

2-1-1999

From *Humanae Vitae* to *Donum Vitae*: Symmetry and Consistency in Catholic Biomedical Teaching

Paul F. deLadurantaye

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq>



Part of the [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

deLadurantaye, Paul F. (1999) "From *Humanae Vitae* to *Donum Vitae*: Symmetry and Consistency in Catholic Biomedical Teaching," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 66: No. 1, Article 2.

Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol66/iss1/2>

From *Humanae Vitae* to *Donum Vitae*: Symmetry and Consistency in Catholic Biomedical Teaching

by

The Rev. Paul F. deLadurantaye, S.T.D.

The author is Diocesan Secretary for Religious Education and the Sacred Liturgy in the Diocese of Arlington, Virginia. He is also a member of the Board of Directors of the Natural Law Study Center which, on January 19, 1998, sponsored a conference entitled "Natural Law, Medicine and Bioethics." The following was presented to that conference.

I. Introduction

Thirty years ago, in July, 1968, Pope Paul VI issued his encyclical letter *Humanae Vitae*. The pope's encyclical did not spring from a void; rather, it had been anticipated from the time of the Second Vatican Council. In a footnote to the chapter on the dignity of marriage and the family in *Gaudium et Spes*, the Fathers of the Council had observed that, "by order of the Holy Father, certain questions requiring further and more careful investigation have been given over to a commission for the study of population, the family, and births, *in order that the Holy Father may pass judgment* when its task is completed"¹ (emphasis added). The Commission's views had been made public in 1967²; however, Paul VI himself noted:

The conclusions at which the commission arrived could not, nevertheless, be considered by us as definitive, nor dispense us from a personal examination of this serious question; and this also

because, within the commission itself, no full concordance of judgments concerning the moral norms to be proposed had been reached, and above all because certain criteria of solutions had emerged which departed from the moral teaching on marriage proposed with constant firmness by the teaching authority of the Church.³

Thus, Pope Paul's purpose in writing the encyclical was to examine in a fresh and deeper way the moral principles, rooted in natural law as illumined by divine revelation, central to the Church's teaching on marriage (cf. *HV* 4).

These principles are taken up and proposed again by the *Instruction on Respect for Human life in its Origin and on the Dignity of Procreation (Donum Vitae)*, issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the faith in February, 1987.⁴ *Donum Vitae* is a response to certain questions raised by Episcopal Conferences, individual bishops, theologians, doctors, and scientists concerning biomedical techniques which make it possible to intervene in the initial phase of the life of a human being and in the very processes of procreation. The questions raised have to do with the conformity of such techniques with the principles of Catholic morality (*DV*, Forward).

Between these two documents of the Church's Magisterium, there is a relationship of symmetry and continuity. I would like to explore this relationship by looking first at the anthropological presuppositions of both documents; secondly, offering some considerations on the moral difference between donation and domination; thirdly, examining the principle of inseparability as applied to both contraception and in vitro fertilization; and finally, offering some reflections on the contemporary bioethical landscape.

II. Anthropological Presuppositions

A. An Integral Vision of the Person

Every ethical system or theory of moral reasoning presupposes an anthropology — that is to say, a vision of man stands at the basis of all principles of human morality. The encyclical *Humanae Vitae* contains not only a definite vision of man — a proper anthropological vision — but is itself based on the foundation of such a vision. This anthropological basis does not appear in the form of a systematic exposition, but rather permeates the whole of the encyclical from beginning to end.⁵ Indeed, Paul VI himself, when he begins to speak of the doctrinal principles underlying his teaching, states that:

The problem of birth, like every other problem regarding human life, is to be considered, beyond partial perspectives — whether of the biological or psychological, demographic or sociological orders — in the light of an integral vision of man and of his vocation, not only his natural and earthly, but also his supernatural and eternal vocation.⁶

As the pope notes, there is a tendency in the contemporary world to consider every problem regarding human life under partial aspects. In particular, the modern mentality seems to be gripped by a Cartesian dualism which opposes within man his intellect (his consciousness) and his body. As a consequence of such an opposition, it becomes very easy to examine everything that concerns the body only and exclusively in the light of somatic processes which, as the progress of medical science demonstrates, can be directed and dominated artificially. It is precisely here that we find a continuity between *Humanae Vitae* and *Donum Vitae*. The encyclical addresses the problem of regulating births through means that are fundamentally reducible to technical efficiency: abortion, sterilization, contraception⁷; the Instruction addresses means of procreation that are likewise technically efficient. In fact, *Donum Vitae* points out

...one cannot derive criteria for guidance from mere technical efficiency, from research's possible usefulness to some at the expense of others, or, worse still, from prevailing ideologies. Thus science and technology require, for their own intrinsic meaning, an unconditional respect for the fundamental criteria of the moral law: that is to say, they must be at the service of the human person, of his inalienable rights and his true and integral good according to the design and will of God.⁸

The integral vision of man, stressed by both *Humanae Vitae* and *Donum Vitae*, concerns the human person, not simply as a being among other beings, but as one who is made, according to the Biblical text, in the "image and likeness" of God (cf. Gen 1:26-27). This image and likeness concerns not only the spiritual nature through which the person is constituted in his individual uniqueness and irrepeatability, but also the dimension of relation, that is, the referral to another person, which is inscribed in the interior structure of one's own being. As persons, we are made for communion,⁹ for mutual self-giving, and the most perfect form of such self-giving among human persons occurs between man and woman in spousal love.¹⁰ Both *Humanae Vitae* and *Donum Vitae* highlight the

responsibility of spouses, and indeed all of society, to protect the uniqueness of conjugal love, to maintain intact its fundamental characteristics,¹¹ and to safeguard it against every form of falsification or instrumentalization.

B. "Homo Ethicus" or "Homo Technicus"?

In delineating the authentic nature of conjugal love, the two magisterial documents at the same time bring into focus what it means to be truly human, that is, to have a knowledge of good and evil (cf. Gen. 3), and thus to be a man of moral conscience. *Humanae Vitae* and *Donum Vitae* speak of the progress made in the domination and organization of the forces of nature (cf. *HV* 2), and Pope Paul VI reminds us that "the Church is the first to praise and recommend the intervention of intelligence in a function which so closely associates the rational creature with his Creator."¹² However, the two documents go on to caution that control over the forces of nature must be done with respect for the order established by God (cf. *HV* 16).

Such an order is both ontological and axiological: it is an order of being and of moral value. To speak of moral value introduces us into the realm of ethics: the ethical person is one who recognizes the difference between good and evil and who, as an acting subject, pursues and does what is good, because the good perfects his very humanity. To reduce ethics to the level of technical efficiency or economic calculation is to put at risk one's own humanity. The "ethical man" (*homo ethicus*) cannot be simply equated with the "technical man" (*homo technicus*) without losing the dignity proper to the human person as such. *Donum Vitae* approaches this problem when it warns:

Advances in technology have now made it possible to procreate apart from sexual relations through the meeting *in vitro* of the germ-cells previously taken from the man and the woman. But what is technically possible is not for that very reason morally admissible. Rational reflection on the fundamental values of life and of human procreation is therefore indispensable for formulating a moral evaluation of such technological interventions on a human being from the first stages of his development.¹³

Paul VI had already noted how the Church, in defending the integral wholeness of her teaching on conjugal morality, urged "man not to abdicate from his own responsibility in order to rely on technical means."¹⁴

Thus, in order to think and act correctly when dealing with any bioethical question, we cannot be satisfied with a partial perspective which suggests merely the attainment of technical mastery over a problem. Rather, we must continually integrate scientific progress with a complete vision of man as a personal, ethical subject. Only in this way can authentic human dignity be preserved.¹⁵

III. The Difference Between Domination and Donation

A. Domination

The problematic raised by the search for an adequate anthropology can be illustrated by considering the moral difference between domination and donation. With respect to domination, or the making of a product, one imposes one's own will on the object and puts it on a level of pure passivity.¹⁶ For example, when one uses a computer to type a document, the computer is merely a passive instrument responding wholly and entirely to the will of the user. The computer is not free to introduce ideas of its own into the text; there is only a one-way process occurring, with the author imposing his will on the machine so that it types what he wants typed and no more. Thus, we say that the author "uses" the computer. The computer is nothing more than an instrument, a means to an end.

The judgments of the Instruction *Donum Vitae* on such issues as experimentation on human embryos, in vitro fertilization, surrogate motherhood, cloning and the like, reveal that what is too often operative behind such procedures is a mentality of domination. The child conceived is treated as a passive object, to be brought into being by the dominant will of another. In contrast, *Donum Vitae* affirms:

In reality, the origin of a human person is the result of an act of giving. The one conceived must be the fruit of his parents' love. He cannot be desired or conceived as the product of an intervention of medical or biological techniques; that would be equivalent to reducing him to an object of scientific technology. No one may subject the coming of a child into the world to conditions of technical efficiency which are to be evaluated according to standards of control and dominion.¹⁷

The mentality of domination not only disregards the right of the child to be treated as a person, with his own human dignity respected; domination suggests that a human being, whether spouse or scientist, is able to stand in the place of God and create or dispose of life at will.

Humanae Vitae addressed this problem with regard to the moral issue of contraception; *Donum Vitae* did so with regard to certain other moral issues surrounding the origin of human life.¹⁸ What these magisterial documents place in relief is the temptation faced by Adam and Eve in the Garden, a temptation which often lies hidden behind contemporary bioethical debate: to be like God, having the power to decide over the life or death of another innocent human being and so treat that human being as an object of use.

B. Donation

The attitude of domination fundamentally reduces a person to an object of use: it makes of a spouse or a child an instrument of selfish enjoyment.¹⁹ The opposite attitude is that of love, reflected in the act of donation, or the giving of a gift. Giving a gift is a particular kind of action, morally distinct from domination (the making of a product). When one gives a gift, the will of each person involved must be respected. In other words, one person freely offers the gift, and the other person freely receives it. Moreover, giving a gift is in some way tied to a person's interiority; the gift symbolizes and stands in for the self.

Applying this notion to the marital relationship, the Magisterium has taught that the conjugal life of husband and wife is marked by a unique kind of giving: a mutual self-donation on the part of man and woman which involves a union of persons (on the bodily and spiritual level) and a creative power — the power to transmit new life.

In a true conjugal relationship, each spouse says to the other: "I accept you as somebody like no one else in my life. You will be unique to me and I to you. You and you alone will be my husband; you alone will be my wife. And the proof of your uniqueness to me is the fact that with you, and with you alone, am I prepared to share this God-given life-oriented power."²⁰

Thus, conjugal love consists in the gift of one person to another, a gift that embraces the human being as a whole, soul and body. This gift finds its deepest expression in the conjugal act. *Humanae Vitae* is clear on what self-donation by means of the conjugal act entails: "By means of the reciprocal personal gift of self, proper and exclusive to them, husband and wife tend towards the communion of their beings in view of their mutual personal perfection, to collaborate with God in the generation and education of new lives."²¹ *Donum Vitae* is no less clear:

The conjugal act by which the couple mutually express their self-

gift at the same time expresses openness to the gift of life. It is an act that is inseparably corporal and spiritual. It is in their bodies and through their bodies that the spouses consummate their marriage and are able to become father and mother. In order to respect the language of their bodies and their natural generosity, the conjugal union must take place with respect for its openness to procreation; and the procreation of a person must be the fruit and the result of married love.²²

Contained in these quotations from Paul VI's encyclical and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's Instruction is the Church's constant teaching that just as the matrimonial covenant is ordered to the procreation and education of children and the mutual union of the spouses, so the conjugal act itself possesses these two aspects, which are always inseparable.

IV. The Principle of Inseparability Applied to Contraception and In Vitro Fertilization

A. Contraception

Reflecting on the nature of conjugal love and the purposes of the marital act, Pope Paul VI formulates this judgment in *Humanae Vitae*: "[T]he Church, calling men back to the observance of the norms of the natural law, as interpreted by its constant doctrine, teaches that each and every marriage act must remain open to the transmission of life."²³ The basis of this judgment is the "inseparable connection, 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."²⁴ As a consequence, Paul VI declares morally wrong such methods of regulating births as direct abortion, direct sterilization, and "every action which, either in anticipation of the conjugal act, or in its accomplishment, or in the development of its natural consequences, proposes, whether as an end or as a means, to render procreation impossible."²⁵

What, then, is really occurring in contracepted sexual intercourse? If one analyzes it carefully, one sees that there are two distinct actions being performed. On the one hand, a man and a woman choose to engage in an act which is by itself suitable for the transmission of life. They also perform a second act: they adopt by choice an intelligible proposal to do something, either preceding intercourse, accompanying intercourse or subsequent to intercourse, which impedes the possible new life from

coming to be.²⁶ Thus, by a free choice against the procreative good of marriage, the couple has separated the unitive and procreative meanings of the conjugal act. In so doing, they have falsified the meaning of conjugal love and have changed an act intended to signify mutual self-donation into an act of domination. What remains from a contracepted act of intercourse is not an intact expression of the unitive meaning, but a deformed version of that meaning. When contracepting spouses will that a possible new human person not come into existence, they simultaneously lock themselves into a defective expression of conjugal union, dissociated from the real goods of procreation and cooperation with God. What is left is not an act of genuine conjugal *love*, but rather one of *use*.²⁷

B. In Vitro Fertilization

The Instruction *Donum Vitae* sees a similar dynamic operative with regard to techniques of artificial procreation. Here, what is at stake is not the procreative meaning of marriage (since a new life is intended to come into existence); rather, the personal union of the spouses is affected. The Instruction formulates its moral judgment on the various methods of artificial procreation with two fundamental values in sight: the life of the human being called into existence and the special nature of the transmission of human life in marriage.²⁸

With reference to both of these values, *Donum Vitae* strongly affirms that a new human life is a gift which comes forth from the sexual donation of the spouses to each other in the marital covenant. More precisely, the new life is a gift in a double sense: a gift from God to the child who is called into existence, and a gift from God to the parents who are cocreators with the Author of Life.²⁹ As a result of this divine donation (in which the human parents share), "Every human being is always to be accepted as a gift and blessing of God. However, from the moral point of view a truly responsible procreation vis-à-vis the unborn child must be the fruit of marriage."³⁰

In sexual procreation, then, neither spouse may be replaced by another person, because what is involved in the sexual union is an expression of personal commitment, and in personal commitment one person cannot take the place of another. The spouses give themselves to each other in conjugal union, and one cannot give another's self.³¹

What occurs in the process of in vitro fertilization, on the other hand, is a series of steps whose moral quality does not depend on *who* carries them out. Being merely an instrumental action, the process of in vitro fertilization implies no uniquely personal commitment; it can be carried out by anyone who possesses the requisite technical knowledge and

skills. In vitro fertilization, then, assumes the following premises, all of which relate to the anthropological presuppositions and the difference between domination and donation previously mentioned:

(1) the new life is not really a gift but rather a commodity which may be produced or manufactured;

(2) the new life may be manufactured by a process which is impersonal in the sense that *anyone* could carry it out, and so is not the expression of a uniquely personal commitment³²;

(3) one may place the new life in the inferior role of the product of a process of domination.³³

These three premises, however, cannot be accepted as true, for they inevitably treat the new life without the respect that is due to a person and place such a new life on the level of a "thing" to be used or produced. Moreover, were these premises to be accepted, one would have to agree that the unitive and procreative meanings of the conjugal act are not intrinsic to the act itself, placed there by God; rather these meanings would be the result of human convention and therefore separable, one from the other. Once such a separation is accepted, the ancient error of dualism rears its head. The person becomes divided against himself, and the relationship or amative values connected with human sexuality are assumed to take precedence over the biological aspects of fertility and the transmission of new life. Such a dichotomy posits that a person's capacity to generate new life is subject to the individual's conscious choice.

It is here that the continuity and symmetry between *Humanae Vitae* and *Donum Vitae* appears with clarity. Both documents ultimately teach that the exclusion of either of the meanings of the conjugal act deforms the other meaning. When, through contraception, one chooses against the procreative meaning, the conjugal act is no longer a full and true expression of the unitive meaning as self-donation, but a withholding of part of the self, a domination imposed upon a donation. In vitro fertilization excludes the unitive meaning along with the conjugal act, and what is left is not a true and full expression of the procreative meaning as a donation by the parents in cooperation with God, but a domination which usurps the creative power of the Lord.³⁴ Each of the two meanings retains its integrity as a donation only if it remains intrinsically united with the other meaning. The logic of domination essentially contradicts the logic of donation; it is not just a matter of employing some technique as a less good way of realizing a hoped-for result. What *Humanae Vitae* and *Donum Vitae* point out to us, each in its own way, is that the vocation to life and love is inscribed in the being of every human person, who fully discovers his own

identity only in the sincere gift of himself: a gift which includes every aspect of his personhood, in his bodily and spiritual dimensions; a gift which is at one and the same time, and inseparably, a gift of life and a gift of love.

V. Reflections on the Contemporary Bioethical Landscape

The previous considerations can, I believe, help us sort through the minefield that is contemporary bioethical debate. Genetic screening, genetic manipulation, the combining of human genes with animal genes, the use of fetal tissue in the treatment of various pathologies, and most recently the debate over cloning both of animals and, now, humans — these and many other issues are no longer confined to the pages of Aldous Huxley's fictional *Brave New World*. These are present-day (or at least near-term) realities which contain, in the eyes of some, exciting possibilities, and in the eyes of others, grave dangers. The Church's contribution to the contemporary debate lies not in the field of biomedical expertise, but rather in a profound anthropological and ethical vision of the human person, of his capacity to transmit life and to express love. It is this vision which lies at the root of the Church's moral teaching, considered here with particular regard to *Humanae Vitae* and to *Donum Vitae*. Whether one is dealing with contraception, artificial procreation, or any other bioethical issue, it is absolutely crucial to establish ethical boundaries that respect human life, the dignity of the human person and the entirely unique nature of the transmission of life which takes place in marriage. Otherwise, we fall into a reductive, utilitarian form of moral thinking that is only too ready to justify practices contrary to the truth about the human person and the gift of human life.

The encyclical *Humanae vitae* and the Instruction *Donum Vitae*, when read together display a consistent symmetry. *Humanae Vitae*, by affirming the inseparability of sexuality from procreation, defends the dignity of man. It is an affirmation of the truth of love as the destiny of mankind, and an affirmation of the goodness and beauty of being. *Donum Vitae*, for its part, develops systematically what was already fundamentally the teaching of *Humanae Vitae*; it carries further the Church's commitment to the defense of human dignity — the dignity of the spouses and their conjugal love, and the dignity of the new life called into existence.

The moral principles established in *Humanae Vitae* and *Donum Vitae*, then, provide fundamental criteria for judging other bioethical questions. The two documents speak to the anthropological and ethical truth about man, created in God's own image and likeness, and placed within an order not only of being but also of value. This is an essential

point which must not be forgotten or overlooked in our ethical discourse or in the resolution of critical bioethical problems. As Paul VI writes in *Humanae Vitae*: “[M]an cannot find true happiness — towards which he aspires with all his being — other than in respect of the laws written by God in his very nature, laws which he must observe with intelligence and love.”³⁵ The conclusion to *Donum Vitae* says the same:

By defending man against the excesses of his own power, the Church of God reminds him of the reasons for his true nobility; only in this way can the possibility of living and loving with that dignity and liberty which derive from respect for the truth be ensured for the men and women of tomorrow.³⁶

References

1. Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 51, note 14.
2. The English versions of the commission's reports may be found in Robert Hoyt, ed., *The Birth Control Debate* (Kansas City, MO: National Catholic Reporter, 1969).
3. Pope Paul VI, *Humanae Vitae*, no. 6. English translation by the Daughters of St. Paul (Boston: St. Paul Books and Media, n.d.).
4. English translation provided by the Vatican Polygolt Press, 1987.
5. For an outline of such an anthropological foundation in *Humanae Vitae*, see Karol Wojtyla, “La visione antropologica della *Humanae vitae*,” *Lateranum* 44 (1978), 125-145.
6. *Humanae Vitae*.
7. See on this point *Humanae Vitae*, no. 14.
8. *Donum Vitae*, Introduction, 2.
9. In this regard, the text of *Gaudium et Spes* 24 is most significant: “It follows, then, that if man is the only creature on earth that God has wanted for its own sake, man can fully discover his true self only in a sincere giving of himself.”
10. See Karol Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility*, trans. by H.T. Willetts (New York:

Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1981), 95-100.

11. These characteristics are addressed in *Humanae Vitae*, no. 9: conjugal love is first of all fully human; it is total; it is faithful and exclusive until death; and it is fecund.

12. *Humanae Vitae*, no. 16; cf. *Donum Vitae*, Introduction, 2: "Basic scientific research and applied research constitute a significant expression of this dominion of man over creation. Science and technology are valuable resources for man when placed at his service and when they promote his integral development for the benefit of all; but they cannot of themselves show the meaning of existence and of human progress."

13. *Donum Vitae*, Introduction, 4.

14. *Humanae Vitae*, no. 18.

15. In this regard, see Wojtyla, "La visione antropologica della *Humanae vitae*," 143-144: "One can say that the entire ontology and likewise the entire axiology of the person finds its meaning in the affirmation that man cannot be 'an instrument' for another man...[Man] therefore cannot be treated as a means, prescinding from his personal dignity. The integral vision of man excludes in itself utilitarianism as a principle of action."

16. Bartholemew Kiely, S.J., "Contraception, In Vitro Fertilization and the Principle of Inseparability," *Humanae Vitae: 20 Anni Dopo* (Milan: Edizioni Ares, 1989), 330.

17. *Donum Vitae*, II, B, 4, c.

18. See, for example, *Humanae Vitae*, no. 13: "On the other hand, to make use of the gift of conjugal love while respecting the laws of the generative process means to acknowledge oneself not to be the arbiter of the sources of human life, but rather the minister of the design established by the Creator. In fact, just as man does not have unlimited dominion over his body in general, so also, with particular reason, he has no such dominion over his generative faculties as such, because of their intrinsic ordination towards raising up life, of which God is the principle." See also *Donum Vitae*, I, 5: "By acting in this way [i.e., voluntarily destroying human embryos obtained *in vitro*] the researcher usurps the place of God; and, even though he may be unaware of this, he sets himself up as the master of the destiny of others inasmuch as he arbitrarily chooses whom he will allow to live and whom he will send to death and kills defenseless human beings."

19. This is but one of the consequences resulting from the acceptance of contraception prophesied by Paul VI in *Humanae Vitae*, no. 17: "It is also to be feared that the man, growing used to the employment of anticonceptive practices,

may finally lose respect for the woman and, no longer caring for her physical and psychological equilibrium, may come to the point of considering her as a mere instrument of selfish enjoyment, and no longer as his respected and beloved companion." Concerning techniques of artificial procreation, the Instruction *Donum Vitae* teaches: "The child is not an object to which one has a right, nor can he be considered as an object of ownership..." (II, B, 8). In both cases, the danger of viewing another person as *something* rather than *someone* is made clear.

20. Cormac Burke, "Marriage and Contraception," *Why Humanae vitae Was Right: A Reader*, Janet Smith, ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 157-158.

21. *Humanae Vitae*, no. 8.

22. *Donum Vitae*, II, B, 4, b.

23. *Humanae Vitae*, no. 11.

24. *Humanae Vitae*, no. 12.

25. *Humanae Vitae*, no. 14.

26. See Joseph Boyle, "Human Action, Natural Rhythms, and Contraception: A Response to John Noonan," *The American Journal of Jurisprudence* 26 (1981), 43: "By contrast, one who chooses to use contraceptives because one just might be fertile — however unlikely that might be — is choosing to render an act of conjugal intercourse infertile; such a person is choosing to impede procreation. The human act of marital intercourse is deliberately done in such a way that it cannot be fertile; this human act is not as such open to the transmission of life." For a general argument that the choice of contraception is an anti-life kind of act which always and necessarily involves a contra-life will, see Germain Grisez, John Finnis, Joseph Boyle, and William May, "'Every Marital Act Ought to Be Open to New Life': Toward a Clearer Understanding," *The Teaching of Humanae Vitae: A Defense* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988), 35-116.

27. This point is strongly made by Pope John Paul II in *Familiaris Consortio*, no. 32. An argument can be made that contracepted sexual intercourse is not *conjugal* intercourse. See Kiely, *op cit*, 332; also John Finnis, "Personal Integrity, Sexual Morality and Responsible Parenthood," *Anthropos* I, 1 (1985), 48. Cormac Burke argues that contracepted intercourse, because it is not truly conjugal, does not consummate marriage. See his "Marriage and Contraception," 164.

28. *Donum Vitae*, Introduction, 4.

29. This teaching is found throughout *Donum Vitae*. See, for example, the Introduction, 5; II, A, 1; II, B, 4, c.

30. *Donum Vitae*, II, A, 1. The Instruction goes on to specify why this must be the case: "For human procreation has specific characteristics by virtue of the personal dignity of the parents and of the children: the procreation of a new person, whereby the man and the woman collaborate with the power of the Creator, must be the fruit and the sign of the mutual self-giving of the spouses, of their love and of their fidelity" (Ibid.).

31. Kiely, op. Cit., 333. A Similar point is made by William E. May, "The Simple Case of In Vitro Fertilization and Embryo Transfer," *The Linacre Quarterly* (February 1988), 32-34.

32. Contrast *Donum Vitae* II, B, 4, c which insists that "the generation of a child must therefore be the fruit of that mutual giving which is realized in the conjugal act wherein the spouses cooperate as servants and not as masters in the work of the Creator who is Love."

33. Contrast *Donum Vitae*, II, B, 5: "Such fertilization entrusts life and identity of the embryo into the power of doctors and biologists and establishes the domination of technology over the origin and destiny of the human person. Such a relationship of domination is in itself contrary to the dignity and equality that must be common to parents and children." See also Kiely, op. cit., 334.

34. Kiely, op. cit., 335.

35. *Humanae Vitae*, no. 31.

36. *Donum Vitae*, Conclusion.