

Fall 2018

## Humanae Vitae Fifty Years Later

Paulinus Ikechukwu Odozor C.S.Sp.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/spiritan-horizons>



Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Odozor, P. I. (2018). Humanae Vitae Fifty Years Later. *Spiritan Horizons*, 13 (13). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/spiritan-horizons/vol13/iss13/11>

This Soundings is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Spiritan Horizons by an authorized editor of Duquesne Scholarship Collection.



Paulinus Ikechukwu Odozor, C.S.Sp.

Paulinus Ikechukwu Odozor, C.S.Sp. is Associate Professor of Moral Theology at the University of Notre Dame, Indiana. His thesis at the University of Toronto was published as *Richard McCormick and the Renewal of Moral Theology* (Notre Dame Press, 1995). Other publications include: *Morality Truly Christian, Truly African: Foundational, Methodological and Theological Considerations* (Notre Dame Press, 2014); *Moral Theology in An age of Renewal: A Study of the Catholic Tradition since Vatican II* (Notre Dame Press, 2003). He edited, *Sexuality, Marriage and Family: Readings in the Catholic Tradition* (Notre Dame Press, 2001) and, with Elochukwu Uzukwu, C.S.Sp., *Africa: Towards Priorities of Mission* (Enugu: SIST Publications, 2000). Odozor was professor and registrar at the Spiritan International School of Theology in Enugu, Nigeria, where he also served as President of the Governing Council, 2005-2017.

## HUMANAE VITAE FIFTY YEARS LATER

*Humanae Vitae, On the Regulation of Birth*, the encyclical on contraception that Pope Paul VI issued on July 29, 1968 did not just happen. It was rather the culmination of a long process of debates on birth control that go back into the history of the church.<sup>1</sup> But, *Humanae Vitae* appeared at a pivotal moment in this history and, when it did, it brought up many other issues that touched on several aspects of the church's moral tradition and theology in general.

A group of theologians meeting at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, barely one month after the publication of the encyclical captured some of the important questions that the encyclical raised for the theology, history, and life of the church. Here are the questions raised in a communique they issued after their meeting:

- (1) In the areas of human understanding which are proper to human reasoning, such as natural law, what is the function of the church as the authoritative teacher of revelation?
- (2) What are the sources for the formulation of binding moral doctrine within the Christian community?
- (3) What is the precise role of the Pope as authoritative teacher in these areas?
- (4) What is the role of the bishops, of the body of the faithful, and of the church's theologians in formulating such moral teaching?
- (5) What qualifications may be attached to the individual Christian's assent to admittedly fallible statements of the merely fallible magisterium, especially when this involves practical judgments of grave consequences...<sup>2</sup>

Many of these issues had been simmering, as it were, in other aspects of church life and theology, but now came to a head with the publication of the encyclical. The Pope's text acted then as a lightning rod that gave focus to these theological concerns. Fifty years after the publication of the encyclical, these questions continue to reverberate in the church. Indeed, we have come full circle on nearly all of them following the publication of Pope Francis' Post-synodal Exhortation, *Amoris Laetitia (The Joy of Love)*. In this commemorative article, we

provide a quick overview of the history of birth control in the Catholic Church leading up to the publication of *Humanae Vitae*. Then follows a summary of the main arguments of the encyclical, a brief history of its reception from both its advocates and its detractors, and some of the larger questions the encyclical raised and continues to raise. I also address some of the connections between *Humanae Vitae* and *Amoris Letitia*.

## History

The first known instances of contraception come from ancient Egypt and India where the ancients, in a bid to maximize the productivity of their farm animals, found ways to insert foreign objects in the wombs of the animals in the understanding that the womb cannot accommodate two disparate objects at once. In this way they ensured that the animal could work all year round or as much as needed.

Soon, however, the idea of contraception for use in humans also developed.<sup>3</sup> The various types of contraception invented by these ancient peoples were quite impressive.<sup>4</sup>

There is no explicit mention of contraception in the Bible.

The one case which has been used throughout church history to support the prohibition of contraception is

the well-known story of Onan in Genesis 38:8-10. Onan was said to have been killed by God for withdrawing his member rather than depositing semen in his late brother's wife with whom he had sexual intercourse as required by law to raise offspring for his late brother. As John Noonan points out, there have been various exegetical readings of the Onan case. "Most obviously, in the context of a story of the descent of the tribe, Onan had broken a law designed to perpetuate the name of the older son. He had also shown a want of family feeling and at the same time displayed an introverted egotism. Moreover, he had appeared to accept the obligation placed upon him to marry his widowed sister-in-law, but by his act had frustrated the purpose of the obligation. Finally, his contraceptive behavior itself seemed wrong to the narrator. Was Onan punished for his disobedience, for his lack of family feeling, for his egotism, for his evasion of an obligation assumed, for his contraceptive acts, or for a combination of these faults?"<sup>5</sup> St. Augustine of Hippo would later emphatically state that the reason God punished Onan was for withdrawing and spilling the seed at the point of orgasm, that is for having contraceptive intercourse. From the time of St. Augustine, therefore, the act of withdrawing from sexual intercourse at the point of orgasm rather than consummating the act, *coitus interruptus* (*Onanism* in the moral manuals), has been considered morally evil and displeasing to God.

*There is no explicit mention of contraception in the Bible.*

Although there was no explicit mention of contraception in the Bible, Christian tradition from earliest times firmly taught that contraception was immoral. This teaching came about on several grounds. The first was via the convergence of ideas based on several New Testament teachings on sex and sexuality. Some of the teachings on sex from the New Testament that influenced the church's position on contraception include the teaching on the superiority of virginity (Luke 20:34-36); the teaching on the institutional goodness of marriage (Mark

*...Christian tradition from earliest times firmly taught that contraception was immoral.*

10:7-8; John 2:1-12; Eph 5:25-33; *et cetera*); the teaching on the sacred character of sexual intercourse (1 Cor 6:16; 1 Thess 4:14; 1 Pet 3:2, 7); and the teaching on the moral goodness of procreation (John 16:21; 1 Tim 2:15), among many others. In these passages, writes Smith,

fertility and family are portrayed as great goods, as evidence of faithfulness to God, and as rewards for faithfulness to God...In this context contraception could be seen as a rejection of a gift from God, as an action stunting the growth of God's chosen people, for which reason to this day, Orthodox Judaism rejects contraception.<sup>6</sup>

The Christian position on contraception has also been arrived at from the Fathers through *Humanae Vitae* and beyond on conclusions drawn from natural law. The essence of this argument from natural law is that there is a *telos* or finality to the biological processes; this *telos* is discoverable by use of natural reason and is not to be violated. Among the stoics, for example, a thing was natural if it was uncontaminated by human sin or error, or is what animals do or is in conformity with the known structures of the human body. Thus, an eye is for seeing, a mouth for talking or eating, and the human sexual organs are for procreation. In speaking against contraception, Clement of Alexandria, for example, argued that the Christian law is for husbands "to use their wives moderately and only for raising up children." To indulge in intercourse without intending children is an outrage to nature, that we should take as our instructor. Her wise directions concerning the periods of life are to be obeyed..." For St. Augustine, "husbands and wives who use the poison of sterility to systematically exclude conception are not joined in matrimony but in seduction." They turn the bridal chamber into a brothel. For

whoever makes the procreation of children a greater sin than copulation, forbids marriage, and makes the woman not a wife but a mistress, who for some gifts presented to her is joined to the man to gratify his passion. Where there is a wife, there must be marriage. But there is no marriage where motherhood is not in view; therefore, neither is there a wife.<sup>8</sup>

The position of the Fathers on contraception was solidified in arguments against various Gnostic groups. In opposition to the Manicheans who held that marriage, sex, and children were evil because material and indicative of co-operation with the evil creator principle, Augustine maintains that children were good, and that marriage was not a concession to libido or an afterthought. There are three important values (goods) in marriage - the sacrament, fidelity, and children. Contraception goes directly against one of these goods - children.<sup>9</sup> In short, as Brian Clowes<sup>10</sup> and many scholars have pointed out:

from the time of its founding, the Catholic Church has universally condemned contraception. Many Church Fathers, such as Athenagoras, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Barnabas, St Basil the Great, Caesarius, Clement of Alexandria, Ephraem the Syrian, Epiphanius, St Jerome, St John Chrysostom, Hippolytus wrote and spoke a Catholic No to contraception.<sup>11</sup>

The manuals of moral theology, as well as the official teaching of the church for many

centuries assumed the givenness of this teaching. There were, in any case, some situations where the teaching came up against some hard cases. Two are worth mentioning here. One is the situation where one of the partners in a marriage had a communicable disease that could infect the other and perhaps kill him or her. Was the use of condom in such a situation an incidence of contraception? Another is what to do if there was need to excise in some way parts of the reproductive organs of either a man or a woman thereby impairing the person's reproductive capacities. The drawn-out debate on direct and indirect sterilization among moral theologians leading up to Vatican II was partly an attempt to find answers to quandaries like these. Despite all the casuistic efforts in individual challenging cases, it was assumed generally that contraception was wrong.

*...what to do if there was need to excise in some way parts of the reproductive organs of either a man or a woman thereby impairing the person's reproductive capacities.*

Christian consensus on contraception was sorely tested in modern times by several factors and historical developments, chief among which was the rising concern about population explosion, a concern which was first raised by the British economist and philosopher, Thomas Malthus, who in his famous "Essay on the Principle of Population" that appeared at the end of the eighteenth-century, argued that the world's population was now growing at an exponential rate every 25 years. Malthus called for moral restraint in matters of population if the world was not going to run out of space and resources due to "overpopulation." The fear of overpopulation, therefore, gave rise to new technologies and inventions which were all meant to curb human population. These technological advances combined with other social trends, such as the increased emancipation of women who found new status for themselves rather than solely being producers of children, put pressure on the old Christian prohibition of contraception. Christian churches were of course initially critical of these new trends, but soon began to rethink their stance on the matter following the Anglican Church's decision at the August 1930 Lambeth Conference to approve of methods other than abstinence from sexual intercourse as legitimate means of birth control. From this date in 1930 until 1958, all major Christian bodies, except the Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church, began, one after the other, to approve as legitimate and morally right the use of various forms of contraception in marital sexual intercourse. This move, ratified in 1959 by all the Protestant Churches at the World Council of Churches in Geneva, meant that the Christian consensus on the immorality of contraception had broken down irretrievably. This fact and the reality of the development of the birth-control pill in the late 1950s put added pressure on the Catholic Church to rethink its age-old thinking on contraception.

The Catholic response to the new developments both in the church and in society came in two waves. The first was the publication of *Casti Connubi* in late 1930 in which Pope Pius XI, in reaction to the move by the Lambeth Conference, maintained that "any use whatever of marriage, in the exercise of which the act by human effort is deprived

*The commission eventually returned two reports - a majority and a minority report.*

of its natural power of procreating life, violates the law of God and nature, and those who do such a thing are stained by a grave and mortal flaw.”<sup>12</sup> The second move by the Catholic Church happened with the coming to the papacy of Pope John XXIII who, in reaction to the furor over contraception in society and in the church, quickly set up the Birth Control Commission, a secret commission that meant to study the issue and advise the Pope accordingly. Following his death a few years later, Pope Paul VI, his successor, reconstituted the Birth Control Commission by enlarging its membership and making its existence known to the whole church. He also took the matter of birth control away from the agenda of the Second Vatican Council that he had reconvened following his predecessor’s death. The mandate remained the same, that is, to study the matter and to advise the Pope whether there was need for change of this ancient doctrine. The commission eventually returned two reports - a majority and a minority report. The majority report, while admitting that contraception could be immoral, argued that there could also be circumstances where it should not be considered so. The minority report, on the other hand, argued that contraception violated the end of marriage and of sexual intercourse in marriage; that it was against a solidly held teaching of the church over the centuries, and that anything to the contrary would amount to saying that the church had been in error on this matter all through its existence and had led people to error through its teachings.

Pope Paul VI deliberated on these two texts for three years, from 1965 to 1968. Meanwhile, the world awaited his response as the supreme pastor of the church. This response came on July 25, 1968 in the Encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, whose fiftieth anniversary we celebrate this year. *Humanae Vitae* upheld the ancient teaching of the church against contraception by teaching that “each and every marital act must of necessity retain its intrinsic relationship to the procreation of human life” (no. 11). It argued that the basis of this doctrine is “the inseparable connection, established by God, which man on his own may not break, between the unity significance and the procreative significance which are inherent to the marital act” (no. 12). Here the Pope was arguing that when a man and a woman are engaged in the act of sexual intercourse, they are united in one body. In this one act they realize several important goods such as pleasure, intimacy, and the like, and legitimately so. They must also not employ any artificial means to exclude the other essential good of marriage - children. The unity of bodies and the procreative goal cannot be separated from each other because God had willed their inseparability. Pope Paul VI believed that the issue of contraception must not just be viewed merely negatively as one of controlling birth. Rather, it must be considered on a much wider canvas, hence his preferred term, *responsible parenthood*. Responsible parenthood, in his words, “requires that husband and wife keeping a right order of priorities, recognize their own duties toward God, themselves, and human society” by taking into consideration several factors - economic, psychological, social, and personal in their quest to regulate the birth of their children. It means that sometimes they could have more children or they could space the birth of their children or even refrain from having children altogether according to their personal situations. Such a decision must

*“all actions before or after sexual intercourse, specifically intended to prevent procreation whether as means or an end”*

however be taken in accordance with “moral law.” Thus, husbands and wives “are not free to act as they choose the transmitting of human life, as if it were wholly up to them to decide what is the right course to follow” (no. 10). The Pope suggests various means of birth control. One is abstinence and the other is natural family planning (NFP). In recommending NFP, the Pope stated that “God has wisely ordered the laws of nature and the incidents of fertility in such a way that successive births are already naturally spaced through the inherent operation of these laws” (no. 11). It was left, therefore, to married couples in the exercise of their duty as responsible parents, using their reason to discern “the biological laws that apply to human persons” (no. 10). Part of responsible parenthood is the awareness of these biological processes and the respect for their proper functioning. On the contrary, the Pope also lists various means of birth control that he considered unlawful or immoral. These included direct abortion, even for therapeutic reasons, direct intervention in the “generative process already begun,” direct sterilization, and “all actions before or after sexual intercourse, specifically intended to prevent procreation whether as means or an end” (no. 14). In no. 17 of the encyclical, the Pope speaks of a contraceptive mentality which was a consequence of the widespread availability and use of contraception. He argued that the widespread use and availability of contraception could “lower moral standards, promote lax morals among the young, turn women into objects of sexual gratification, and could be misused by unscrupulous public authority” (no. 17). All this is to say, that there would be little or no moral restraint regarding sexual activity for many unscrupulous persons who would want to exploit others for their own selfish ends.

There are other aspects to *Humanae Vitae* than the discussion on birth control. For example, the text contains a rich theology of marriage and family. Married love originates from God, is not the chance of blind evolution, is part of God’s loving plan for humanity, offers the couple the vocation of being cooperators in that divine loving plan of humanity, and represents the union of Christ and his church. He lists several characteristics of married love. It is human, total, faithful, and exclusive of all other until death, and fecund in that it “goes beyond the loving exchange of husband and wife to bring new life into being.” Much of the material on this issue is a carry-over from Vatican II’s Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (*Gaudium et Spes*, 48-52). It shows how much the Encyclical aimed to be part of the renewal of doctrine and pastoral life that Vatican II was about in the church. However, it is the teaching on birth control which has rightly given this Encyclical its name recognition.

## Reception

The reaction that followed the publication of *Humanae Vitae* was like an earthquake of the most intense form. Many theologians, in groups or as individuals, reacted with caution or with open hostility to the papal text. One of the most notable reactions came in an op-ed, “The Washington Declaration,” in the *New York Times* signed by over 600 Catholic theologians who questioned the Pope’s authority to teach authoritatively on a matter of natural law, but especially in this regard, the conclusion he drew based on natural law on the birth control issue.<sup>13</sup> The Washington Declaration all but gave theologians total oversight of magisterial pronouncements by insisting that it was for theologians to evaluate magisterial teachings to ascertain their soundness. It argued

that *Humanae Vitae* does not belong to the infallible magisterium of the church, rather to the noninfallible teaching magisterium and thus was reformable. Perhaps and more importantly, the Washington Declaration considers *Humanae Vitae* erroneous on three grounds: ecclesiology, natural law, and tradition. The encyclical portrays a narrow view of the church whereby the bishops and the pope took a stand that was contrary to the views of most Catholic theologians and a sizeable number of the laity. It was, according to the Washington Declaration, a break with the recent tradition on marriage, family, and sexuality which they believed the Council had initiated, and it read too much into natural law, in a way that ignored “the multiple forms of natural law theory... and the fact that competent philosophers come to different conclusions on this very question...”<sup>14</sup> Individual theologians, like Charles Curran who had himself even before the publication of *Humanae Vitae* started to orchestrate dissent on the Church’s traditional teaching on birth control, now intensified the dissent on the matter, focusing on the conclusions of *Humane Vitae*. Other notable theologians of the day, such as Richard McCormick, Joseph Fuchs, and Bernard Häring joined in the dissent in various forms. To calm the situation, several Episcopal Conferences issued statements in which they tried to clarify the papal teaching while urging obedience to it from theologians and the lay faithful alike.<sup>15</sup> Paul VI’s birth control encyclical ran head on against a powerful climate of opinion both within and outside of the church, which for various reasons believed it was time to change the church’s teaching on the matter. And because the encyclical did not meet the political and theological litmus test of this theological and secular elite, it seemed dead on arrival. It will always be an open question whether the impact of the encyclical would have been different had it been received with a more open mind than was the case.

*Paul VI’s birth control encyclical ran head on against a powerful climate of opinion both within and outside of the church,...*

### ***Humane Vitae* and Post-Vatican II Moral Theology**

The impact of *Humane Vitae* on Catholic moral theology in the post-Vatican II church has been enormous, and some would say, not all together, salutary. Recall that moral theology, even before the publication of *Humane Vitae*, had come under scrutiny at Vatican II by the Conciliar Fathers who, dissatisfied with the moral theology of the manuals, had urged its renewal.<sup>16</sup> The effort at renewal had barely begun when *Humane Vitae* was published. Its publication hijacked the renewal process in many ways and the questions surrounding the content of the encyclical became the basis for the discussion of moral theology for the next forty years or so. Moral theology became obsessed with questions about objective and non-objective moral norms, the authority of the Pope to teach authoritatively on matters of natural law and his authority to determine moral norms, the extent of these norms in general, the role of circumstances, whether Scripture contained any moral truths that could be found nowhere else, and of course the question of dissent. This latter point, that is, dissent from official church teaching, became, as it were, the default mode from which many moral theologians operated and through which they challenged the credibility of the church as a moral teacher. It was no longer easy in moral theology to know where a legitimate quest for truth and scholarly insight began; the desire

to become an alternative magisterium in the church took over. Too much pastoral energy was spent on internal squabbles concerning these matters, important as they may be. Meanwhile as the world moved on, new questions were being raised which demanded close attention from the church through its moral theological experts and tradition. At least, this was the feeling of Pope John Paul II that led to his issuing the landmark encyclical on moral theology in 1993. John Paul II's stated aim in this text was "to set forth ...the principles of moral theology based upon Scripture and the living Apostolic Tradition, and at the same time to shed light on the presuppositions and consequences of dissent which that teaching has met" in recent years.<sup>17</sup> In an article he published soon after the Council, the German theologian, Josef Fuchs, summarized the Council's injunction for the renewal of moral theology in these words:

The Council requires that moral theology shall be taught not primarily as a code of moral principles. It must be presented as unfolding, a revelation and explanation of the joyful message, the good news of Christ's call to us, of the vocation of believers in Christ. This means that Christ and our being-in-Christ are to be center and focus; the fundamental characteristic of Christian morality is a *call*, a vocation, rather than a law. Christian morality is therefore, responsive in character; it is a morality for Christians; its exalted nature must be made clear in the manner of its presentation.<sup>18</sup>

*...Christ and our being-in-Christ are to be center and focus; the fundamental characteristic of Christian morality is a call, a vocation, rather than a law.*

The debate on *Humanae Vitae*, on the contrary, helped orchestrate a situation in moral theology today where, according to Pope John Paul II, especially in matters sexual, theologians devoted a lot of attention trying to show that Christian revelation contributed nothing new or unique to morality. The quotation above was from Josef Fuchs before he turned his attention to the debates occasioned by *Humanae Vitae* and thus to denying that there was a distinct Christian morality either of sex or anything else. Fuchs seems to suggest that the renewal the Council decreed could have been more theological and christologically oriented.

## Recent Echoes

*Amoris Laetitia* (The Joy of Love) the post-synodal Exhortation of Pope Francis on the family, has unwittingly resurrected several of the key contentions generated by *Humanae Vitae*, especially among those within the hierarchy and the theological community who remember the post-*Humanae Vitae* debates and who have followed the impact of these debates on Catholic theology and on Catholic moral discourse. Chief among these are the questions whether there are absolutely binding norms, and whether norms considered binding in the past such as the absolute prohibition of divorce from an otherwise valid marriage are subject to change due to circumstances or the subjective intentions of the moral agent. Put another way, the issue is whether there are settled moral truths which the church in faithfulness to its texts must hold and continue to teach as binding in season

and out of season and under every circumstance. Some people, while praising *Amoris Laetitia* on many counts, believe it has left this aspect of Catholic moral thought open to unacceptable interpretations and contrary to the teachings of recent magisterium, especially of Pope John Paul II.<sup>19</sup> Some others believe it provides a needed re-assessment of the role of individual consciences and intentions in determining moral rightness or wrongness. The ghost of *Humanae Vitae* lives on.

### ***Humanae Vitae* Fifty Years After: A Refection**

No one reading this text should make the mistake of thinking that Catholic moral theology after Vatican II and after *Humanae Vitae* has been, in the famous phrase of Paul Ramsey, “a wasteland of moral relativism.” On the contrary, *Humanae Vitae* injected a vibrancy into Catholic moral discourse that was not there before, or at least not as widespread. People got in on the act who had never had a voice or had been inclined to participate very vigorously in matters of moral theological concern in the church.

Alasdair McIntyre often spoke of a living tradition as one in which there is continuous debate as to what constitutes the nature and telos of that tradition. In this regard, Catholic moral theology is a vibrant living tradition of moral discourse in which the goods which constitute the tradition are constantly under debate to arrive at a better clarification of truth. In the end, the debate is about how the community is trying to see how best to live up to its foundational ethos in a world which is coming up continuously with new challenges for the faith.

*...Catholic moral theology is a vibrant living tradition of moral discourse in which the goods which constitute the tradition are constantly under debate to arrive at a better clarification of truth.*

The debate on birth control as more particularly about sex, sexuality, and subjects related to it evoke several hard questions that the Christian community must face regarding the sexual climate of our times. First, does, and can, Christianity teach any normatively binding truths about human sexuality? If so, what are these truths and how do we know them? Secondly, is there a right and wrong use or expression of human sexuality? Again, how do we know these, and on what grounds do we know them? Thirdly, does Scripture have any significance or teach anything authoritatively on these issues? Fourthly, what can human experience in general contribute to the way the church formulates its teaching around human sexuality, especially, in this case, birth control? These are ongoing questions to which there are no easy answers, even fifty years after *Humanae Vitae*.

*Paulinus I. Odozor, C.S.Sp.  
University of Notre Dame, Indiana, USA*

### **Endnotes**

<sup>1</sup>The best and most comprehensive study of the history of contraception I know of is John Noonan, *Contraception: A History of Its Treatment by the Catholic Theologians and Canonists* Cambridge, Mass and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965, 1986.

<sup>2</sup>Quoted in Odozor, Paulinus, *Moral Theology in an Age of Renewal, A Study of the Cath-*

*olic Tradition since Vatican II*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 200, 53.

<sup>3</sup>The ancient Egyptians conceived the first known pregnancy test. As it was explained by the worldwide renowned Egyptologist Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt in her book, *L'héritage fabuleux de l'Égypte (the fabulous Heritage of Egypt)*, women were moistening a sample of barley and emmer wheat with their urine every day. If the barley grew it would mean that the expected child would be a boy; if the emmer wheat grew, it would mean that it is a girl. If none of both grew, it would mean that the woman is not pregnant. The efficiency of the test has been confirmed by modern science. Indeed, the urine of non-pregnant women prevents barley from growing up. Traces of condoms were found around 1350 BCE in Egypt. Condom was composed of colored linen soaked in olive oil. It was used on the mummies by embalmers, but we do not know if it was done for sacred or sexual reasons. We also know about condoms made from intestinal membranes of sheep, especially used to prevent infectious diseases. To prevent a pregnancy, a birth control pill is mostly used. It consists of hormones (estrogens) meant to inhibit one part of the brains (the hypothalamic-pituitary complex), and then prevent the fetus' growth. The ancient Egyptians seemed to have understood that because they were using hand-made pills. Grinding pomegranate grains to make some powder, they were making small contraceptive cones with the help of wax. Indeed, pomegranate contains natural estrogen! And that is not all! Egyptians were using some creams that we can compare to modern spermicides. Almost 3800 years ago, crocodile or elephant excrements mixed with honey, dates, or other substances were used in the ointments and creams prescribed by Egyptian medical doctors. [shows that] often we have improved already existing techniques instead of inventing new ones. Translated from French to English by Lisapo ya Kama Source : <http://leplus.nouvelobs.com/contribution/2227-contraception-les-egyptiens->

<sup>4</sup>See, Susan Raga, Nine forms of birth control used in the ancient world [mentalfloss.com/article/83685/9-forms-birth-control-used-ancient-world](http://mentalfloss.com/article/83685/9-forms-birth-control-used-ancient-world)

<sup>5</sup>Noonan, John, *Contraception: A History*, 34-35.

<sup>6</sup>Smith, Janet, *Humanae Vitae: A Generation later*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1991, 132.

<sup>7</sup>Clement of Alexandria, *Christ the Educator*, trans. Simon P. Wood New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1954, 173.

<sup>8</sup>Augustine's position is developed in many parts of his writings, especially the various debates with the Manicheans and several key persons. See St. Augustine of Hippo, "The Morals of the Manicheans," *Writings in Connection with the Manichaean Heresy*. Vol 5: *The Works of Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo*. A New Translation. Ed. Marcus Dods, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1872, 18.65. See also in the same compilation, "Reply to Faustus the Manichean, 22.30. Noonan, *Contraception: A History*, 107-139 provides a strong slew of Augustinian sources on this matter.

<sup>9</sup>"*Haec omnia sunt bona, propter quae nuptiae bonae sunt: proles, fides, sacramentum*" (These are all goods on account of which marriage is good: offspring, fidelity, sacrament). St. Augustine, "The Good of Marriage" in *Treatises on Marriage and Other Subjects*, translated by Charles T. Wilcox et al, edited by Roy J. Deferrari. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc, 1955, 48. See also *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia* (Marriage and Concupiscence) 418-420; *De Adulterinis Coniugiis* (Adulterous Marriages) 419, among others.

<sup>10</sup>See Brian Clowes, "What is Historical Church Teaching on Contraception?" in <https://>

[www.hli.org/resources/historical-church-teaching-contraception/](http://www.hli.org/resources/historical-church-teaching-contraception/).

<sup>11</sup> See the exhaustive list of references provided by Brian Clowes, “What is Historical Church teaching on Contraception: <https://www.hli.org/resources/historical-church-teaching-contraception/> Accessed August 2, 2018 Origen of Alexandria (185254), *Against Heresies*; Tertullian, *Apology*, 9:8 (circa 197); *The Soul*, 25,27 (circa 210); St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan (circa 339397), *Hexameron*, 5.18.58; Athenagoras of Athens, *Letter to Marcus Aurelius* in 177, *Legatio pro Christianis* (Supplication for the Christians), 35; St. Augustine (354-430), *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia* (On Marriage and Concupiscence), 1.17; St. Basil the Great, *First Canonical Letter*, Canon 2 (circa 374); Caesarius, Bishop of Arles (470-543), *Sermons*, 1.12; Clement of Alexandria (circa 150220), *Christ the Educator* (Catholic University of America Press, 2010). St. Jerome, *Letter to Eustochium*, 22.13 (circa 396); St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Romans*, 24 (circa 391); Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies* (circa 228); Lactantius, *Divine Institutes* 6:20 (circa 307).

<sup>12</sup> Pope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*. Vatican City: 1930, no. 56.

<sup>13</sup> “Washington Declaration,” Text of the Statement by Theologians, *New York Times*, July 31, 1968.

<sup>14</sup> “Washington Declaration” quoted in Odozor, *Moral Theology in an Age of Renewal*, 58.

<sup>15</sup> See a compilation of many of these letters by Phillipe Delhaye, Jan Grootaers and Gustave Thils in *Pour Relire Humanae Vitae: Declarations épiscopales du monde entire*. Gembloux, Belgium, 1970.

<sup>16</sup> See Vatican II, *Optatam Totius*, 16.

<sup>17</sup> Pope John Paul II, *The Splendor of Truth*. Boston: St Paul Books and Media, 1993, no.11.

<sup>18</sup> Fuchs, Josef, “The Christian Morality According to Vatican II,” in Fuchs, *Human Values and Christian Morality*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1970, 3.

<sup>19</sup> See “Cardinals’ Letter to Pope Francis on Amoris Laetitia”, <https://www.catholic-herald.co.uk/news/2016/14/full-text-cardinals-letter-to-pope-francis-on-amoris-laetitia>.