that even in marriage in which one partner is infected with HIV, condom use is always prohibited. “Certainly, it’s difficult, it’s tough to be able to maintain matrimonial chastity in this case,” Ruffini said, but moralists cannot make “an exception to Christ’s law.”

The Church puts her faith in Jesus Christ, and is simply responding to and inviting mankind to answer that clarion call to Love. If a couple is married and one or both spouses are infected with HIV/AIDS, they may still express their love without sexual intercourse. It may be possible that they can still choose to express their love with sexual intercourse after weighing the consequences of possible transmission to the other and/or the likelihood of a child from their union. By abstaining, they are not
refusing Love. Rather, by abstaining together they are Loving by making a gift of themselves for the other because it is good. They are ensuring the well being of the other. There is real responsibility required to Love rightly. Some people would rather die than abstain from sex. The truth is, if a person is really being a gift and receiving a gift, there is real giving. For one who would rather die than abstain from sex, his ‘yes’ to sex and to marriage holds no bearing. For if he cannot say ‘no,’ he cannot say ‘yes.’ He is bound in the chains of selfish lust and a slave to his cravings. The ache he experiences is a call to die to self so that he might have Life! Christ is ALIVE! Grace is REAL. At the Sermon on the Mount, Christ calls us to perfection when he says, “Be perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect”26. The Church recognizes that full and lasting happiness, i.e Heaven, will be more and more realized the closer a person is to perfection. This is only possible if a person has a relationship with Jesus Christ. Faithfulness and abstinence are possible with grace from our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and are the truest weapons in this battle. Even if condoms had been considered acceptable, they are still defective.

According to a meta-analysis performed by the Center for Disease Control (CDC), the efficacy rates for condoms ranged from 87%-96%. The numbers of HIV/AIDS transmissions appear to be much less because condoms are being used. Still, if there is even the knowledge of the possibility of transmission, why would one take this chance of death on the person he/she loves. Also, the fact is that the availability of condoms condones the promiscuous acts of people in society (extramarital affairs, multiple sex partners etc.). The root of the problem is more easily overlooked with the presence of condoms. The problem is not that people do not have enough condoms. The problem is the immoral decay of society. To solve a problem, it is vital that it is uprooted, not
simply maintained. Pope John Paul the Great understood this all to well. He understood the reality of Jesus Christ. Truly, we do not know Christ if we believe he came to earth, died, and rose to New Life so that we may have “sin maintenance” as a gift from God. That sounds ridiculous, but that is exactly what is being suggested in the proposition of condoms for any reason.

Author Christopher West, in discussing John Paul the Great’s Theology of the Body in his book Good News About Sex and Marriage, reminds the reader of the anthropological introductions of this paper when he writes,

...the two realities (physical and spiritual) cannot be separated. To do so is actually to fall into an age-old heresy in the Church known as dualism. Dualism makes a divorce in human nature between what is physical and what is spiritual. But human beings are an indivisible marriage of flesh and spirit, body and soul. We’re not persons “in” a body that can be dispensed with. We’re body-persons. This means that our spiritual reality as human beings is expressed through our bodies as male and female...Pope John Paul II says, any attempt to break the personal unity of soul and body “strikes at God’s creation itself at the level of the deepest interaction of nature and person.”

In light of this, the barrier caused by a condom is more than just the physical prevention of semen containing HIV. The condom, in fact, communicates a lie. While the marital embrace makes visible the union of husband and wife in their full gift of self to their beloved, the presence of the condom in the marital embrace communicates a holding back and incomplete receptivity, which is contrary to what marriage is and what sexual intercourse has been given to communicate.
Science Affirms the Truth

The philosophical proposition of Hylomorphism and religious faith of the Church receives reason as a gift from God that may affirm the truth that has been revealed by Jesus Christ. The physical world communicates invisible realities of the transcendent world. In seeing the human person consisting of the unified nature of body and soul, the mission begins to gather scientific evidence, understanding that the physical world holds inherent meaning from the Creator.

There exists a responsibility among healthcare professionals and the entire medical community to find common ground and to offer the most accurate information available on how to avoid HIV/AIDS. The scientific community has called for implementation of programs that have clear evidence of their effectiveness.

Perhaps the most well known evidence of effectiveness are the cases in Uganda, which embraced the ABC method (Abstain, Be faithful, and Condom use). Surprisingly, it is difficult to find statistics on Uganda in many of the peer reviewed articles. The Bush Administration is basing its AIDS initiative on the success of Uganda, which has experienced the most success in fighting AIDS than any other country. Studies found that from 1991 to 2001, the rates of HIV infection declined from 15 to 5 percent. Pregnant women in Kampala, which is the capital of Uganda, experienced a decrease from 30 to 10 percent in HIV infections. Data from the Ugandan method has been recognized as sufficient and effective by USAID, the Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the World Health Organization (WHO), the Harvard Center for Population and Developmental Studies, the Ugandan government, and various independent studies published in medical journals. The various reports agree on one
central fact: abstinence and reduction in number of sexual partners, not condoms, were the most important causes of the behavioral changes linked to the decrease in HIV/AIDS seen in Uganda. In the Demographic and Health Survey performed by Uganda in the 2000-2001 year, it was discovered that 93 percent of Ugandans changed their sexual behaviours to avoid AIDS. This is dramatic. From the years of 1989 to 1995, the numbers dropped from 41 to 21 percent in the number of Ugandan males who had more than one partner. As for females, the numbers dropped as low as 9 percent. In the same years, researchers found that young people reported a drop in the premarital sex rate from 60 to 23 percent among young men and 53 to 16 percent among young women. Those who reported never having had sex at the age of 15 increased from 20 to 50 percent over that same period.31

As for condoms in the battle against AIDS in Uganda, they were used only as a last resort for those in especially high risk areas. Of the condoms distributed, 91 percent went unused. This method is drastically different from most US and foreign health organizations including the USAID, Centers for Disease Control, UNAIDS, and World Bank, who focus primarily on condom education and distribution to combat the problem of AIDS. This is alarming, considering that when the AIDS virus is contracted widely throughout a society, as is the case in Africa, condoms have proven to be the least effective means of controlling it. UNAIDS reports that no definite examples of epidemics are being solved by programs based on condom promotion. This is seen as those countries with the highest levels of condom availability such as Zimbabwe, Botswana, South Africa, and Kenya have the world’s highest HIV prevalence rates.32
Some of the most vital players in the success story of Uganda have been the religious organizations including Christian, Muslim, and Jewish traditions. These faith based organizations were included from the beginning of the national promotion of abstinence and faithfulness. The Ugandan government welcomed and invited religious organizations to participate in this cultural movement. The organizations were essential in fighting the stigma associated with persons infected with HIV/AIDS and showed great compassion for those persons suffering from the disease while, at the same time, challenging and encouraging behavioral changes of all the people. Religious Faith and anthropological insight provided the “why” that became the “how” in the question of “what” to do in this epidemic. From the movement promoting abstinence and faithfulness also came movement for women in being treated with equal dignity. A recent study cited in the article by Loconte stated that Ugandan women ranked first among all African nations in their ability to refuse unwanted sex.33

In July of 2004 a study was published studying youth of South Africa, the world’s leader in HIV/AIDS prevalence. Questionnaires were distributed to 2,430 consenting youth ages 15-24. The study found that the median age for sexual debut was 16.5 years. Twenty four percent of youth abstained from sexual intercourse in the past 12 months. Among males and females respectively, 52.8 and 47.6 percent reported using a condom at their last sexual intercourse. Seventy four percent had discussed HIV prevention with their partners in the past 12 months.34 The study claims that these are good signs because the number of people using condoms has increased. There is not, however, any direct evidence showing that this increase in condom use has caused any decrease in the transmission of HIV/AIDS.
Another peer reviewed article by authors Naomi Starkman, J.D. and Nicole Rajani, M.A challenges abstinence only education claiming that there is little evidence that abstinence only programs are successful in encouraging teenagers to abstain. They express concern with the $135 million (30% increase) being spent on abstinence only education as they claim that such programs restrict students access to information on sexuality and contraception. The proposal of the authors is comprehensive sex-education, which emphasizes abstinence and its benefits while also teaching about contraception and prevention of disease. They claim that only comprehensive sex education has been proven to reduce rates of teen pregnancy and STD infection.35 There were no statistics included in the article to show as evidence of the claim being made.

A similar claim is made by Pam Willen, who says that based on 15 years of research, comprehensive sexuality education programs for youth that encourage abstinence, while teaching about contraception, and teach sexual communication skills are the programs responsible for success in stopping the spread of HIV/Infection. The accusation is made again that little scientific evidence exists to show that abstinence only education works. The article states that the few studies that have been performed showing evidence of success have very limited generalizability because appropriate comparison groups were not used in the sampling strategies, causing an increase for bias in the studies.36 Nowhere in the article was there presented any hard evidence showing the success of comprehensive sexuality education programs.
Conclusion

It was alarming how difficult it was to find statistics from the study of Uganda to show hard evidence as to the success being experienced by the country. There arises from such experience a question as to why such and what challenges are present in the modeling of Uganda’s success. Most of Africa lacks the health care infrastructure that is necessary to treat deadly diseases effectively. Most of their governments are unprepared or too corrupt to face the AIDS crisis seriously. As seen from much of the research, international AIDS organizations seem to ignore the success in Uganda as they believe the answer to the epidemic is primarily condoms, not behavioral changes of abstinence and faithfulness. Their success has yet to be realized.

The research on abstinence-only education is scarce as it seems to be disregarded as religiously based and unrealistic for youth. The case in Uganda claims that such a paradigm is deeply flawed. It seems that condoms have been proven to reduce the chances of a person acquiring HIV/AIDS. Therefore the assumption is made that if condoms are distributed, there will be a decrease in HIV/AIDS prevalence. Many studies are discovering that increased condom use is occurring. However, the bridge between increased condom use and decreased HIV/AIDS has remained an assumption. The hard evidence for such an assumption has not been realized. What has been realized is the success of a cultural change in Uganda. The research presented bridges the subjective experiences of mankind to the objective Truth of reality. The time has come. The Truth is not afraid of the questions people have. The question is, are people afraid of the Truth?
At the root of the AIDS epidemic is a battle over what it means to be human. The Church offers a vision of human sexuality that recognizes the subjective experiences of each and every human person in relation to the objectivity that exists in being human. Such insight shares knowledge that is necessary for healing of the human person to be realized.

Condoms address an exclusively physical problem. The reality is, however, that the problem is inclusively physical, but also consists of wounds in the human soul. The sexual abuse that exists in the world is a symptom of much deeper wounds in the human person. Condoms aim fuel to an already existing fire in the human heart that aches to be quenched.

Abstinence only education is inadequate as well if it is simply a ‘no’ to sex and a repression of the desire to have sexual intercourse. Neither repression nor indulgence are answers offering any lasting consolation to the human person. Theology of the Body offers Redemption of such desires, whereby the desires of the human person are formed in virtuous habits. Indeed, it is a call for a cultural change, a forming to a culture of life.

It is difficult to discuss such theological dissertation in a society poisoned by relativism. The message, however, is one of great joy for all the world. The research performed may act as a bridge between the bodies of faith and reason. The truth waits to be discovered by each person in his/her subjective experience of life. In a world that is dying and desperate for hope there comes a voice, “Be not afraid.”

The mystery submitted to in Faith is infinite and cannot fit into our finite minds. We are invited to live in the mystery, not to cram it into our tiny minds. The Truth is the great,
timeless mystery, not that it is separate from time. Rather it is not confined by time while it penetrates cultures of all times. As cultures transform and transfigure, the Truth is the moral fabric that weaves these transformations into a life-giving continuum of culture.

In the end, the only way that one can propose Christianity is the way Jesus proposed it, through living a life, and within that being able to articulate reasons, to “give and account for the hope that is in you.” Our tendency is always to thing first of a project. And that has its place, but I think none of this really is fruitful except through loving people and forming friendships because, in the final analysis, people are moved in the context of a relation. You love them, they are attracted, and that becomes an invitation to respond in a certain way. But we also need to understand that Jesus does not promise us “success,” but only Resurrection, and resurrection presupposes death. Away of friendship that doesn’t involve in some significant sense a crucifixion is not Jesus’ way of friendship.37

The Church invites the Truth of the human person to be seen. Uganda has tasted just some of the fruits that await this hungry world. With this Good News proclaimed, chastity may take root and be seen and experienced as the freedom it truly offers. For too long has the HIV/AIDS crisis been addressed at the exclusive level of physicality. The time has come for the person to be seen again and healed. Through the healing will come a great re-discovery of humanity, one whose many fruits will be a victory in this battle against HIV/AIDS.
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