Ignatius would be Indignant: Why Paying for Someone to Have Sex at Georgetown is Ludicrous
by Bob Moeller, D.Min.

As an alumnus of Georgetown University (I attended two summers of classes in debate and rhetoric there in the early 70's), I find the current controversy ignited by a female law school student there who is demanding that you and I pay for her birth control pills, somewhat bewildering, if not altogether nonsensical. For those of you not following the news as of late, a certain female Georgetown Law Student testified before a Congressional Committee this week that it is prohibitively expensive for her to pay for her own birth control pills. She believes she is entitled, as an American, to have you and I pay for her active sex life even though she is single, highly educated, and attending one of the most expensive law schools in the country.

Allow me to raise a number of questions for which I have not yet received satisfying answers:

1. A spiritual question: Why is this student attending a school that was founded by the Society of Jesus, Ignatius Loyola to be specific, that has as one their foundational goals, "achieving moral excellence?" I quote from one of the Jesuits' own websites, "The Jesuit tradition prizes the life of the mind, viewing it as a path to the integration of the intellectual and moral aspects of personal and social life. From the beginning, Jesuits believed "that scholarly excellence was vitally important because of the role it played in achieving moral excellence."1 Does a single law student engaging in regular sexual activity outside of marriage fit well with the Jesuit vision of Georgetown University as a training ground for "moral excellence?" Perhaps she needs to consider transferring to a school committed to "moral mediocrity," that is, one more compatible with her open lifestyle.

2. A medical question: In an age of rampant sexually transmitted diseases and the threat of AIDS, why is the current call of our government to provide birth control pills? Why this rather than other forms of contraception given that The Pill offers zero protection against STD's (not to mention documented studies proving it significantly raises the risks later in life for breast cancer, stroke and infertility)? Isn't this encouraging high risk behavior which just a few years ago our government told us we were to avoid at all costs (recall the 1990's era television ads paid for by the Department of Health and Human Services that extolled the virtues of condoms and roundly condemned unprotected sex)?

3. A legal question: Since when is helping people enjoy worry free sex in terms of pregnancy the domain of the Federal government? Under which Article of the Constitution is the federal government specifically empowered to use all its delegated powers and authority to prevent someone from having a baby? Then again proponents of the measure will argue this is precisely what the Framers of the Constitution had in mind when they stated their intent in the Preamble, "to form a more perfect union."
4. A practical question: If engaging in sex is a selective rather than compulsory behavior, why isn’t the government also providing mandatory coverage for other optional lifestyle habits such as weight loss programs for those who overeat, debt counseling classes for those who overspend, and hang-over medications for those who drink too much? While we’re at it, why not pay for better tires for those who like to speed or windshield replacement costs for feel compelled to chase storms?

5. A social question: Whatever happened to the term "fornication?" to describe the very behavior that we are supposed to be funding? There was a time when sexual activity outside of marriage was stigmatized by such terms associated with it. They did so primarily because society recognized it as poor behavior lacking in moral character and detrimental to the welfare of the common good. Perhaps it is no coincidence that as the incidence of co-habitation (once called "shacking up") has been on the rise in America, so the rate of marriage has also declined. With the decline of marriage has come a host of new social ills, including increased incidences of domestic violence, child abuse and generational poverty.

6. A character question: What kind of men is the student having sex with anyway, given the fact they apparently won’t even offer to pay for her birth control? Perhaps more than our government providing birth control pills for the hapless co-ed, the HHS should consider providing relational self-esteem counseling for her and others who appear to fit the profile of women "who love too much."

7. A financial question: Why is it, given that Georgetown’s University’s own website lists the cost of tuition and housing per year at slightly more than $65,000.00 per year, that this student cannot afford the $15 to $30 a month to cover the cost of contraception (that’s a measly $180 to $360 per year -- half of 1% of her school costs). Perhaps with governmental tuition assistance to attend Dave Ramsey’s Financial Peace University and some needed budgeting guidance the law student can resolve her current monetary crisis.

A closing question: Why again is it my civic obligation to fund someone's active libido lifestyle? To use an analogy, why should I have to pay for my neighbor's taxi rides home simply because he likes to get drunk every weekend? And in the larger scheme of things am I really helping doing him or doing society a service by doing so? We used to call such misdirected compassion for what it is -- co-dependence.

This law student honestly believes that what she is asking for is for the good of her and others. Sooner or later, however, she will have to face the sober reality that life is made of either consequences or results. As the ancient wisdom of Proverbs observes, "There is a way that seems right to a person but in the end leads only to ruin." It is the moral and spiritual choices we make today that determine which we will receive tomorrow. And that is our responsibility to bear and ours alone. And no one else should have to pay for it.