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PREFACE

This thesis extract is part of a project in the Moral theology department whose objective is to study the impact of personalism in theology and anthropology which serves as a basis to the Conciliar doctrine on the key questions of marriage. These key issues include conjugal love and the articulation of the goods and ends of marriage with matrimonial love. Here, our investigation will be centred on the post en Vatican II Council theological bibliography.

There is sufficient evidence from an analysis of the texts and external arguments, that the Vatican II Council approaches the question of marriage from a clearly personalistic perspective. This is an indication that the Fathers of the Council, on expounding the matrimonial theme, were greatly influenced by the new thinking in moral theology. This renewal had developed from the 1930's which was a continuation of the efforts initiated by the Tübingen School. This new understanding of marriage in the Church was to play a very significant role in theology up to our days and even beyond.

The topic of marriage under the heading: Some more urgent problems which also include culture, economic and social life, politics and peace is treated in part II of the Constitution of The Church in the Modern World, Gaudium et spes. The dignity of marriage and the family occupies the whole of the first chapter. Part I of the same Constitution, entitled: The Church and man's vocation, develops the anthropological aspect inspired in a particular way by the French personalists, e.g., E. Mounier, J. Lacroix and M. Nédoncelle. In the decree Apostolicam Actuositatem, on the Lay People, it is pointed out that the family especially the married couple has to play a major role in the formation of the children (AA 11). In the decree Optatam Totius, on the Training of Priests, proper knowledge of the duties of Christian marriage is emphasized (OT 10). However, it is in GS that the Magisterium for the first time presents marriage as a «community of life and love» (GS 48).
The post-Vatican II Magisterium in its theology (e.g., in Humanae Vitae, Familiaris Consortio, Donum Vitae, Gratissimam Sane, Evangelium Vitae) and the Canon Law (CIC 1983) embraces the personalistic view on the matrimonial theme, treating topics like married love, the goods and ends of marriage and its connection to marital love. There has been profound understanding and the development of the doctrine of marriage amidst confusions and oppositions from some quarters outside and even in the Church. The Magisterium has continually taught and clarified the Church’s stand especially in the question of marital love, conjugal act, marriage as a vocation, accentuation of the goods and the ends of marriage, etc., which were significantly a great achievement of the Vatican II Council.

Today despite all the odds, marriage continues to play an important role in the society. Marriage is an institution found in all groups of people all over the world. Different cultures express the same reality of the married relationship in diverse ways. Traditionally, we have had polygamous or monogamous societies. With the changes and the development in the world of science and technology, the society in general is affected and naturally this is registered in the marriage union and the family. The marriage institution has been influenced positively and negatively needless to say by these cultural changes.

In the 20th century, especially in the last 30 years, marriage has undergone a metamorphosis which provoked our study. With the changes in the family system — the changing role of women in the society, contraceptives, fewer children, rural-urban immigration —, the traditional marriage set-up has evidently evolved. Notable is the influence of the sexual revolution of the 60’s with the introduction of the contraceptive pill. The married, and even the unmarried could now satisfy their sexual gratification without the fear of «unwanted» babies. The 70’s saw the legalization of abortion, and the introduction of the making of babies apart from the sexual union via artificial insemination and artificial fertilization. The results are that our society has adapted a new culture, the contraceptive culture. In fact, ours has become a hedonistic society, interested only in quenching the sexual gratification of the moment.

However, the marriage institution still has its boat rowing, but the waters are rough and the waves are hitting hard from all sides almost making it capsize. We experience marital unions marked by insincerity, infidelity, contraceptive behaviour, child-free unions, separations, annulments, divorces, single parents, gay and lesbian unions, etc. It seems that the marriage values have been traded in for vices.
Despite this dull picture, there are couples who faithfully follow the teaching of the Church on the noble ends of marriage. Spouses who are interested with sharing their love faithfully and generously responding to the call of co-operating with the Creator in bringing new life into the world. Yes, there are married couples who are schooled in chastity and self-mastery as they practice periodic abstinence and enjoy the NFP method.

Our research was prompted to study the reality of marriage, seeing how it has been negatively influenced with a view of seeking ways of maintaining the God-given design of a loving fidelity. A fidelity that is generously open to life and the education of children.

**Objective**

The objective of this project is to study the theology of marriage and sexuality in the post-Conciliar years. We shall investigate on the key questions on marriage: conjugal love and the unifying and procreating meanings of sexuality.

Our contribution will therefore be; —towards the understanding of the doctrinal development which has undoubtedly influenced the matrimonial love—. This we shall do by emphasizing the theological and anthropological proceedings of the renewal and seeking a better understanding of moral theology in the understanding of sexuality and married love. This will be with a view of perhaps looking for a better way of carrying out this renewal. We hope to unveil the underlying theological-anthropological propositions in the plan of action of this renewal that do not conform to the Church teaching.

**How do we propose to elaborate our work?**

Since our objective is to study the influence cum effects of the personalistic attitude on matrimonial ethics, we shall attempt to make an analysis of the bibliography on marriage on topics like matrimonial love, conjugal relationships, contraception, the goods and ends of marriage, etc., in the post-Vatican II theology.

Concretely, we hope to make an analytical study of the post-Vatican II bibliography on the themes of marriage and contraception, mainly from the decisive influence of *Humanae Vitae*. Many articles have been written in books and periodicals in support or against the HV teaching.
Our aim is therefore, to research on the question of marriage as presented in these articles. We shall study topics related to marriage for example, conjugal love, conjugal act, contraception, the goods and ends of marriage, procreation, etc. We shall investigate on what is new in terms of the ideas or the manner of presentation indicating the emphasis, the tone, and style.

In order to discover the development of the Moral Theology in recent years, our study will incorporate an evaluation in the light of the recent magisterial documents. These include *Humanae Vitae, Donum Vitae, Evangelium Vitae, Familiaris Consortio, Gratissimum Sane*.

WHERE DO WE BASE OUR STUDY?

We hope to study this topic of marital love and contraception in a select English bibliography. To be precise we are going to focus our attention on periodicals mainly edited in the United States of America, narrowing our focus in «*Homiletic and Pastoral Review*», from the year 1969 to 1988.

We propose to investigate on what this periodical treats, its emphasis and methodology. We shall later make a synthesis of the findings.

We shall examine if the articles presented in the periodical paint the picture of marriage as a communion of life and love. If they do —how far and in what ways—. If they do not —what do they underline as regards marriage—. What has been their influence and what do they offer for the better understanding of married love, contraception, the goods and ends of marriage, etc.

Recourse shall also be made to articles in books that could be relevant to deepen the understanding of the themes drawn from the periodical on marriage as a community of shared life and love: married love and contraception.

OUR METHODOLOGY

We will study articles in «*Homiletic and Pastoral Review*» to see what and how it presents the above mentioned issues on marital love. We hope to find out: what topics or themes are recurrent, and discover how the different authors base their arguments. Do we encounter continuity, disagreements or differences? What has influenced the positions that held? What positive contribution can we underline?

Having made an analytical synthesis of the articles, we will then be in a position to wind up our study by way of a conclusion. Before
then however, it will serve the purpose to make an evaluation in the light of the official teaching office of the Church. We shall therefore be screening the positions held by the articles on this important question of married love and contraception for its conformity or non-conformity to the post-Vatican II Magisterial teaching.

We present our work in four chapters. Since the Encyclical *Humanae Vitae* has influenced the present state of marriage in a big way, we treat it briefly in our first chapter. We also make a presentation of the periodical «Homiletic and Pastoral Review». Marriage and its openness to life is the subject of our second chapter, where we shall present our findings on the two meanings of marriage—unitive and procreative. Here too, NFP is proposed as means of keeping the unitive and procreative aspects inseparable.

Chapter three deals with contraception; the contraceptive mentality, sexuality without procreation, and procreation apart from the sexual act. In the fourth chapter we make an evaluation of our findings in the light of the Magisterial teaching of Popes Paul VI, John Paul I, and John Paul II. We wind up our work by way of a conclusion, with suggestions on renewal of the marriage theology.

* * *
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In this extract we present only part of our thesis that gives a background on the contraceptive culture and its influence on the two dimensions of marriage: the unitive and procreative. The periodical «Homiletic and Pastoral Review» represents a faithful and objective stand towards understanding the Church's teaching on human sexuality and married love. Our basis or better emphasis will be based on the encyclical letter of Pope Paul VI on Human Life; *Humanae Vitae*.

1. THE PERIODICAL «HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW»

Although the discussion on the role of contraception in married love was very alive before the Vatican II Council, it took a dramatic change with the issuance of the encyclical on Human Life. This papal document initiated a great polemic in the Catholic Church, in the Christian world, in the media and the general public. Many theologians raised their voices contributing either in support or against the Church’s teaching while others remained indifferent. This polemic is well documented by diverse authors in articles in books and periodicals. One of these journals is «Homiletic and Pastoral Review».

«Homiletic and Pastoral Review» is the premiere publication for clergy and laity interested in pastoral issues, offering practical insights into living, celebrating and spreading the Catholic Faith today. «Homiletic and Pastoral Review» provides pastors and the lay faithful up-to-date, yet authentically Catholic articles on pressing moral, theological and liturgical matters. Each issue includes outstanding homilies for Sundays and holy days by some of today’s top homilists. Also included are book reviews and practical, insightful questions and answers by one of America’s leading moral theologians, Msgr. William Smith, as well as informative, faith-filled articles.

The themes of the articles published range from spirituality, sacramental theology, liturgy, Canon Law, morality, doctrinal questions, socio-economic problems, war and arms, etc. We could therefore, confidently say that the aim of «Homiletic and Pastoral Review», is to offer practical help and suggestions to difficult and current theological issues to Christians as a whole. In particular, it is directed to Catholics with a view of expounding the Catholic doctrine, by dispelling fears and/or doubts; and presenting the true and solid teaching. Generally, the articles found in this periodical conform to the Magisterium and are used to refute unorthodox tendencies. In short, we could say the goal of «Homiletic and Pastoral Review» is towards a practical Christian doctrine.

The line of thought of «Homiletic and Pastoral Review» is pastoral; giving advice to Christians on doctrinal matters, dogmatic, catechises, moral, or spiritual. The articles also serve to update the priests on various difficult pastoral questions. Use of the Magisterial documents, encyclicals, letters and exhortations is notable. Perusing through the table of contents, we encounter articles on sacramental life, prayer life, liturgy, the pastor-parishioner relationships, leadership in the Church, the Magisterium, virtues and vices, morality, catechetics, preaching, etc. However, we shall limit ourselves to our area of interest: «Marriage as a communion of life and love: married love and contraception». And even here we restrict ourselves to the years 1969 to 1988.

The contributing authors range from professional theologians to free lance journalists. Among the authors are priests, religious, lay persons, parents and the single who form a group.

2. The encyclical Humanae Vitae

The authors in the articles studied present arguments in support of HV either directly or at times in correcting of the negative understanding of the papal document. The position taken by the dissenters is laid out and then a response stressing the position of the Church is given.
In this encyclical on human life, Paul VI following the unwavering tradition of the Church stressed the beauty of human sexuality in the marriage covenant. The Pope reaffirmed the absolute value on the inseparability of conjugal love and the marital act. The mystery of love would fail to realise its sacred mission if it systematically excluded the power to transmit life. Impeding the transmission of new life via contraception is not an answer to the sexuality problem.

The encyclical, *Humanae Vitae* was given by Pope Paul VI on 25th July 1968, to all men of good will to resonate the Catholic position on:

«the most serious duty of transmitting human life, for which married persons are the free and responsible collaborators of God the Creator».

Among other questions Paul VI discussed the transmission of life, conjugal love and its characteristics, marriage act, responsible parenthood, birth control and chastity. However, it was mainly on the issue of the competence of the Magisterium (HV 4), the openness to life of every marital act (HV 9) and the prohibition of all forms of artificial contraception (HV 14), that the encyclical was and continues to be attacked.

In summary, *Humanae Vitae* prohibits direct abortion (even therapeutic), sterilization (male and female) and sexual intercourse which is deliberately contraceptive (HV 14). At the same time the encyclical states that every act of sexual intercourse must retain its natural potential to procreative life (HV 12).

No doubt the mass media played a key role in the years before and after the issuing of the encyclical HV. Here we present briefly the polemic that was alive in the press then. The majority report of the papal commission on population and birth control, the encyclical itself and the role of the dissent, will also be briefly expounded.

a) The role of the press

Although the post Conciliar polemic on marital love and contraceptives started well before *Humanae Vitae*, the debate was fully blown after July 25, 1968. Barely 24 hours after its issue, American priests and theologians were already protesting. This was facilitated by the great influence of the mass media, which generally gives more publicity to dissenters while the defenders of the Church's traditional po-
sition get less coverage. Two questions had been raised in the 1960's especially towards the end of the Council, and were greatly publicized by the media, which was more than alert. These were «over-population» awareness, and the discovery of a «pill» that could regulate ovulation. Could this pill, though regulating ovulation and at the same time causing temporal sterility, be morally accepted?

The media slowly began to publish stories of theologians who departed from the stand of the Church, e.g., saying that married couples wanted rightful participants in the Church's Magisterium. All the books and articles that argued for the change in the Catholic teaching achieved a good deal of notice in the press, with articles on dissent on front-page news, while tradition or conservative news was pushed to the center pages or the back page. The press even predicted that Paul VI would budge on the contraceptive issue.

«The year leading up to the issuance of Humanae Vitae in July of 1968 was largely anticlimactic. On June 21, Time reported that a motu proprio which the Holy Father was about to issue had been withdrawn at the urgent entreaties of several European bishops. The same month the journal U.S. Catholic published a lengthy article asserting that the traditional doctrine was no longer in effect, and only a few days before the encyclical was issued on July 25 Father John Thomas was reported as predicting in a public lecture that the Church would accept all medically approved methods of birth control except sterilization».

So as to study this question of enormous importance on the transmission of life, a Commission had been chosen. John XXIII had formed the Commission and later in 1965, Paul VI augmented the number of the members. This Commission was composed of experts in theology, medicine and other relevant sciences.

During the working of the Commission, there were disagreements and at the time of presenting the findings two reports were tabled. The minority held that contraception was always a grave evil and therefore illicit. The majority on the other hand proposed that contraception in marriage was not always wrong, and therefore could be permitted for just reasons. As can be noted, the minority advocated that the Church should remain faithful to the tradition, while the majority called for a radical change.

Between the completion of the task by the Papal Commission, and the issuing of the encyclical, the press somehow got their hands on the report. Thus we had the famous «minority» and «majority» reports, circulating in the press way before the issuing of the encyclical.
b) The «Majority report»

The Majority report was signed by majority of the theologians and proposed that parents could use contraceptives as means of birth control. This group maintained that since the couple is involved in many other acts that are not contraceptives; the few contraceptive acts could be permissible. That is to say, the whole could justify the part. The authors also argued that an action could be good if the intention is objectively good, appealing to the principle of proportionate reason. If the intention is good the non-moral evil is tolerated. William May, in his article «Sex, love and procreation», notes that this is bound to bring difficulties.14

«This methodology is open to very serious criticism. It is a methodology that argues that it is legitimate “to intend premoral evil in ordine ad finem proportionatum”, that is perfectly permissible to intend to effect an evil in itself but not for itself. It is definitely a type of consequentialism.»15

May gives the principal objections against this way of justifying moral judgements; 1). No one ever intends an evil in and for itself; one always intends an act to bring about some good. e.g., torture could be an exquisitely delightful experience, thus not an intended evil in and for itself. What is intended here is the evil in itself, for the will is targeted on the torture. But the torture is not intended for itself, since it is only used to achieve the delightful aesthetic experience. 2). One when doing an evil act takes the moral identity of the evil, e.g., killer, for evil is what we are doing if the evil involved is an act that cannot be intended. 3). Man is an image of God, when he does evil he cannot thus be a mirror of God. God permits evil but does not directly intend it.16

This method, May notes, is widely accepted by many Roman Catholic moral theologians, including in its ranks such well-known and respected personalities as Richard McCormick, Cornelius Van der Poel, William van der Marck, John Dedek, Bruno Schuller, Louis Janssens.17 The majority report and these theologians base their arguments on a dualistic anthropology. Here the person is separated from his body.18

This dualistic anthropology gives a false division of the human person with an end of sustaining the contraceptive behaviour. The person is separated from his own sexuality even to some extent from his own self. Here sex is equated to doing other than a style of being. In fact
those who find moral grounds for justifying contraception believe that the sexual act is a “thing” isolated from the human person.19

The argument is, “I am a body, but this body is not something of itself personal, a me. What this group stressed is the duality of man, the body and sexuality but forget that all this are subordinate to the person. We have examples of theologians like Joseph Fletcher and Daniel Maguire who fall into this group of viewing the body and its organs apart from the human person.20 Material or bodily goods are at best necessary conditions for achieving higher, psychic goods. Only the latter are really human. Physical life, for instance, is only a condition for personal life, and if the possibility of personal life, is absent, then physical life is no longer to be valued.

The old morality considered the human person as a whole, not merely as beings possessing bodies. The Neo-platonic and Gnostic: matter/spirit dualism denied the unity of the human person. This dualism is the basis of the new morality with respect to human life and sexuality.21

With this kind of anthropology, attacking the life of the body cannot be regarded as an attack on the person; because the two are different.

“If the person is not really a body, then destruction of the life of the body cannot be regarded as directly and in itself an attack on the person. The lives of the unborn, the lives of those not fully in possession of themselves—the hopelessly insane and the “vegetating” senile—and the lives of those who no longer are capable of engaging in praxis or problem solving become lives no longer meaningful, no longer valuable, no longer inviolable. Human life as such need not be respected unless it is of such quality as to be meaningful or valuable to persons. If a human individual is incapable of personal relationships, his or her life can be deemed to have fulfilled its potential.22

Humanae Vitae spoke against this dualistic view of the human person. Fecundity is not simply a biological process, an impersonal “it” but is embedded in the personhood of human beings and participates in the dignity of the human person (HV 10).23 John Paul II points out that dualism of the human person seriously changes the truth and beauty of human sexuality. The Pope says that contraception makes the anthropology of man a dualistic one, i.e., distinguishing the person from his body. The body becomes something one possesses not part of him or her. This then, gives the lie to the conjugal act as it a serious distortion of the truth.24
c) The encyclical on Human Life

Pope Paul VI, after studying the commissions reports and making consultations and prayerful considerations, issued an encyclical that reaffirmed the Church's teaching on human life; *Humanae Vitae*. He refuted some of the conclusions that were incompatible with the Church's tradition. (HV 6). The Pope's stand was therefore to maintain constant the teaching of the Church. (HV 10, 11, 20, 29).

The press polemic was even hotter after the issuing of the encyclical, with theologians like Charles Curran conscientising the Christians on their right to dissent from the «non-fallible teaching». The result was a mass rejection of Humanae Vitae by the American Catholics which provided a further alienation from the Church.

Many Americans invoke the principle of totality in their interpretation of the two ends of marriage. Thus conjugal love and procreation are on an equal footing of equal dignity and their roles can be fulfilled alternatively and not necessarily concurrently. Klaus observes that this is a very popular view. *Humanae Vitae* on the other hand stresses the integral unity of conjugal love and procreation and not preferring one over the other. Paul VI in *Humanae Vitae*, maintains that human sexuality has two essential elements; union and procreation. Thus the Pope insisted that the unitive and procreative meaning of human sexuality were inseparable. *Humanae Vitae* safeguarded both the essential aspects of marriage, the unitive and procreative.

"That teaching, often set forth by the Magisterium, is founded upon the inseparable connections, willed by God and unable to be broken by man on his own initiative, between the two meanings of the conjugal act: the unitive meaning and the procreative meaning."

Therefore, whatever attacks these two meanings or either of them is morally disordered. Sexual immorality amounts to an attack upon one or both of these elements. Fornication, adultery and perverted sex are wrong. Gerald C. Hay Jr., explains that fornication is not real union because total giving of the self and complete acceptance of the other are lacking; and sex union is not only a now affair, it has future implications. Adultery dishonours a union that has been pledged and given. Sexual perversion even though sometimes motivated by «love» is not even sexual since it eliminates the procreative element in the most blatant manner. Contraception is a willed separation of the procreative element from the unitive (rhythm does not fall here). This is an explicit..."
denial to fatherhood and motherhood. It is a giving that is not a giving, a partial rejection of the other in the same act that is meant to be a total acceptance. Rationally, these kind of relations would be the same for married couples as for the unmarried.

The meanings of human sexuality get their full significance in the marital union. The unitive element affirms and cements the love of the spouses, as they share the gift of each other. The procreative element comes with the gift of children who are the fruit of the love of husband and wife. True love goes a long way to foster faithfulness and the good climate for the bringing up of the children. Up to the 20th century, the society genre held human sexuality in great esteem, conjugal love contributing to the procreation or the fostering of fidelity. But with the wake of the sexual revolution, all the tables were turned upside down with the fruits being marital infidelity, child-free marriages where the couple’s only motive is sexual pleasure. Klaus adds that it is no wonder that the tone of the encyclical seems to reflect a greater concern for fertility and openness to it than for the conjugal relation of the couple. It should be noted however, that *Humanae Vitae* holds the unitive and procreative as two essential aspects of marriage that are inseparable.

Nature has arranged human sexuality such that not each and every coitus results in procreation. The periodic abstinence method of birth control recognizes this and does not contradict it. On the other hand, contraceptive marital acts deny, overshadow and destroy the procreational value of human sexuality. Orville proposes that,

«it is essential for the very survival of Christian marriage that human love and sexuality be clothed again with the protective and ennobling garments of procreation (new life!), conjugal fidelity (“you only”) and indissolubility (“you forever”)».

He further elaborates the blessing of children by considering the goodness of marriage, the pre-eminence of conjugal love and the primacy of procreation. St. Augustine’s «three blessings of marriage», proles, fides, sacramentum; and the phrase «primary and secondary ends of marriage», became casualties of Vatican II.

«The reason is quite obvious: since conjugal union in marriage has a good of its own, there is no need of recourse to compensatory considerations in order to justify and dignify the sexual aspects of marital intimacy. GS proclaims the goodness of conjugal union within the wider concept of “pure conjugal love and undivided affection” (GS 49)».
The Church strongly continues to teach that the contraceptive behaviour has no place. Although we are experiencing great changes, schisms almost, with theologians who once opposed sexual evils now considering them normal and admissible. Many more have questioned the principles on Catholic sexual ethics. These include, L. Janssens, J.M. Reuss, W.H.M. Van der Marck, R. McCormick, P. de Locht, J. David, J. Fuchs, F. Bockle, and C. Curran. They reject *Humanae Vitae* norms and arguments referring to family planning.40

The following reasons among others are proposed by the dissenters. *Humanae Vitae* teaching on human sexuality involves a great sacrifice and all couples are called to modify their sexual life. Some couples find it inconvenient because they do not want to make sacrifices. They claim that NFP cannot be practical because it is impossible to organize appropriate instruction. Doctors have proved this pretext baseless as they have successfully organized centres for instructions of the same. They claim that *Humanae Vitae* is not infallible, but as we shall demonstrate shortly, it is.

Following are arguments given to disqualify the thesis held by the dissenters; that *Humanae Vitae* is not infallible.

Cardinal L. Shehen in discussing the possibility of further development of the Church’s doctrine, observes that, the critics and dissenters of *Humanae Vitae* claim that there are two unresolved agendas. 1). That each and every act of coitus must be open to transmission of life. 2). That the unitive and procreative meanings are inseparable. But does this warrant dissent from the Church’s teaching? Regis Scanlon focuses his attention on the American Church where some theologians (e.g., the late Cardinal Bernadin of Chicago) hold and teach that «limited and occasional dissent is legitimate».42

This kind of dissent perhaps seems distinguished from the general one that swept all over America and parts of Europe barely 24 hours after the issuing of *Humanae Vitae*. At that time it was direct and total dissent that was marked by quite a number of clergy defecting.43

However, for our purpose, the difference between one or the other is the same; dissent is dissent. The dissent that Scanlon points to is selective and the defectors remain in the Church. For him this dissent actually started on Nov. 15, 1968, when a pastoral letter was issued after the publication of *Humanae Vitae*. In this letter entitled, «Human Life in Our Day», the bishops stated:
«The expression of theological dissent from the Magisterium is in order only if the reasons are serious and well-founded, if the manner of the dissent does not question or impugn the teaching authority of the Church and is such as not to give scandal» \(^{44}\).

Against this, Scanlon joins John Paul II to stress the teaching of Vatican II, LG 25\(^{45}\). He strongly states, that all Catholics, including bishops, must decide to follow either John Paul II's interpretation of Vatican II or that of an individual\(^{46}\).

John Paul II in his address to the US Bishops in 1987 reacted to the criticism and dissent;

«It is sometimes reported that a large number of Catholics today do not adhere the teaching of the Church on a number of questions, notably sexual and conjugal morality, divorce and remarriage. Some are reported as not accepting the Church's clear position on abortion. It has also been noted that there is a tendency on the part of some of the Catholics to be selective in their adherence to the Church's moral teachings. It is sometimes claimed that the dissent from the Magisterium is totally compatible with being a "good Catholic" and poses no obstacle to the reception of the sacraments. This is a grave error that challenges the teaching office of the bishops of the United States and elsewhere» \(^{47}\).

In an article, «Contraception, infallibility and the ordinary Magisterium» (July 1978); Russell Shaw explains that the Church's teaching on contraceptives meets the Vatican II criteria for an infallible exercise of the ordinary Magisterium.

Shaw discusses the infallible proposal of Humanae Vitae in its 10th anniversary. The general contention is that Humanae Vitae has not been taught infallibly, but an article in Theological Studies, June 1978, pp. 258-312, Contraception and the Infallibility of the Ordinary Magisterium by Ford, John C. & Grisez, Germain, demonstrates that the teaching meet the Vatican II conditions\(^{48}\).

The dissenters hold that Humanae Vitae has never been presented as an ex cathedra definition. But here they forget the implicit assumption that the Catholic Church enjoys the charisma of infallibility, and that the ordinary Magisterium is exercised infallibly when the conditions set forth by Vatican II, LG 25, are fulfilled\(^{49}\).

There are four conditions that have to be met; 1). Collegiality, that is, bishops be in union with themselves and with the Pope; 2). Teach authoritatively on matters of faith and morals, not just expressing opinions as individual Catholics or theologians; 3). That they agree in
one judgement, this identifies universality and not an absolute mathe­

cmatical unanimity; 4). That they propose it as something to be held de­
definitively, the teaching is not proposed as something optional, but as something that the Bishops have an obligation to hand on and the Catholics have an obligation to accept\textsuperscript{50}.

These conditions have been fulfilled by \textit{Humanae Vitae}.

«For the purpose of this discussion, however, the crucial question re­
mains: Does the teaching on contraception meet the conditions identi­
ified by the Council for an infallible exercise of the ordinary Magisterium of the bishops throughout the world? It does»\textsuperscript{51}.

3. MARRIED LOVE

a) The marital union

The married are joined together by a bond which gives conjugal love the reason for being. This love is expressed in many different ways. These gestures, each in its own right, go a long way to keep the spouses united. They are all natural symbols that communicate the couple’s love. Their presence edifies the conjugal union while their ab­

sence may sever the relationship.

There is more to the marital relationship than the union. The union has as its natural end the begetting of new life. Children are part and parcel of a marriage relationship, and the spouses should be willing to happily accept this gift in their lives. The couple have thus a duty not only to themselves but also to their children or the would-be children if not yet born. The children have a right to a stable home and a good up­

bringing in all fields and especially in matters of faith. The parents are therefore called to make their relationship happy and permanent.

When two people, a man and a woman meet and come to know one another and decide to share their lives together, they make each other spouses. The two have acquired such a great affinity that they want to be united so as to share their goodness together. This great force that is irresistible, almost intoxicating their lives that nothing else seems to exist, is love. Through the union of love and exchange of consent, two single persons make themselves husband and wife. The two thus change their status of singles to be a married couple\textsuperscript{52}.

The intimate relationship between a man and a woman with an expressive intention of sharing their lives could constitute a marriage.
But a marriage is a relationship between a man and a woman drawn together by love and ready to extend this love in their children. In the ceremony, formal or informal, a marriage bond is established and the two assume new rights, duties, privileges as well as responsibilities. Or at least they are expected to. This ceremony when formalized in the Church, it is a covenantal tie which is sacramental. Marriage is

«fundamentally a covenantal reality with a significance that is sacramental and transcendental. Committed love between a man and a woman is sacramental because it forms a sign whereby the covenantal love of God for this world is made present (...). In the conjugal act husband and wife become “one flesh”. Through this embodiment of their love the love of Christ, the Groom, for his Bride, the Church, is uniquely present»53.

A new family is born. The family then, is the basic cell of the community, the family itself being a community. But the family is not just any kind of community, it is a special relationship based on love and mutual fidelity. The family is a permanent relationship which unites not only those related by blood, parents and children, but others who form the family chain.

Schall discusses how the family has everything from love to justice. Yet many times we do not discover this, and thus the family is neglected or abused by undue freedom or presumptions. He insists that we need to know what a family is and why no institution is really better for man than the family.

«A family is an odd institution, it seems, composed of grandparents, parents of grandparents, and anyone who might have descended from or have married into such an improbable relationship. Some members of a family are alive but not born yet; some are noticing their hair is getting grey; others can now use public transportation with senior citizens privileges; still others are thinking about getting married; and many are already dead. Scientists, lawyers, economists, philosophers, journalists, even theologians are busy these days, moreover trying to figure out some better way to launch and keep us in existence. They freeze embryos, test-tube us, hire wombs, discard us if we do not meet their self-made standards to the extent that they succeed. I suspect, the human race will probably fail. The human family may well be the greatest intellectual challenge God gave to the human race, sort of defying it to come up with a better idea for human life, all things considered»54.

Marriage is constituted by the free exchange of consent between a man and a woman. Thus, consent is the basic element. Marriage is a
covenant and a covenant is a permanent relationship. A covenant cannot be broken, it can only be violated, the consequences being broken hearts. As an African proverb says; «when two elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers». Those affected most are the children as they become as John Paul II points out, orphans of living parents.55

The couple share and discover new ways of expressing their love in openness, honesty and sincerity. In sharing their conjugal love, they do so in all freedom because their wills are joined, yes, but their individuality is not dissolved.

As the spouses share their love both in genital and non-genital union, they do so in a fruitful way by being open and accepting the gift of children. The marriage covenant therefore becomes unitive and procreative. A man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh. Also God blesses man to be fruitful and multiply. (Gen. 2:24; & 1:28) This is the great munus of the marriage; that every marriage is ordained for the transmitting life.

If the marriage has to exist as a covenant in the service of life and love, it is condemned to last a whole life-time. Love properly understood and nourished ought never to burn out, but to grow towards perfection each day. The children if they have to develop well, need a stable home. The Church’s teaching on the indissolubility of marriage is a positive reality. In defending indissolubility, the Church is also defending: i) the children who have a right to parental unity for their well being; ii) the rights and expectations of the community, i.e., other couples, people preparing for marriage, and the young in general; and iii) the spouses themselves. While Christian marriage is a way of sanctity, it is also a challenge to the couple amidst their many problems to lay their trust in the Lord. Here Burke makes this contribution.

«The law of indissolubility says to a married person, “You have no right to give up the effort to love even if marriage proves difficult or runs into unforeseen obstacles”. You have no right to let your spouse down, or your children down, or other people down... And, finally you have no right to let yourself down; to think you can find a better happiness than the one God has planned for you. You won’t be happy that way. It won’t work»57.

Any interference with the marital indissolubility wounds the marital covenant. Some moral theologians argue that it is not a disorder for sterile couples to accept semen, ovum, or even an incubate uterus
to get a baby. Their argument is that after all there is no actual intercourse involved, but this is a shallow minded argument. A third party is an intruder in the marriage covenant because the spouses have allowed their embodied love existing as a sacramental sign of God’s love to be violated, a form of adultery.

«For spouses to procreate outside this sign is nothing less than a blasphemy against the sacred meaning of marriage»58.

Many critics of the position defended by the Church fall into the fallacy of argumentum ad hominem, by arguing that the Catholic priests cannot possibly understand sexual matters. They insist that priests are not to be held credible to discuss on these issues. Lawler applauds and strongly defends the role of the Catholic clergy who in the light of the Holy Spirit comprehend and defend human sexuality in the light of faith.

«And yet the Catholic Church, governed by celibates shows an enormous sensitivity to the joys of parents. Indeed, the Catholic Church alone among all other institutions in our society today, insists that the transmission of life is so sacred that nothing can be allowed to compromise it. That is the message of Humanae Vitae: that human sexuality is a precious gift precisely because it involves the power of procreation»59.

In a world where divorces, annulments, teenage parents, contraception, abortions, and artificial insemination govern the family panorama, what could be the solution? With all the confusion what can save us? The Church teaching or licence?

«The only thing that can save us from the quagmire of ethical confusion posed by “pluralistic reproduction” is the Church’s teaching concerning the inseparability of the unitive and procreative aspects of conjugal love. That procreation must occur solely within the bodily union of the spouses and that the fullness of this union requires that the God-given procreative end not be destroyed forms the foundation through which the sacramental reality of marriage is ultimately realized»60.

Griese further proposes that,

«it is essential for the very survival of Christian marriage that human love and sexuality be clothed again with the protective and ennobling garments of procreation (new life!), conjugal fidelity (“you only”) and indissolubility (“you forever”»61.
b) Some of the topics related to the marital union

These include chastity, abortion, population and pornography which influence directly or indirectly the conjugal bond and its two meanings: unitive and procreative.

i) Chastity

Chastity is treated positively and negatively; showing the need for it's cultivation, and bringing to light the elements of unchastity, fornication, adultery, pornography, etc. The unchaste behaviour is greatly influenced by the highly charged contraceptive culture.

«The reason chastity is so decidedly unpopular today is not so much because it is too much to expect a person to harmonize his sexual appetite with reason, but because he is constantly exposed to sexually seductive stimuli»\(^62\).

The rightful place for sexual intercourse is the marital bed where the spouses reciprocally give and receive each other without any reserve. Pre-marital and extra-marital sexual relations do not meet these requirements but mar or spot the meaning of sex. Fornication is evil because it does not mean complete union of hearts in a reverent self-donation\(^63\). In fact,

«Fornication is a training ground for adultery, not marriage, and in the long run it undermines the self-respect of both parties»\(^64\).

In the present American culture, chastity is not at all popular, in fact it practically does not exist.

«The absence of chastity allows lust to take over the personality directing it to the world of fantasy. Lust cannot become a primary passion, it is a joyless, fictitious passion because it is directed toward something that is not real. Lust replaces love, which is ontological in its significance and uniquely capable of providing personal satisfaction. Whereas love is directed to being, lust centres itself non-beings»\(^65\).

Chastity is unpopular because it is so difficult to understand, so contrary to our instincts, and counter to the prevailing ethos. The age-long rule on chastity, demands one to restrict sexual intercourse only with one's spouse. Two options are available, either marriage with total faithfulness to the spouse, or else total abstinence\(^66\). The readiness
and willingness to replace everything with technology alienates man
and with his own sexuality.

«The willingness to replace human virtue with technological virtue is
also consistent with a basic assumption of contemporary society, namely,
that making life easier is synonymous with progress. Such an assump­
tion, needless to say, stands in flat contradiction with willingly accepting
the difficulties involved in developing the human virtue of chastity. Con­
sequently, by assuming that progress means making life easier, society
inevitably concludes that chastity is contrary to progress. As a result, so­
ciety adopts unchastity as a moral norm, although a kind of moderate,
socially responsible unchastity that ask nothing more of people than they
not use sex to hurt one another» 67.

All these then build in man a high voltage of lust. Even then, lust

«it is now thought, is more of a weakness, a helplessness in the grip of
concupiscence, and can hardly contain much malice» 68.

Sattler notes that, when lust takes the upper hand it controls the
whole person that everything else is reduced to objects of satisfying
the urge.

«The problem with lust as a capital sin is that it so engrosses the ima­
gination, appetite, mind, body and will of the actor so as to reduce all ot­
ers even God to mere things, mere stimuli or blocks to self satisfac­
tion... (In fact) lust is single minded self-concentration that sees all
others as a means to satisfaction, or as enemies to orgasm... Lust alone is
for the self. It is egoistic, it protests “I love you” while it really screams “I
need you” or cynically: “baby light my fire!”. There is nothing more re­
jecting than lust. Even if two people mutually seek lust willingly and fre­
ely, they are far apart as persons, contradictory as they merely practice an
egoisme a deux, a selfishness of two, a mere pleasure bond while the pers­
sons are miles apart» 69.

The modern industrial and urban society sets a new moral norm; a
new sexual ethic. This leads to marital infidelity and breaking of fami­
lies, catalyzed by the success and orderliness in the work places not
found in the home. Or too much stress in the home because of the
unavailability of the husband, and the wife decides she is bored of
being a housekeeper. Or the loneliness of a teenager who thus vents
his or her energy in pre-marital sex, because it is free. What is bred in
this kind of society is an individualistic private life.
Private life (including family) functions now to cultivate, to nurture, and to support individuals in a highly mobile, fast-changing, tension-packed, and rationally organized society. It is tension packed because one's system is characterized by individualism and competition. Because it functions that way, it needs a sexual ethic that will serve that function. It will help the individual become successful or help the person who is not so successful to console himself and still keep working.

Unchaste behavior does not always mean sexual intercourse outside the marital yoke.

Adultery is a human sin or crime which only a sexual adult human person can perform, and which perverts the inherent meaning of human sexual activity and mixes foreign elements into the sexual relationship, not of a mere male and female, but of a man and a woman.

Although we mostly speak of adultery in reference to a third party, lust invites adultery within marriage. This is because lust is a way of looking that reduces the other person into an object of sexual gratification. This is contrary to the marital life. St Paul admonishes husbands, «love your wives as your own bodies» (Eph. 5:28-33). And also, «husband and wife belong to each other» (1 Cor. 7:4-5).

The deepest meaning of adultery is seen in its application as a metaphor. To adulterate is to render a reality other than it appears by admixture of a base, inferior, foreign, diluting substance. To adulterate is to cut, contaminate, taint, pollute, corrupt, water down, thin out, debase, render impure. Adultery, then, is sexual impurity.

We could therefore say that, purity in sex is when one sees and considers the other as a subject but not relating to him or her as an object of mere pleasure.

Sexual purity, then, demands that sexuality mean otherness, without admixture, adulteration, of lonely, empty self. Sexuality must not mean mere copulation with transfer of genetic material without mongrelization of result, but it must say: “I want to be in you; I wish you to be in me; I want us to be in other persons”. Pure sex is pure otherness; impure sex is selfishness.

DeMacro reminds us that the essence of any virtue is that it be moderated by reason; and chastity too needs to be within the reign of man’s rationality. Chastity also involves allowing sexuality to embrace the total person and not just a part of the person.
«Unchastity is a moral and human defect not because it honours man's sexual instinct but because it divorces instinct from reason, championing the rights of the part at the expense of the whole. Chastity demands that sex be humanised, that is to say, integrated into the whole of the human personality. It demands that there are times when we should abstain from sex; but at the same time, it demands that we never abstain from reason. And it never demands that we abstain from love. Chastity, then, is not simply a negative virtue»75.

Chastity is a positive virtue that should be cultivated by all persons. Let us promote chastity not just because we are sure of success but because we are convinced of its importance and the dignity of our task. Otherwise we give unchaste behaviour a breeding ground.

«Sex as America’s cultural deity can be seen in the increasingly suggestive fare provided viewers of films, TV programs and commercials, as well as in smut magazines and the outright pornographic novels, journals and pictures flooding the market which also, interestingly, increasingly spot elements of blasphemy and sacrilege»76.

Likoudis insists that the sex education program in America should respect education in purity following the examples of saints like Don John Bosco.

«The current “catholic” sex education programs, with all their panoply of illustrations, charts, diagrams and weighty “scientific” bibliographies constitute a serious deformation of the “positive and prudent sexual education” of the youth requested by the second Vatican Council, and represent a monstrous caricature of the divine pedagogy of the Saints with respect to Educating for Purity»77.

ii) Abortion

Abortion is the forceful expulsion of the embryo from the womb before viability; or the killing of the embryo in the womb, then expelling it.

«Abortion is the deliberate and intentional termination of the life of an unborn child, with the result that it will never take its place in the world as a human person. Abortion brings to an end, with irreversible finality, both the existence and the development of a human person»78.

Abortion, no matter which method is used goes against the life of the defenceless unborn. Although many may wish to deny it, abortion
is an invasion of the most ultimate reaches of the woman, evidenced by the multiple psychological traumas suffered by women who have aborted.

«There may not be a surgical procedure but the psychological aftermaths of killing a child live long and sometimes recurring periodically at specific times for the rest of the woman's life.»

By 1970 civil law had legalized abortion in many states in the United States of America. But it was in 1973 that drove in the final nail; when the Supreme Court of the US made abortion lawful.

«Jan. 22, 1973, marked a spectacular victory for abortion when the U.S. Supreme Court in effect established access to the lethal operation as an only slightly qualified woman's "right".»

The proponents of such laws try to appeal to the social acceptance by making people believe that their only motive for passing these laws is the human compassion.

«In the effort to promote permissive abortion before the U.S. public, major emphasis has been placed on pathetic cases: the foetus affected by rubella or some marked defect that the child will carry throughout life if allowed to be born; the pregnant poor woman who already has many offspring; the raped adolescent.»

And Bishop Harrington concurs with the same idea as he explains:

«The proponents of such laws have no monopoly on human compassion. They speak warmly and sympathetically of the victims of rape and incest, of the sickly mother and the deformed child. We share concerns for the physically and mentally afflicted. We, too, relate and respond to the needs of human beings. We see in them a personal dignity, enhanced by commitment to the proposition that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. But we do not see that the taking of innocent human life is either an answer to, or solution of the problems that are the object of our compassion.»

Harrington sees legalizing abortion as playing God no matter what name it may be given.

«No matter how many attempts are made to present a rationale to gain social acceptance of feticides, the basic flaw will always be that it makes an innocent human being the victim of people who take it upon
themselves to exercise God’s prerogative in determining who is to live, who is to die, and when the moment of death should occur.\textsuperscript{83}

The Supreme Court has shown contempt for the value of foetal life, contempt for the Constitution, and contempt for the will of the people. Dwight then wonders,

«what has become of our country —and the principles upon which it was founded— when a small group of men can impose their will over the people contrary to their will, on a fundamental life and death issue like abortion; when a child within the womb has no legal right to life and a mother can legally kill her unborn child at her convenience; when a 13 or 14 year old girl can undergo a surgical operation which kills her unborn baby and the girl’s parents have no legal right to be informed; when any woman has no legal right to know that she may suffer severe physical and psychological harm if she aborts»\textsuperscript{84}.

It is interesting to note that the child’s interests are ignored, all that is considered are the interests of the mother, parents and the community.

«The basic flaw in all such cases is that they totally neglect the child’s point of view —his (her) opinion hasn’t been asked; a decision of absolutely the utmost significance: “shall you live or die?” — has been made for the child by others»\textsuperscript{85}.

Some pro-abortionists argue that it is doubtful whether the embryo is child or not. Carr using Dr. Noonan’s argument says a foetus may be seen in many ways. For example, by observing a pregnant woman, pictures of life in the womb, observing an abortion while the foetus lives, or even the examination of the foetal corpse.

«The proponent of abortion is invited to consider the organism kicking the mother, swimming peacefully in amniotic fluid, responding to the prick of an instrument, being extracted from the womb, sleeping in death. Is the kicker or the swimmer similar to him or to her (the proponent)? Is the response to pain like his or hers? Will his or her own face look much different in death?»\textsuperscript{86}.

Respect of human life should be from the very moment of conception, as science has already demonstrated a living foetus does exist. The embryo is a new life different from the mother, it is a human being otherwise it would never become human. From the very beginning the embryo has the genetic package of a human being, all that
remains is time to develop. Good science tells that the embryo is a human being right from the start. Thus, science strengthens not the abortionist view but the Church’s stand.

The propagators of abortion are not deterred by the reality of the child. They use hypothetical arguments in favour of destroying the innocent defenceless life of the unborn child. Pregnancy from rape is their favourite bait for insisting that abortion is right. But isn’t accepting the rape cases only a pointer that every unintended pregnancy may be interrupted? Abortion becomes and has become a solution for the hard cases.

The abortion movement has now entered the domain of live foetal experiments, forcible sterilization, euthanasia, dysthanasia (painful death) and even aborting healthy and wanted children. DeMacro finds the abortionist very platonic, i.e., denying the reality of the unborn child. They further regard what does not exist (the future hypothetical) as more important or more real.

«Thus, the parents who abort the child of undesired sex disparage the reality of the former which does not exist in favour of the reality of the latter which does not exist.»

No reason can objectively authorize dispensing of another person’s life even if that life is just commencing. Therefore, the frequently given reasons like the health of the mother, poverty, social stigma from rape or incest, foetal abnormality, etc., cannot justify abortion. While it is true that we all have anxieties, the fear of the abortionist leads to rejection of being.

«Will the child be deformed, rejected, abused, unhappy, unsuccessful? Will population and pollution reduce our prosperity? Will pregnancy disrupt, disfigure, distort, disgrace, deprive? We feel threatened on all sides and in our attempt to avoid non-being we avoid being in the process... Thus, love and courage are essential: love to affirm what is in its being; and courage to accept the negatives that every affirmation of being requires.»

Consequently, the mother and the society are obliged to protect this life. Carr stresses that Catholics should form their conscience according to the Church’s teaching. This means all Catholics but especially the mother and would-be agents of abortion like doctors. The medical doctor or midwife who performs the abortion is the principal agent. The others are secondary agents e.g., the nurse who co-operates
with the doctor. Here we distinguish between formal agents — those who approve and even counsel the patient to abort; and material agents— those who do not approve but because of reasons of employment have to assist the procedure. (This later group it should be noted, should not be employed in an abortion-only clinic)\textsuperscript{92}.

Sometimes a doctor may be in a dilemma when confronted with the case of a pregnant patient whose uterus is infected by a cancer. The doctor who respects life including that of the unborn will do all he can to save both the mother and the child. But if he eventually has to remove the cancerous uterus, and in the process the child dies, this is indirect or therapeutic abortion. This is opposed to the direct abortion whose principal goal is the killing of the unborn child\textsuperscript{93}. Abortion is always an intrinsically moral evil, indirect abortion is only a tolerated exception. (The issue of direct and indirect abortion is not a favourite topic of «Homiletic and Pastoral Review»).

Those who fund abortion activities collaborate with the actual abortion procedure. For instance, the March of Dimes Foundation sponsors eugenic experiments that could lead to abortion. If the intention of the parents, sponsors and doctor is abortion should defects be diagnosed, then the role of any co-operating agencies must be evaluated with great care. The parents are the primary agents because they request or at least consent to the abortion. The secondary agents include all who cooperate, the counselling centres, the medical personnel, the sponsors like the March of Dimes. To exonerate itself, the March of Dimes foundation registers its objection to abortion maintaining that their primary motive is research.

«The foundation forbids the use of any portion of its funds to defray the expense of a procured abortion. No agency supported by the March of Dimes is permitted to require prior parental commitment to the abortion of a defective unborn child as a condition for providing counselling or diagnostic services. The Foundation has insisted that “the decision to terminate a pregnancy is solely a parental decision”...»\textsuperscript{94}.

Grisez argues on the difference between cooperation and willing that an act be carried out. One who consciously funds an abortion procedure is procuring the abortion just like the real abortionist. This is not a matter of just material cooperation, as there is a wanting, in fact a willing that the act be done.

«The issue of public funding involves no abstruse problem of application. All that is required is the specification of the general principle by re-
ferring to the method paying for the abortions: Since it is wrong to want abortions done, it is wrong to want them done by means of public funding. The specification is just as straightforward as: Since it is wrong to want abortions done, it is wrong to want them done by D & C, by saline, or by some other method.95

An important pastoral touch is given in an article entitled: «For women who have had an abortion». The author using John Paul II’s EV 99; gives words of encouragement and hope.

«John Paul II understands hearts which have been broken by sin. He knows they are very vulnerable to the self-condemning despair which deprives the soul of hope and can become an obstacle to repentance. Therefore, the Pope’s pastoral goal is not to condemn these women (their own hearts have already done this), but rather to bless them with hope. Hope he teaches is found not by hiding from the truth, but by facing the truth with an honest and humble courage. Beyond acknowledging the death of one’s child, it is also necessary to understand the fullness of what happened. This includes recognising the situational and personal factor (such as coercion, abandonment, and deception) which would both mitigate one’s own culpability for an abortion and also reveal one’s general weakness. Confronting the truth, then, means confronting and better understanding ourselves. This is not an easy task. The courage needed to face the truth must be bolstered by the assurance that forgiveness is ready to be had from the “Father of Mercies”.96

After reconciling themselves with their dead children and with God; on their journey to full emotional recovery;

«John Paul II predicts that post-aborted women will draw upon their experience with abortion to become our “most eloquent defenders” of life and witness of God’s great mercy.97

Abortion is an issue that involves everybody, although the Catholics have been at the fore front as pro-lifers, there are many non-Catholics in the team. Many fight against abortion as a Catholic affair but legislation to protect the rights of the unborn is in the best interests of the entire human family, Catholic as well as non-Catholic.

«That abortion is wrong and unjust is not a mere Catholic opinion; that abortion is wrong and unjust is the truth of the matter. The Church does not invent the moral law. She discovers and rejoices in it and urges her sons and daughters to uphold that moral law not because it is an exclusive Catholic domain (which it is not) but because it is our common
human heritage to live that law. Catholic politicians should be against abortion not because opposition to abortion has always been part of Catholic tradition; Catholic politicians should be against abortion because it is inhuman to treat the youngest members of the human family in such a way»).

iii) Population

The pro-abortionists use the argument that the world is overpopulated to sell their murderous attitude. That there are already too many people around and one of the ways of thinning the population is through abortion. There is thus the famous fear instilled by many governments; —the fear of population explosion—. All the same, the demographic transition is however, a reality. This has something to do with the difference between the developed and developing countries. In the former the population growth rate is low while in the «Third world» countries it is comparatively high. Therefore, it is evident, that the population explosion is, then;

«predominantly an explosion of the population of the Third World. It is somehow misleading to talk about global population growth, since the chief population growth is taking place in the developing countries. There is, in fact, no developed country with a rate of population growth as high as 1.4 percent. And there are few less developed countries with population growth rates of less than 2 percent».

Hitchcock observes that among the issues raised in the 60’s in which public discussion was carried on was the awareness of an overpopulated world. That the population needed to be checked was all in the media.

The obvious result is that politics comes into play and the society is ruthlessly manipulated. In the name of comfort and convenience Christian principles and human dignity are sacrificed.

«The effects of political expediency and the intellectual conceit are most apparent in questions of population control. A conscious effort is being made to detach American society from its Christian culture. The thesis advanced is that a world population explosion threatens to exhaust food resources and debauch human society with universal poverty... population control requires fertility control... Because contraception may prove ineffective, abortion must be accepted as a backup of birth prevention. To achieve these aims, traditional concepts of sex, marriage and family must be modified».
The Malthusian and Neo-Malthusian theory, was an alarming thesis, «that population growth would eventually increase faster than food production». Today the facts prove the Malthusian theory wrong.

«The real Malthusian call-to-arms in the year 1798 was the alarming thesis that, while unchecked population growth proceeds at a geometrical rate, “the means of subsistence, under circumstance most favourable to human industry, could not possibly be made to increase faster than in arithmetical ratio”. Thus the people would multiply at a rate 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, while food only at the rate 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. In his basic premise of his whole thesis Malthus was simply wrong. World population rose from 1.6 million in 1900 to 2.51 billion in 1950 to 3.8 billion in 1970 to 4.6 billion in 1982. Yet food supply has not only kept up with this near-geometrical increase; it has exceeded it»

Engulfed in the fear of population explosion, many governments have insisted on the use of contraceptives naturally followed by abortion. Schall sees the solution to this kind of fear being found in the intelligence and development and not in running to technical means of controlling the family.

«Population levels and relationships, it is becoming clearer, are primarily functions of intelligence and development, not techniques of birth control or abortion. This is what the central line of Roman Catholic thought has attempted to suggest all during the modern era. Furthermore, it has insisted that human life is the value, the constant around which we should build our society... The “quality of life” cannot be used against actual life given by conception and birth, this is the basic Christian contention»

The population issue is not a family planning issue, but has to do with devising ways of increasing food production, not for consumerism but toward an equal distribution.

«The earth is not insufficient. Indeed, it is so abundant that we are barely beginning to fathom it. We need not starve, pollute or bomb ourselves to death. We are finally beginning to appreciate that those anti-human proposals offered in recent years to “control” population or reduce man’s expectations are themselves the major obstacles to our future»

The Church then, has a role as a teacher of individuals and nations. She has to teach on love and justice as regards the distribution of the natural resources, and the dignity of the human person.
«Population policy, then, is a necessary concern for the Church, which is the teacher of the nations and the individual persons. In a moral consideration of population policy, what moral issues are involved?... What are the main elements of the Church's teaching that need to be taken into account and which might form a solid base for a Catholic approach to the population situation? There are two principal and traditional lines of Catholic teaching that are relevant here. The first is the fundamental Catholic intuition about the value of human life. The second is the Church's perennial interest in the quality of life and especially in the quality of life of the poor... Moreover, the Church has underlined the sanctity of life, not just of all human life, but of the life of each person, and not only in general but over and above in particular cases such as condemnations of abortion, of euthanasia and of all violence against innocent persons.»

iv) Pornography

Pornography is presented as a catalyst to, and actually is part and parcel of the contraceptive culture. Pornography breeds promiscuity, is against chastity, harms the marriage alliance and is a big blow to the family. Pornography is the volatile fuel of these sexual obsessions and the constant stimulant of the uncontrolled sex appetite. It is no wonder the pornographic industry is one of the most profitable enterprises in the American economy.

«Pornography in shortest terms is the degradation of human sexuality and the debauchery of the sex appetite. It is centred in a huge industry reaching a five billion gross in this country alone. The stock in trade of that industry is the endless pursuit of sexual gratification and orgasm, the products of minds sexually obsessed and of imaginations fetid with perversion. It presents every form of masturbation, fornication, adultery, wife-swapping, group orgies, homosexual and lesbian couplings, oral and anal intercourse, bestiality, every kind of sexual wallowing in detail, reaching now to the sick victimisation of the children as sex objects.»

But one may ask, where is all this pornography? Murphy answers us that it is all in the mass media—TV, movies, music and posters—. These have developed through tolerance and abandonment of the Christian life.

«The public tolerance, which shames us as a nation, derived from the gradual abandonment of the basic Judeo-Christian moral code and the substitution of a cultural attitude of exaggerated personal freedom, fee-
ding an atmosphere of permissiveness and disdaining any moral or legal discipline. As that cultural attitude grew, it enfeebled enforcement of obscenity laws chiefly in the courts, but also on the level of arrest and prosecution. The result, largely an unrestricted market for pornographers, where only the jungle law of competition for the dirty dollar rules the marketplace.\(^{110}\)

Many times at the disguise of sex education, perpetuated by the Planned Parenthood group, pornography is fed to the pupils from kindergarten through to 12th grade. Regis Scanlon describes this program thus:

«This type of sex education presents children with graphic words and pictures about sexual intercourse and the parts of the body that determine masculinity and femininity (not to pass over contraception and abortion information). This is explicit classroom sex education. Explicit discussions and pictures of sexual intercourse, homosexuality, masturbation, condoms... do not escape the category of pornography simply by labeling them as sex education.\(^{111}\)

Educational films should not be pornographic, i.e., it should not cause erotic excitations. Careful censorship should be made by those in charge of educating and forming others in the field of sexuality.

«And while an act of sexual intercourse, with preliminary love-making, between husband and wife is not in itself sinful, displaying such actions to an audience is.\(^{112}\)

Pornographers in selling their trade appeal to freedom. Some of their tenets include:

«a) Sex is a personal appetite to be indulged in at will. It is an appetite that cannot and should not be denied. b) All sexual activity is good —solitary, pre-marital, extra-marital, normal and abnormal—. c) Traditional restraints, moral, religious, or legal, are all the tyranny and hypocrisy of puritanism. d) There is no necessary connection between sex and marriage and the family. Any social or generative aspects of sex are incidental to personal sexual indulgence.\(^{113}\)

In other words, sex is reduced to slavery and there is never any true human love. Pornography only permits

«ersatz fever of physical arousal and climax. There is never any welcome to children as the fruit of a generous womb of new life and the pre-
ulous extension of the life and love of consecrated parents. Pornography admits no other dedication than to the sterile and selfish satiety of the moment\textsuperscript{114}.

Murphy affirms;

«Pornography, promiscuity, and perversion are the sick offsprings of the sexual revolution. That revolution was proclaimed to be liberation, the primrose path to sexual freedom and fulfilment. The reality mocks the promise\textsuperscript{115}.

The consequences are obvious, increase in sexually transmitted diseases including the deadly AIDS, teenage pregnancies, promotion of «safe sex» by employing contraceptives and use of condoms, etc., with the result being wholesale pornography and promiscuity. This escapism which also involves the supply of free clean needles for the drug addicts and condoms by the government is only proof of the blindness to the fundamental enemy: sexual promiscuity\textsuperscript{116}.

The naked truth remains that the only cure for promiscuity is chastity. Purity of body, mind and heart for all; single or married.

«There has never been any effective prevention except sexual continence. There is no “safe sex” other than the dignity and discipline of faithful marriage. A community that won't do all it can to promote personal and social chastity is only complacent to the suicide of its moral, medical, and social welfare. Such a community becomes partner to the sepsis of pornography, the sepsis of promiscuity, and the sepsis of perversion»\textsuperscript{117}.

4. THE CONTRACEPTIVE MENTALITY

The American society and the Western society in general, because of the influence the above practices becomes a contraceptive culture. The obvious results are that the community acquires a hypersexual culture which necessitates contraceptives to perpetuate it.

The sharp hostility and the evident dissent in which the Encyclical \textit{Humanae Vitae} was greeted in America, says a lot about the cultural-spiritual climate that was beginning to reign. Following all the polemic about the anovulant pill and other types of contraceptives, the American family scenario was changing. With the wake of the sexual revolution;

«a “contraceptive mentality” reigns supreme»\textsuperscript{118}. 
And

«the expression “contraceptive mentality” or “contraceptive state of mind” is alternatively described as the “contraceptive attitude” or “contraceptive morality,” or a feature of “contraceptive culture”»119.

But when can we speak of a certain mode of behaviour as a mentality? DeMacro sheds some light on this issue.

«A mentality exists in a society when enough people react automatically to a situation without thinking of the long range consequences»120.

For example, we have the «inflation mentality», the «slave mentality», the «consumer mentality», the «cold war mentality» and the «contraceptive mentality»121. Here Marx concurs with DeMacro as he connects abortion to contraception.

«Once contraception-abortion becomes a cultural pattern, you will see young people increasingly engaged in ever more irresponsible sexual activity. They feel they will not be pregnant, especially if they use contraception, and if they are unwantedly pregnant —since only wanted children should be born— they can always resort to the fail-safe means of birth control called abortion also described as “post-conception family planning” or “menstrual extraction” at Planned Parenthood (PP) meetings»122.

Once this becomes a way of life the results are obvious. Increased venereal diseases, illegitimate births, increased teenage pregnancies, abortions, and blocked fallopian tubes123. When it is no longer odd to seek sexual gratification with whoever, however, whenever and wherever, —contraception behaviour evolves into a mentality—124. The «contraceptive mentality» affects both the married and the single. This is because conjugal love is brewed in such a way that children are aliens, in fact enemies of the spousal union. In this kind of society, the policy becomes; «everything goes» provided no babies are born.

«Now contraceptive intercourse by married persons is ordinarily not, if it is to be effective in bringing about the desired goal —preventing conception and at the same time permitting the sexual expression of marital love— an isolated event. It demands a policy decision, the choice to adopt the practice of contraceptive intercourse for a prolonged period of time. It is difficult for me to see how it is possible to choose a policy, to adopt this practice as a way of life, as an expression of one's personality, without taking on a “contraceptive mentality”, whether or not one really wants to
take this kind of mentality or not. It imperceptibly becomes a dimension of one’s existence. Contraception, to be effective, must become a habituated mode of action. A person might say that he does not have a contraceptive mentality and really believe it (perhaps because he really does love children), but actions speak louder than words. The habitual practice of acting contraceptively, even if it may not proceed from a “contraceptive mentality” would seem to generate this kind of mentality, ...”\textsuperscript{125}.

As DeMacro emphasises.

«The “contraceptive mentality” results when this separation of intercourse from procreation is taken for granted and the contraceptive partners feel that, in employing contraception, they have severed themselves from all the responsibility for a conception that might take place as a result of contraceptive failure»\textsuperscript{126}.

It is absurd that the proponents of this mentality have labelled it, being «responsible», even with responsible parenting. Responsibility for them is, to have all the fun and pleasure in the world and to do anything possible to avoid babies. What all this amounts to is that a couple has both the means to alienate intercourse from procreation, and also the right or responsibility as well\textsuperscript{127}.

The masters of the contraceptive mentality have their flag flying practically all over the world. According to the «Homiletic and Pastoral Review», Stanislas de Lestapis, a Jesuit sociologist in his work \textit{La limitation des naissances}, Paris 1960, was among the first person to draw attention to the contraceptive mentality. He called it then a contraceptive state of mind, evident in the high number of abortions recorded from habitual users of contraceptives; in England, Sweden, Switzerland. Contraception does not reduce abortions but rather establishes a «contraceptive state of mind» which leads to absolving responsibility for children conceived, and therefore to more abortions\textsuperscript{128}.

Other figures include John T. Noonan, Jr., Christopher Dawson, who as early as 1933 saw contraception as a threat to marriage, as did Dr. Paul Popeneoe. Max Horkeimer (Germany) and Cardinal Suenens (Belgium) attributed the instability of marriage and the rise in divorce cases to the contraceptive mentality. Robert V. O’Brien in 1967 termed the mentality as a symptom of a sick civilization\textsuperscript{129}.

DeMacro reports that by 1975, the contraceptive mentality was already playing a dominant role in the sexual behaviour of the Western world. In the US, 10 million women were using the pill indicated by the 64 million annual prescriptions, the sale of condoms reached
$150 million a year. In England, a 1972 report indicates that 90 percent of the married couples are believed to have practised contraception in some form at some time in their married lives. In Canada, 24 percent of the women aged 18-44 were on the pill by 1976. By mid-seventies, 40 million women throughout the world were using oral contraceptives.

«Clearly, the “contraceptive mentality” has achieved a nearly global acceptance and there is the push to make that acceptance even broader, especially among the young continues... As the “contraceptive mentality” becomes better established it assumes the character of being natural and inevitable which, by contrast, makes any opposition to contraception seem more and more unnatural and incomprehensible.»

The contraceptive behaviour therefore becomes part and parcel of modern man. With this mentality, does man have any alternative? Even otherwise committed Christians are usually caught up in this «do it» philosophy of our time. The motto is do not abstain, after all, the contraceptives are there for your use. It is only yours for the asking.

CONCLUSIONS

This work in four chapters has been dedicated to study the theology of marriage and human sexuality in the post-Conciliar years. This we have done by making our study in the periodical «Homiletic and Pastoral Review», with a view of offering a basis for a better understanding and perhaps, a renewal. As is logical, our findings reflect the American society since our primary source is edited in the United States of America. However, we note that the situation in other Western countries is no different. We could therefore deduce and affirm the following.

1. *Humanae Vitae* has occupied a decisive role in the understanding of human sexuality. The wind of change blown by the sexual revolution of the 1960’s has no doubt engraved its effects in the society. This, together with other factors initiated an attitude of dissent even before the issuance of the encyclical on human life.

The press played a significant role in making the voice of the dissenters popular. Our study revealed that the dissenting theologians were given front page coverage while the traditional theological arguments were hidden in centre pages or the back page. Therefore, it was
not surprising that HV was greeted with such hostility with some of the theologians actually registering their direct dissent barely 24 hours after its promulgation. Some theologians were afraid or shy and only indicated indirect dissent —neither asserting to the Papal teaching nor attacking it but by remaining mum—. This group too has done a lot of harm to the Church just like those who couldn’t stomach this prophetic document and abandoned the priesthood.

The encyclical, *Humanae Vitae* was a response to the questions on the Church’s doctrine on human sexuality especially as regards contraception. HV taught that every act of coition must retain its natural potential of being procreative (Cf. HV 11). At the same time, prohibited was direct abortion is prohibited, as well as sterilisation and sexual intercourse which is deliberately contraceptive (Cf. HV 14).

The dissenters argued that since nature at times allows the sexual act not to be procreative, the couple too could separate the two by using contraceptives. But it should be pointed out, that not everything that is humanly possible can licitly be carried out. Some charged that the Supreme Pontiff did not give HV infallibly. On the issue of infallibility HV followed all the criteria stipulated in LG 25.

2. In treating the issue of human sexuality and marriage, the procreative dimension of marriage emerged clearly. The marital union is ordained for the procreation of new life. For the married, this *munus* rests on their conjugal union strengthened by the conjugal love and intimately by the conjugal act. It is through the ONE act that unites the spouses, that is also procreative. Children are the fruits of this union and the family has to be planned through prudence enjoined in generosity.

The unitive and procreative dimensions of marriage are designed by the Creator to be inseparable. In other words the mutual love-giving and life-giving acts are strongly bond together and must always co-exist. When due to no fault of the spouses, or due to natural causes the unitive and procreative meanings are divorced, this is in the mind of the author of life. But the couple cannot deliberately separate the two licitly.

3. If for serious and just reasons the couple has to delay the coming of a baby in their union, NFP may licitly be used. NFP is a scientific method that follows the rhythms of nature to detect fertility. This enables the spouses to effect or avoid a conception by modifying their sexual life; sexual intercourse during the fertile phase for the former, and periodic abstinence for the latter. This method as we saw is not to be confused with the old rhythm or calendar method. NFP is also ca-
lied the sympto-thermal (S-T) method and uses a combination of parameters to positively detect the fertile and infertile days of the woman. For effectiveness all the parameters have to be observed. Actually NFP is almost 100% effective, has no health side effects, respects the human dignity and maintains the naturalness of the marital act. The periodic continence is a school of chastity and self-mastery. Only a method that respects the human dignity and keeps the two meanings of marriage—unitive and procreative intact can be accepted as morally ordered. Some of the objections advanced against this natural method include; that it could instil a contraceptive mentality (serious reasons are needed to justify its use), that rhythm in the past backfired (pastors and all involved are encouraged to keep abreast of new developments), myths that NFP produces deformed children (this has been scientifically disapproved).

4. With so much pornography, the American society has become highly charged with the contraceptive mentality. This mentality gained an upper hand in the wake of the sexual revolution, i.e., when contraception-abortion started becoming a cultural pattern. The fruits as «Homiletic and Pastoral Review» indicates are obvious—increased promiscuity in the society—.

The contraceptive culture in the early days encouraged the seeking of sexual gratification without the commitment of accepting new life. The so called «safe sex» creates an over-confidence that breeds adultery, pre-marital sex, venereal diseases, abortions. The spouses are not seen as persons but as objects of pleasure and means to the same.

The proponents of the contraceptive culture argue that the use of contraceptives is for the good of the couple. They hold that the contraceptive behaviour preserves mutual affection in marriage which could be endangered by too long and frequent abstinence. The many problems among those using contraceptives evidenced by divorces, infidelities and broken homes, disapproves this argument.

The part justifying the whole is another argument raised. Since the couple engages in fertile sexual relations, the contraceptive acts should be evaluated as part of the whole. But frequently making conjugal acts infertile cannot be justified by occasionally permitting them to be fertile. Suggesting the principle of double effect does not make contraception right because it is never permissible to do evil to achieve a good. Neither does the principle of the lesser evil sustain their argument since here contraception is an evil willed not tolerated.

5. For arguments against contraception, we discovered the following. Contraceptive acts go against the design engraved by the Creator
in human sexuality. This they do by making the otherwise fertile sexual acts sterile and thus frustrating their finality. Since the basic aim of contraceptive coition is sexual pleasure, the partner is seen as an object. This indicates a dualistic anthropology (also employed by the «majority report»). Here, the person is taken as being different from his body. HV condemned this dualistic view (Cf. HV 10). The person has to be taken as a whole.

The contraceptive behaviour destroys the God-given wholeness of the unitive and procreative dimensions of marriage. This is made evident by the fact that new life has no place in a contraceptive union. The spouses renounce their munus making their conjugal act disordered, as it amounts to a rejection of fatherhood and motherhood and in fact, a dehumanizing act. Should new life result, abortion is the normal solution because from the very beginning the baby was seen as a threat.

Also contraceptive behaviour is not without psychological shortcomings, among them the fear of the child. Spouses use contraceptives to protect themselves from the baby. This fear is aggravated by the fact that no contraception is 100% effective, and overflows to the fear of the spouse, frigidity, and diminishing of love. Doctors have even detected a pathological condition, sexual anorexia (loss of sexual desire) linked to the fear of intimacy.

6. To promote their cause, the proponents of the contraceptive culture use the schools. One of the organizations which is a great campaigner of this culture, Planned Parenthood, to be effective in its goal fought for the introduction of sex education in the American education curriculum. After the success of having abortion made law, PP announced its next target: the children. Implicit sex education programmes have been introduced into schools disguised as «Family life education». In this programmes, sex is taught without any moral ties apart from «be responsible and do not hurt others». Being responsible here means enjoy yourself but at all costs do not get pregnant.

This programme is present in all public schools and unfortunately it is slowly but surely infiltrating into the Catholic schools. The idea here is to brainwash the children so that they are able to docilely accept contraceptives and abortion. In short, the programme introduces the young minds to the contraceptive culture.

7. A society swimming in the deep oceans of the contraceptive culture is not satisfied by having to enjoy sex without the menace of children. It goes a step further to embrace «artful» baby making outside the sexual act. Artificial fertilization and artificial insemination, proce-
dure that were developed to help childless couples get offspring of their own have been channeled to other ends. Artificial fertilization is the act of fusing the male seed and the ovum in the laboratory, — *in vitro* fertilization followed by the implantation of the embryo in the womb — embryo transfer (ET). Artificial insemination involves the fertilizing of the ovum *in utero*, or helping the sperm have a high possibility of fertilizing the ovum i.e., assisted insemination.

Artificial fertilization is found to be morally disordered because it separates the unitive and procreative dimensions of human sexuality by replacing the conjugal act. Also the semen used is usually collected from masturbatory acts, which are intrinsically disordered. The situation becomes even more complicated when a third person is involved as a donor or even as a surrogate mother. *In vitro* fertilization invites further manipulations and abuses, experimenting with the embryo, selective implantation, *in vitro* abortion, deep freezing of the embryo, etc.

Artificial insemination is not morally licit as the conjugal act is bypassed separating the unitive and procreative meaning. The sperm used is normally obtained through masturbation. However, if the artificial insemination is used to help semen collected from a natural act to have a higher chance of fertilizing the ovum, it could be licit. This is assisted insemination which does not replace the marital act and therefore could be morally accepted.

One of the predicaments of IVF is the «extra», or «spare» embryos. These are either deep frozen or discarded. Over the last decade many embryos have been frozen and forgotten in laboratories. We encountered a dilemma on the fate of these embryos. Could they be rescued through adoption, although their first home would be a surrogate womb? An answer to this real problem was that surrogate motherhood disqualifies this «rescue mission» because the end does not justify the means. Surrogate motherhood is contrary to the unity of marriage and the dignity of the procreation of the human person (DV part II A no. 3).

8. The Magisterial teaching of Paul VI, John Paul I, and John Paul II concurs with the inseparability of the unitive and procreative dimensions of human sexuality as revealed in our study. The unitive meaning is strengthened by the conjugal love and the conjugal act. Children are precious gifts and their proper place is the family. NFP is endorsed as the method of birth control when the couple have serious reasons to warrant the postponing the coming of a child. In NFP, the spouses cultivate chastity and self-mastery and the children are seen as gifts. Contraceptive behaviour on the hand is estranged from the Church
teaching as it separates the unitive and procreative meanings. IVF & ET, AIH and AID employ the dualistic view of man, and they push God out of the baby making program by taking the role of arbiters and children are seen as things to possessed by right.

Having traced the development of human sexuality, marriage and contraception, we could deduce that, a renewal of moral theology in marriage should be one that respects the dignity of the human person. Here then, reproduction or the artful making of «miracle babies» has no place. Fertilisation effected in petri dishes only gives room for manipulation and abuse. Contraception mocks the natural mechanisms installed by the Creator and encourages dehumanisation. This renewal should be one that respects life as a whole and also in the way this life comes into the world. That is, life is to be respected right through from conception, its development in the mother’s womb, the child in the latency years in education and human care, up to ripe old age according to the will of the Creator.

In the evaluative conclusion, we have expounded the teaching of the Church which encourages the inseparability of the unitive and procreative dimension of human sexuality and marriage. NFP has passed the test as the method to ensure this unity. Christians are therefore called to spend time in understanding and defending the Church’s teaching than in trying to accommodate a view of human sexuality based on faulty arguments. This teaching, present in *Humanae Vitae* and recent Magisterial documents like *Familiaris Consortio, Donum Vitae, Gratissimum Sane*, etc., as has been elaborated, gives a basis for the renewal in moral theology on the doctrine of marriage and sexuality.

2. Cf. SHEHEN, L. Cardinal, «Humane Vitae» 1968-73 (Nov. 1973) Part I & II, 23. «... issued his encyclical Humanae Vitae reaffirming the doctrine of Pius XII. While granting the legitimate use of anovulant drugs for the cure of certain ills, he clearly restated that contraception is intrinsically evil, an intrinsic disorder which cannot licitly be embraced by a positive act of the will, forbidden by the natural law».

3. HV1.

4. Cf. DURRAND, A., The Encyclical-A fresh translation (August 1969) 856. «... utterly to be rejected, as a legitimate way of controlling birth, the direct interruption of the process of generation, once this has began, and especially direct abortion, ... direct sterilisation of man or woman, whether permanently or for a time, is to be condemned. Also rejected is any procedure... which aims at blocking procreation either as end desired, or a means to some other end».

5. Cf. Ibid. «This doctrine, often set forth by the teaching of the Church, is founded upon the unbreakable tie between the two meanings of conjugal union, that of oneness and that of procreation. Both are built into the act and tie between them, since it is established by God, is not to be tampered with by man».

6. Cf. WROBLEWSKI, Sergius, John Paul II and «Humanae Vitae» (Oct. 1984) 52. «... as late as 1965 the opposition among theologians and lay people to artificial birth control was almost unanimous. A shift was noticeable in 1967 when theologians like B. Häring and R. McCormick and the Dutch hierarchy openly questioned the ban on contraceptives. At the same time the majority on the Papal Birth Control Commission also favoured departure from traditional teaching. Consequently it was no surprise that the publication of Humanae Vitae in July of 1968 was greeted with hostility».

7. FARREHER, Joseph J., QA: The sensus fidelium does not invalidate «Humanae Vitae» (Nov. 1979) 73. «Since dissenters are usually more vocal and receive more publi-
city than defenders, an observer might get the impression that there is almost a consensus of dissent.

8. Cf. Hitchcock, James, _The American press and birth control: Preparing ground for dissent_ (July 1980) 11-12. "Two issues had arisen in the early 1960's which largely created the context in which public discussion was carried on. One was the awareness of the possibility of an over-populated world and the consequent need to control population, a discovery which even then gave rise to rhetoric, largely accepted without question by the media, which was urgent, panicky, and sometimes bordering on the dictatorial... The second issue revolved around a series of widely proclaimed "break-throughs" in the technology of contraception... The first point at which a change in the Catholic position occurred was on the question of whether the sale of contraceptives should be legal.

9. Cf. Ibid., 19-24. "By 1965 the pattern of the press treatment of contraception, insofar as it related to Church, was established, although the defenders of the traditional doctrine were given some exposure... far more space was given to the growing body of dissenters... From the standpoint of objective and honest journalism traditionalists were also sometimes treated unfairly. For example, Newsweek, after quoting Msgr. Kelly on one occasion (July 6, 1964) gave its own gloss on what he had said: "Msgr. Kelly's fears are justified: sex is more fun with oral contraceptives" 19. «... A brief survey of the New York Times demonstrates the pattern. Although traditionalists were interviewed and quoted, they usually appeared on obscure pages of the paper or in the midst of long articles primarily devoted to dissenting opinions. Meanwhile, prominence was given to other opinions... Front-page coverage was given to a statement by the German theologian Bernard Häring that the Council supported family limitation (June 3, 1964)... A front-page exposure was given to series of meetings at the Ford Foundation, which led to a qualified approval of contraception by the priests and lay people present... (June 20, & August 26, 1965)». 20. «... In March 20, 1965, Newsweek also published an extensive survey of American Catholicism, including opinion polls on a variety of subjects. The survey found not only a sharp increase in the number of Catholics who approved of contraception (about 73 percent) but also a measurable change of opinion about abortion, divorce, and clerical celibacy- 23-24.

10. Ibid., 24.


12. The treatment of the «Minority report», seems to be practically absent. However it could be that, since it held the traditional or conservative position, which later Humanae Vitae incorporated, its ideas are merged with those of the teaching of the Church.

13. Cf. Hitchcock, 23. «In the spring of 1967 (April 19) The National Catholic Reporter published the texts of the differing majority and minority reports of the papal birth-control commission, confidential documents which had presumably been given to the paper by a member of the commission. The fact that the majority of the commission favoured a change in the traditional doctrine received wide attention and was urged as a strong reason why a change should be made. Time (April 28) diagnosed the unauthorised publication of the reports as an attempt to pressure the Holy Father into issuing the desired statement and suggested that it might have the opposite effect. Newsweek characterised those who opposed the majority recommendation as merely a "conservative clique" (May 1)».
NOTES

14. MAY, William E., *Sex, love and procreation* (May 1976) 13-14. «... the authors of the majority report hold that actions destructive of human goods, such as life itself, are morally justifiable so long as "a good or a higher order" is protected or achieved... "where a higher good is at stake and the only means to protect it is to choose a non-moral evil, then the will remains properly disposed to the values constitutive of human good"... This is to say that the intention is good even when the person, reluctantly and regretfully to be sure, intends the non-moral evil if a truly proportionate reason for such a choice is present».


16. Cf. *Ibid.*, 13-14. «First, no one ever intends an evil in and for itself; one always intends his act to bring about some good. A person who cruelly tortures another because for him this is an exquisitely delightful experience is not intending the evil of torture in and for itself; he is intending it in itself, to be sure for his will is certainly targeted on the torture and cannot not be so targeted. But he is not intending the torture for itself, since he intends it for the delightful aesthetic experience that it will bring him. Second, if we take seriously the significance of our deeds as revelatory of our being and as shaping our identify, we must conclude that if our wills are directly targeted on an evil such as death, we must be willing to take on us part of our moral identity the identity of killers, even if this is an identity only reluctantly accepted... Third, if we look upon the significance of our deeds from a Christian perspective and do so mindful of our being as living images of God, we will realise that we ought to be true images of him... if we are to be faithful images of God then we too ought to choose to do a deed that of necessity requires us to intend the evil effected, for if we do we cannot be innocent of evil».

17. Cf. *Ibid.*, 14. «This methodology, ... is widely accepted today by many Roman Catholic moral theologians, including in its ranks such well-known and respected persons as Richard McCormick, Cornelius Van der Poel, William van der Marck, John Dedek, Bruno Schüller, Louis Janssens, and others».

18. Cf. *Ibid.*, 17. «The body with its sexual organs, is an instrument or tool that can be employed in different ways by the personal subject. This dualism is also acknowledged in the final report on responsible parenthood when it states that "it is proper to man created to the image of God, to use what is given in the physical nature in a way that he may develop it to its full significance with a view to the good of the whole person". ... Sexual organs are simply tools that the person who is quite distinct from those tools, can use now for one purpose, now for another, much the same way he can use a hammer now to drive nails, and now to ward off an intruder».


20. Cf. MAY, *Sex, love and procreation*, 17-18. «This dualism, which separates a human being into a personal and conscious subject and into an impersonal body with its organs and biological processes, is also reflected in the passage in the "majority report" that affirms that "it is permissible for man to use his sexual organs both to foster love and to achieve fertilisation". The body with its sexual organs, is an instrument or tool that can be employed in different ways by the personal subject... to grasp the dualism reflected in the "majority report" more clearly, it will be helpful to compare the thought set forth in it with the thought expressed... from Joseph Fletcher and... by Daniel Maguire... Fletcher writes: Physical nature, the body and its members, our organs and their functions... Maguire puts it this way: "Birth control was... for a very long time impeded by the physicalistic ethic that left moral man at the mercy of his biology. He had no choice but to conform to the rhythms
of his physical nature and to accept its determinations obediently. If there is a significant difference between the anthropology of the authors of the "majority report" and the anthropology set forth in these passages by Fletcher and Maguire, it is not, in my judgement, very apparent. All agree in locating the personal and the human —what makes a human being to be a human being—in consciousness; all agree in considering the body, with its organs and biological processes, as a part of physical nature apart from the human person.

21. Cf. GRIZEZ, Germain, *The roots of the new morality* (June 1975) 24. «The old morality with respect to sexuality and human life is founded on the belief that human persons do not simply have and use bodies, but rather that human persons are rational, sentient, organic bodies. Neo-platonic and gnostic matter/spirit dualism denied the unity of the human person, but the old morality was shaped prior to the influences of such dualism on Jewish thought which kept close to the moral outlook of Jewish thought... The human body and its biological processes are consigned by most contemporary ethical theories to the natural world while the person, in whom meaning and value are focused, is identified with the conscious subject».

22. Ibid.

23. MAY, Sex, love and procreation, 23. «... the Pope affirms that responsible parenthood, with respect to the "biological processes", "means the knowledge and respect of their functions" and notes that the "human intellect discovers in the power of giving life biological laws which are a part of the human person" (HV 10). In other words for Paul human fecundity is not simply a biological process, an impersonal "it" pertaining to the world of nature that is set over against the human subject, but is rather something that pertains to the Personhood of human beings and participates in the dignity of the human person».

24. PILON, Mark A., *Contraception: Contra God and contra man* (Oct. 1985) 64-65. «From this perspective, conjugal love involves a total gift of the persons themselves which as "total" must include their bodies, their masculinity and femininity, which are meant to be at the service of life and the Creator. The body is not something these persons have, and give to each as a mere "thing" they have. Rather their bodies are themselves. Human persons are bodily beings, and when they give themselves totally they give the whole of their being, which involves the very masculinity and femininity inscribed in their bodies. To "contracept" this act is therefore to become involved in a tremendous denial of truth related to the human person and conjugal love... This lie, this denial of the full gift, the total good of man and woman to each other, has profound consequences in the whole ethical life of man».

25. Cf. SHAW, Russell, *Contraception, infallibility and the ordinary Magisterium* (July 1978) 15. «Paul VI... says among other things that it would be impossible to accept some conclusions from his Commission of Study of Problems of Population, Family, and Birth-rate because they are not compatible with "the moral doctrine on matrimony, proposed by the Magisterium of the Church with constant firmness" (HV 6). He speaks of "the constant teaching of the Church" (HV 10 and 11) says the Church by its teaching on contraception "promulgates the divine law" (HV 20), and declares the teaching on contraception to be part of the "saving teaching of Christ" (HV 29)».

26. HITCHCOCK, 24-25. «The issuance of the encyclical initiated a battle in the press even more intense and prolonged... In the pages of Newsweek, for example, it gave rise to a vicious vendetta against Pope Paul VI which lasted for at least five years. One final example of media involvement must be note, however, because it reveals how radically the opinions of certain people had changed in a few years, time and
how effectively they had learned to exploit the media for their own purposes. Several hundred American Catholic theologians announced their dissent from the encyclical, under the leadership of Father Charles Curran... American Catholics rejected Humanae Vitae and that rejection was the occasion of a growing alienation from the Church... the rejection of HV, the extent that it occurred, was hardly spontaneous. It was preceded by at least five years when the most influential segments of the press, secular and Catholic, propagandises intensely and unremittingly for a change in the official teaching”.

27. KLAUS, Hanna., A Second Look at «Humanae Vitae» (Oct. 1973) 60. «The Dutch catechism (401-4, Herder and Herder, N.Y. 1967), invoking the principle of totality explains that since Vatican II had put the two ends of marriage, conjugal love and procreation, on a footing of equal dignity, the roles can be fulfilled alternatively and not necessarily concurrently».

28. HAY Jr.-GERALD C, Apologia Pro Vita Humana (Jan. 1970) 283. «That will depend on the meaning of human sexuality. Pope Paul VI maintains that it has two essential elements: union and procreation. Sexual immorality amounts to the attack upon one or both of these elements».

29. SHEHEN, L. Cardinal, «Humane Vitae» 1968-73 (Dec. 1973) Part III, 22. «... that every marriage act must remain open to the transmission of life, i.e., it must retain the its procreative meaning...».

30. Cf. GRIESE, Orville, The blessings of children (Jan. 1981) 60. «A similar position was emphasised by Paul VI in his Humanae Vitae... the inseparable connection willed by God... between two meanings of the conjugal act: the unitive meaning and the procreative meaning».

31. HV 12.

32. Cf. GRIESE, 60. See also HAY Jr, Apologia Pro Vita Humana, 284. «Sexual immorality amounts to an attack upon one or both of these elements. There still exists something of a consensus that fornication, adultery, and perverted acts of sex are wrong. Why? Fornication is not real union, for real union implies a total giving of the self. Union implies a promise to be there in the future; it implies love. Adultery dishonours a union that has been pledged and given. Sexual perversion, even though motivated by love, is not even sexual since it eliminates the procreative element in the most blatant manner. Contraception is a willed separation of the procreative element from the unitive... Rhythm is an entirely different matter... Nothing is done to separate the two elements, even though one may wish, even ardently, that conception not occur».

33. Ibid., 53. «In the wake of the sexual revolution of our day when many take tolerant view of marital infidelity, and even Catholic authors argue for the “compatibility of child-free marriages with authentic Catholic doctrine”, human sexuality for legions of couples stands almost alone a prime value in marriage».

34. KLAUS, 64. «The tone of the encyclical reflects greater concern for fertility and openness to it than for the conjugal relation of the couple, or so it appears to many. But other complimentary argumentation for the encyclical’s position is possible...».

35. HAY Jr., 285. «It is true that not every sexual act must be directed to procreation. Biologically they are not, and practice of rhythm recognises that fact».

36. GRIESE, 53-54.

37. Ibid., 56-57. «Even before Vatican II, papal documents reflected an abrupt shift away from the Augustinian stance on conjugal union... The phrase “primary and secondary ends of marriage”, however, became a casualty of Vatican Council II. GS deliberately avoided any reference to the hierarchical ends of marriage, a concept
which clashed with the covenantal nature of marriage and which would tend to tarnish the goodness and dignity of childless marriages... Certain aspects of St. Augustine's doctrine on the "Three Blessings of Marriage" might be called a second casualty of Vatican II. The doctrine is given no more than passing mention». See also Brankin. 28. «In a masterful stroke, he (John Paul II) dismisses a hierarchical ordering of the ends of marriage where it would seem to place those ends at odds or in conflict with another. John Paul II views love and fruitfulness as inseparable in reality as form and matter».

38. Ibid., 57.

39. Cf. SKRZYDELEWSKI, Conflict and Schism in Moral Theology and Sexual Ethics, 23-27. «Of all branches of moral theology it was the subject of sexual ethics in Western civilisation that in the 1960s and 1970 received the most attention through discussions and examination in both Catholic and non-Catholic publications. Many theologians proclaimed the existing prohibitions outdated, and they pronounced morally permissible several sexual activities that had earlier been considered immoral». 23. «The principle of natural family planning, which has been accepted by the Church and repeated by recent popes, allows adaptation through periodic continence to the natural human structure of fertility but prohibits as immoral the use of contraceptive methods. This principles have been questioned by such well-known theologians as L. Janssens, J.M. Reuss, W.H.M. Van der Marck, R. McCormick, P. de Locht, J. David, J. Fuchs, F. Bockle, and C. Curran. After the publication of Paul VI's encyclical about moral principles governing the transmission of human life, the resistance of many Western theologians turned into open rebellion. They rejected—and continue to reject—the encyclical's norms and arguments referring to family planning». 24. See also SHEHEN, «Humane Vitae» 1968-73, Part III. «Meanwhile the concept of the inseparability of the two meanings of the marriage act seems to have been abandoned by Frs. Fuchs and McCormick and their associates, who for some years had systematised and supported the concept».

40. Cf. Ibid., 24-25. «The most recent claim of many Western theologians is that the recommendation of natural family planning cannot be practical because it is impossible to organise appropriate instruction. This argument is groundless. Doctors and others who have organised NFP centres have proved that they can indeed provide effective instruction... Theologians who oppose the papal teaching on family planning have tried to justify their position by saying that the Magisterium is not infallible in moral matters and that recommendations or dispositions in these matters are not binding. Paul VI rejected this claim as contrary to the centuries-old tradition of the Church, thus placing these theologians in conflict with the highest Magisterium of the Church».

41. SHEHEN, «Humane Vitae» 1968-73, Part III. 20-21. «The critics of the encyclical claim that there are two main unresolved difficulties in the document which seem to call for further development. The first is found in the statement that “each and every act of coitus must remain open to [destinatus ad] the transmission of life”; whereas it is evident that most acts of coitus do not and many cannot achieve procreation or the transmission of life. The second difficulty arises from the teaching that the two inner meanings of each act of intercourse, the unitive and procreative, are God's plan inseparable; whereas the encyclical itself, say the critics, implies the two ends of the act, the unitive and procreative are in fact separated and therefore separable. The encyclical, they claim, reflects the strength of this difficulty in what has been called “almost a contradiction”». 
42. SCANLON, Regis, American Catholics at the cross-roads (July 1997) 16. «Shortly before his death, Cardinal Bernardin initiated his Catholic Common Ground project to bring factions of the Church together in dialogue... “limited and occasional dissent” from the Magisterium was part of it».

43. Cf. KLAUS, 67; «Humanae Vitae then is an encyclical which says much about human life, and some of what it says is a “hard saying”. Indeed many will “go away” even as they did in the Lord’s time when he said hard things». See also STAFFORD, Geraldine, «Humanae Vitae and the Catholic Priest (Dec., 1980) 30-31: «While many changes have taken place in the diocese of Buffalo and in the Church throughout the world since Paul VI issued Humanae Vitae twelve years ago, the controversy concerning the Church’s constant teaching banning artificial birth control is still the cause of much unrest and disunity among Catholics today... During the last twelve years many priests seem to have had a problem upholding Humanae Vitae and some of them, ... have left priesthood as a result of their predicament. Others who could not give their wholeheartedly support to Humanae Vitae, rather than resign have chosen to remain in the priesthood; ...».


45. Cf. Ibid., 20-21. «John Paul II was literally applying Lumen Gentium, no. 25, to the situation of the Church in the United States. The faithful must “submit”, “or” “adhere” in “mind” (“will and intellect”), to the Pope’s faith and moral decisions “even when he does not speak ex cathedra”. Even every bishop and priest must as­sent his “mind” (internally) to the Pope’s teaching on contraception to be fully joined to the Church and receive Holy Communion worthily. Lumen Gentium, no. 25, corrected the pre-Vatican II theological error, that dissent from the Pope could at times be licit».

46. Cf. Ibid., 24. The teaching of Vatican II, is cited especially LG 25. «Thus, while Catholics can dialogue, no amount of dialogue can solve the division in the Church in America. Each and every Catholic, especially each Cardinal and bishop, must decide to follow either John Paul II’s interpretation of Vatican II or Cardinal Bernardin’s».


48. SHAW, 9. «The article by Ford & Grisez attempts to show that the conditions articulated by Vatican I for infallible teaching by the ordinary Magisterium have been met in the course of the tradition, and so a divinely guaranteed teaching is involved. “Such teachings, once given, cannot later be contradicted by the Church as whole”. It is argued that those who defended the legitimacy of the dissent from Humanae Vitae “proceeded directly from the non-definitive character of Paul VI’s pronouncement to the possibility of licit dissent from infallible teachings, ignoring the possibility that the non-definitive pronouncement contained a reaffirmation of a teaching which, even if never defined, was already infallibly proposed by the ordinary Magisterium”. After a lengthy argument the final conclusion runs: “We think there is an extremely strong case for the position that the received Catholic teaching on the immorality of contraception has been infallibly proposed by the ordinary Magisterium”».

49. Ibid., 10. «The major assumptions are, first, that the Catholic Church does enjoy the charisma of infallibility in belief and teaching and, second that the ordinary Magisterium is exercised infallibly when the conditions set forth by Vatican II are met».
50. *Ibid.*, 12-13. «... there are four conditions which must be met for an infallible exercise of the ordinary Magisterium of the bishops throughout the world. These are: that the bishops be in communion with one another and with the pope; that they teach authoritatively on a matter of faith or morals; that they agree in one judgement; that they propose this as something to be held definitively». See also *Scanlon*, American Catholics at the cross-roads, 16-26.


52. Cf. Marra, William A., *Human love and the sacredness of sex* (July 1974) 21-22. «Against the autonomous splendour of spousal love, marriage can be seen as at the service of spousal love. This love, which shakes a man to his depths, which has a primacy among human loves and an exclusiveness not found in other loves, calls for a mutual pledge of fidelity, and this of course is the essential meaning of marriage. Far from being some formality imposed by positive law or custom, the mutual pledge is an organic outgrowth of the spousal love itself. The lovers want to share their life and their fate. They are happy to exchange the firm pledges of their wills as proof against whatever possible change of the hearts that the future may bring. There is, hence an earnestness in genuine love, a taking seriously the beloved and the love itself. It is just the earnestness which is expressed in the vows of marriage».


55. Cf. Gratissimam Sane 14. «But not all the consequences are taken into consideration, especially when the ones who end up paying are, apart from the other spouse, the children, deprived of a father or mother and condemned to be in fact orphans of living parents».
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100. Cf. Hitchcock, 11. «Two issues had arisen in the early 1960’s which largely created the context in which public discussion was carried on. One was the awareness of the possibility of an over-populated world and the consequent need to control population, a discovery which even then gave rise to a rhetoric, largely accepted without question by the media...».

103. Cf. Ibid. 14. «Since then the contraceptive revolution has occurred. Nature’s own arrangement to assure production is widely being rendered sterile. The ultimate consequences are unforeseen. Already in some countries, there is a birth dearth. Everywhere that contraception has gone, abortion has followed».
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NOTES

109. Cf. *Ibid.*, 56. «It spreads into every town and hamlet by means of printed materials (magazines, paperbacks, sex brochures and obscene cartoons), through incredibly foul advertising in the U. S. Mails, through movies. Through adult book stores, combining peep show booths, through the sale of bizarre sex paraphernalia such as false penises and vaginas, through an increasing variety of sex parlours such as massage houses and male strip joints, through obscene discussion and rock music programs over the radio, and finally through the descent television programming into themes of sexual promiscuity, adultery and perversion».
113. MURPHY, *The effects of pornography on family life*, 57.
116. Cf. *Ibid.*, 60-62. «The consequences can hardly escape recognition. Yet we drift along in a bemused euphoria of social tolerance, a ship of state wallowing without moral rudder in tempestuous sea of sexual passion. Sexually transmitted diseases such as syphilis, gonorrhea and herpes afflict our population in a remorseless and advancing tide of venereal infection. But these are outstripped by the disaster of A.I.D.S., the most devastating plague known to modern man. AIDS is a killer disease one hundred percent lethal... We compound the promiscuity and the perversion by distributing condoms and so-called “safe sex kits” featuring spermicidal lubricants, latex gloves and massage oil... Teenage pregnancies now reach well over a million annually. This, of course, is largely the by-product of teenage promiscuity, casual sex among 40 percent of the young at the present time. The beginning age lowers each year down now to 10-12 year old children. Pustules of venereal infection, sterility, cervical lesions, the subversion of marriage, neglected babies, psychological and emotional trauma are some of the sad results... Contraception, condoms, and now free needles are support systems for continuing promiscuity».
118. WROBLEWSKI, Sergius, John Paul II and *Humanae Vitae* (Oct. 1984) 52.
121. *Ibid.* «“Mentality” describes a pervasive —almost Pavlovian— mindset that is awake to the immediate benefit but asleep to the distant repercussion. An “inflation mentality”, for example, occurs when people, thinking of their own immediate needs, demand higher and higher wages in order to keep pace with inflation, but in so doing, ensure the perpetuation of the very inflation they seek to offset. A “mentality” is very difficult to correct because it is insulated by unconscious assumptions and preserved by sheer force of habit, A “mentality” is also very difficult to resist. Carl Jung offers a powerful example this when he describes the slave mentality which flooded ancient Italy and caused every Roman to become inwardly and unwittingly a slave. Because the Roman lived “constantly in the atmosphere of slaves”, according to Jung, “he became infected through the unconscious with their psychology”. (Contributions to Analytical Psychology, London, 1928). Thus we refer, in our own time, to a “consumer mentality”, a “cold war mentality”, and a “contraceptive mentality”».
122. MARX, Paul, *From contraception to abortion* (Feb. 1983) 8-9 (emphasis added).
123. Ibid., 9. «But the stepped-up irresponsible sexual activity on the part of the single and the married, once contraception-sterilisation becomes a way of life, leads to ever more venereal disease (VD), illegitimate births, increased teenage pregnancies, abortions and blocked fallopian tubes in women, which by the way, has caused the highest sterility in American history».

124. ENGEL, Randy, The moral plague of SAR (June 1984) 18-27. The «contraceptive mentality» is fuelled by SAR workshops taking place in many Catholic college campuses and seminaries. SAR is an acronym for Sexual Attitude Restructuring whose aim is to teach sex and not sexual morality. Some of the things emphasised include; a group discussion... on the sin of hurried sex (not of fornication)... the group facilitator suggests that sex, like fine wine, should be slowly savoured and not gulped. 23. «Sexual lifestyles are a matter of choice this is SAR dogma». 25. «Films from the Forum-Multi-Media films SAR unit fall into for basic categories: (1) Heterosexual Patterns; (2) Male and Female Masturbation; (3) Sexual Enrichment; (4) Homosexual and Lesbian Patterns».

125. MAY, Sex, love and procreation, 20.

126. DEMACRO, The contraceptive mentality, 56.

127. Ibid., 57. «Somewhat ironically, this practice of using contraception to relinquish responsibility for one’s own offspring is, in the minds of many, consistent with “being responsible” and even with “responsible parenting”. At any rate, the “contraceptive mentality” implies that a couple have not only the means to separate intercourse from procreation, but also the right or responsibility as well».
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