

“John Paul II and the ‘Theology of the Body’ – A Study in Modernism”

By Randy Engel

As Blondel and de Lubac discovered “authentic Christianity” 2000 years after the fact, so Karol Józef Wojtyła (Pope John Paul II) discovered “authentic Christian sexuality” for the Church 2000 years later.(1)

Introduction to Series

The “Theology of the Body” is the invention of Karol Józef Wojtyła, known to history as Pope John Paul II. (2)

The major themes of Wojtyła’s new philosophy and theology on the bodily dimension of human love, sex, sexuality, marriage and celibacy gestated and took concrete form over a long period of time beginning even before his ordination to the priesthood in 1946 and continuing to his appointment as Auxiliary Bishop and later Archbishop/Cardinal of Kraków, Poland (1958 -1978).

On September 5, 1979, less than one year into his pontificate, John Paul II delivered the first of one hundred and twenty-nine talks based on the revised texts of his earlier completed book on the Theology of the Body, to the Wednesday General Audience. Six talks based on the *Song of Songs* were prepared but not delivered as they were deemed too delicate for youthful listeners. The pope’s last catechesis on Theology of the Body was delivered five years later, on Wednesday, November 28, 1984.

As a catechetical work, the Theology of the Body is *anthropocentric*, that is, man-centered, and personalist in keeping with the central theme of the Second Vatican Council, and the phenomenological and personalist philosophy of Wojtyła.

From a Catholic perspective, the very term “theology of the body” is problematic.

Theology [Greek from *theós*, meaning God and *logos* meaning discourse], in all its form, centers upon God, on God's attributes, on things divine, revealed truths and matters of faith, and not man, *per se*.

Regarding the human body, man is one. He is composed of *both* a rationale, spiritual soul and a material body, which gives man his personal corporeal identity. The immortal intellectual soul, infused into the body at the moment of conception, is the first informing and substantial principle which makes the body alive. The body without a soul is inert, a corpse.

How then can there be such a thing as a "Theology of the Body"?

A difficult question, but only one of many such questions that the author (Wojtyla) and his supporters have endeavored to answer in defense of the "new" and "revolutionary" "development" in Catholic sexual catechetics called the "Theology of the Body."

That the Theology of the Body makes for difficult reading and even more difficult understanding is readily admitted by both proponents and opponents of Wojtyla's work.

Indeed a world-wide cottage industry has come into existence having as its sole objective the explanation and popularization of the new theology among Catholic and non-Catholic laymen, clergy and religious. It has yet to dawn upon advocates of the cult of John Paul II, that perhaps the difficulty in discerning Wojtyla's writings on the Theology of the Body stems from the fact they are not Catholic, or perhaps it is fairer and more accurate to say that where his writings are original they are not Catholic, and where they are Catholic they are not original.

Given the unusual complexities and multifaceted nature of the Theology of the Body (TOB) controversy, this writer has chosen a question and answer format to facilitate a clearer understanding of the critical issues involved in the subject matter.

Part I

A Backgrounder on Theology of the Body

When was Wojtyla's Theology of the Body (TOB) first made public?

The original book manuscript of Wojtyla's works on TOB was written in Italian under the title *Uomo e donna lo creò: Catechesi sull'amore umano (Man and Woman He Created Them: Catechesis on Human Love)* and completed prior to Wojtyla's elevation to the papacy in 1978. (3) After he became pope, John Paul II delivered his revised talks in short segments to the Wednesday General Audiences starting in the fall of 1979 and ending in the fall of 1984, with only a few major timely interruptions. The alternative title to the work, *Theology of the Body*, came from the pope himself.

The first cycle of John Paul II's TOB catechetical instruction titled "What is Meant by 'Beginning,'" based on the two accounts of *Genesis* on the indissolubility of marriage, was delivered on September 5, 1979, one year before the opening of the 1980 Synod of Bishops in Rome on the Role of the Christian Family in the Modern World.

Are there more than one English translations of TOB?

Yes. The first English translation was published by the Daughters of St. Paul in 1997. This translation was based on text from the English editorial office of the Vatican newspaper, *L'Osservatore Romano*, which routinely translates the pope's talks after they are delivered. In the case of TOB, the large number of different translators, each with their own style, led to numerous inconsistencies in the text.

In 2006, Michael Waldstein produced a new and superior English translation of *Man and Woman He Created Them – A Theology of the Body* based on Wojtyla's Polish text which contained the original system of chapter headings as well as six additional talks that had been published in Polish only. (4) Waldstein is a pivotal figure in any discussion of TOB. He is the president and founder of the International Theological Institute for Studies on Marriage and the Family in Gaming, Austria. The Institute was established at the request of John Paul II.

Does TOB have its roots in Wojtyla's early ideas and writings on human sexuality?

On May 11, 2006, Pope Benedict XVI, addressing participants of the John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and Family meeting in Rome, acknowledged:

The idea to “teach to love” was already with the young priest Karol Wojtyla and subsequently energized him, as a young bishop, when he faced the difficult moments that followed the publication of the prophetic and always timely encyclical of my predecessor Paul VI, “Humane Vitae.” It was in that circumstance that he understood the need to undertake a systematic study of this topic.

In his essay “The Mystery of ‘Fair Love,’” John T. Crosby, a professor of philosophy at the Franciscan University of Steubenville, Ohio, and an advocate of TOB, states that “Karol Wojtyla has had a special affinity for the love between man and woman from the very first days of his priestly ministry” and “he showed an unusual ability to reflect” on that love. (5) Crosby quotes from John Paul II’s *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*:

As a young priest I learned to love human love [that is, the love between man and woman]. This has been one of the fundamental themes of my priesthood. . . . If one loves human love, there naturally arises the need to commit oneself completely to the service of ‘fair love,’ because love is fair, it is beautiful. (6)

Crosby states that Wojtyla’s first book, *Love and Responsibility*, born of his pastoral experience with young couples, is a deep and original study of “fair love.” (7)

When was *Love and Responsibility* written?

Love and Responsibility is based on a series of graduate lectures focusing on Catholic sexual morality, conjugal relationships, chastity and sexual ethics which Wojtyla delivered in 1958 and 1959 at the Catholic University of Lublin (KUL) while he was still Auxiliary Bishop of Kraków. In 1960, the first edition of *Love and Responsibility* was published in Polish as *Matos I Odpowiedzialnosc* by the TNKUL (Learned Society of the Catholic University of Lublin). The French and Italian language editions were published in 1965, but the English translation had to wait until 1981. (8)

What impact did *Love and Responsibility* have on the Theology of the Body?

It had a great impact on TOB. As John Paul II himself has noted, the philosophy and basic themes of TOB **originated** with *Love and Responsibility*, in addition to some of his earlier studies such as *Person and Act*. (9) *Love and Responsibility* includes Wojtyla’s important early ideas on the sexual value of the body, marriage, adultery, chastity,

continence, celibacy, and most of all, the value and supremacy of the “person.” The very title that Wojtyla chose for his work, *Love and Responsibility*, foreshadowed the radical nature of his future catechesis on sex and marriage, that is, *The Theology of the Body*.

The title, *Love and Responsibility* also signaled the opening of a covert assault on the traditional teachings of the Church on the primary ends of marriage, that is, the procreation and education of children and formation of a family (a position that Wojtyla viewed with a jaundiced eye in the belief that it devalued conjugal love) in favor of the primacy of “inter-personal relations,” “integration” “love” and “responsibility.”

What is the philosophical basis of *Love and Responsibility*?

Love and Responsibility represents one of Wojtyla’s earliest attempts at “marrying” the traditional Scholasticism of St. Thomas Aquinas with modern(ist) secular philosophies, most especially that of Max Scheler, a disciple of Edmund Gustav Albrecht Husserl, the father of phenomenology. (10) It is no great secret that, even as a young seminarian, Wojtyla found Scholasticism wanting, and that he entertained high hopes of developing a new philosophical and ethical system that would incorporate the objectivity of Thomisticism with the personalism and human subjectivity of Schelerism – a system that would better suited to the needs and concerns of that mythical creature of *Gaudium et Spes*, “modern man.” (11)

Did the “marriage” succeed?

No! How could it?

Wojtyla’s intellectual passions clearly favored Scheler over Saint Thomas.

At this juncture, one is reminded of St. Paul’s warning against the proverbial “itching ears that turn away from listening to the truth and wander into myths” (12) and that of Saint Pope Pius X, who, in his 1907 encyclical *Pascendi*, linked the Modernists’ affinity for philosophical and theological novelties to their hatred of Scholasticism, and noted that “there is no surer sign that a man is on the way to Modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for this system.”(13)

Though Wojtyla knew better than to attack Thomisticism directly, he did attempt an end run around it.

These observations and criticisms of Wojtyla and his early writings are validated, albeit, indirectly, even by promoters of his works.

For example, Father Richard N. Hogan, a disciple of John Paul II, while acknowledging the past contribution of the Thomistic and Augustinian traditions which begin with the existence of God and are “**objective, deductive, and principled**” in nature, nevertheless, believes that our “modern culture” now dictates that the truths of the faith must be revealed by new means which are “**primarily subjective, inductive, and experiential.**” (emphasis added) (14) Hogan notes Wojtyla’s contribution towards this end:

The difficulty, however, is to take the ‘jewels’ of the faith ... and present them in a new way with a new philosophical system without changing the content of these ‘jewels.’ We need to have another genius, another Saint Augustine, another Saint Thomas, who would do for our era what each of these saints did for his. John Paul II is another Saint Thomas, another Saint Augustine.

Wojtyla saw that phenomenology provided a way to re-link ethical norms to reality. ... Despite the criticisms Wojtyla made of Scheler’s work, he saw that Scheler’s use of phenomenology provided a powerful tool for the study of Christian ethics. If the Christian norms taught by Revelation could be understood as interior norms, i.e., if these norms could be perceived through experience, **they would cease to have the character of external laws imposed on one from the outside** (emphasis added). Further, one could speak about these values in a subjective way appropriate to the modern world. (15)

As reported by Zenit News, on March 22, 2003, some forty-three years after writing *Love and Responsibility*, John Paul II praised both Husserl and Scheler at a Vatican reception given to delegates of the U.S.-based World Institute of Phenomenology. The pope thanked God for having allowed him to participate in the “fascinating undertaking” connected to the research and development of Scheler’s works, starting with his years of study and teaching and even afterward, “in the successive stages” of his life and pastoral ministry.

Characterizing phenomenology as “first of all a style of thought, an intellectual relation with reality, whose essential and constitutive traits one hopes to gather, **avoiding prejudices and schematisms,**” the pope ended his address by describing phenomenology

as “almost an attitude of intellectual charity toward man and the world and, for the believer, toward God, the principle and the end of all things (emphasis added). (16)

Was *Love and Responsibility* widely read in the United States when it was published in English in 1981?

Coming as it did, more than twenty years after the Polish edition, the book probably escaped the notice of most Catholic laymen, although it may have enjoyed a degree of popularity in certain Catholic academic circles and among clergy, religious and seminarians.

When did you read *Love and Responsibility*?

I read it for the first time in 1981 shortly after it was translated into English. The new edition carried some additional features not present in the original 1960 Lublin text including a new introduction by Karol Wojtyla, now sitting on the Chair of Saint Peter as John Paul II; references to the encyclical *Humanae Vitae* issued by Pope Paul VI on July 25, 1968; a supplementary survey on sexology and sexual ethics; and “notes” in which the pope refers to his earlier works, most especially, *Person and Act*.

The book was a “gift” from a long-time friend, a traditionalist priest, who became so distraught after reading it that he threw it into the waste paper basket, but, having second thoughts, dug it out and forwarded it to me. Like him, I also found many aspects of the book disturbing.

Briefly, what particular aspects of *Love and Responsibility* disturbed you?

Well, even to a layman, it was clear from the start that the author of *Love and Responsibility* had waded into very strange and dangerous philosophical waters.

In his **original** introduction written in 1960, Wojtyla affirms that his work is “not an exposition of doctrine.” (17) Rather, it reflects throughout “a personalist character.” (18) He credits the book’s origin to the “incessant confrontation of doctrine with life,” that is, the lived experience of persons, himself and others. (19) “Sexual morality is within the

domain of the person. ... The personal order is the only proper plane for all debate on matters of sexual morality,” he explains. (20)

Wojtyla states that his book “was born principally of **the need to put the norms of Catholic sexual morality on a firm basis**, a basis as definitive as possible, relying on the most elementary and incontrovertible moral truths and the most fundamental values or goods,” most especially the good of the person within the context of “love and responsibility” (emphasis added). (21) The implication of this statement is clear – the Church had to wait nearly 2000 years for Wojtyla to put “Catholic sexual morality on a firm basis,” as if the Natural Law, Scripture, the Church’s Magisterium and Tradition had proven inadequate for the task.

In his new introduction to the English translation of *Love and Responsibility*, written after he became pope, John Paul II reaffirms the primacy of “experience” in the realm of sexual morality.

“The intention of the book is to provide an opportunity for continuous, uninterrupted ‘confrontation’, a chance to ‘test experience by experience,’” the pope explains. (22) He then expands his thesis on the value of experience:

This work is open to every echo of experience, from whatever quarter it comes, and it is at the same time a standing appeal to all to let experience, their own experience, make itself heard, to its full extent; in all its breadth, and all its depth. ... If we do omit them [i.e. the contents of experience], we shall be detracting from and impoverishing experience, and so robbing it of validity, though it is the sole source of information and the basis of all reliable knowledge on whatever subject. *Love and Responsibility*, with this sort of methodological basis, fears nothing and need fear nothing which can be legitimized by experience. Experience does not have to be afraid of experience. Truth can only gain from such a confrontation.” (23)

Can you cite a specific example from *Love and Responsibility* that illustrates how Wojtyla’s philosophical misadventures affected his ability to communicate the objective truths which undergird the Church’s perennial teachings on sexual morality?

One of the most bizarre examples is found in Chapter V, “Sexology and Ethics,” which, as noted earlier, was written at a later date by Wojtyla as a supplement to the four earlier chapters. (24) It contains the only reference to abortion in the book.

In a section titled “The Problem of Birth Control,” Wojtyla introduces the question of induced abortion, which he euphemistically refers to as “the act of artificially terminating pregnancy.” (25)

Wojtyla states that morally, “‘termination of pregnancy’ is a very grave offence,” but the sole focus of his writing is on the experience of the abortee not the child who is killed:

It [abortion] is indeed an artificial interruption of the natural biological rhythm with very far-reaching consequences. There is no analogy for the enormous feeling of resentment which it leaves in the mind of a woman. She cannot forget that it has happened and cannot get rid of her grudge against the man who has brought her to it. Apart from its physical effects artificial abortion causes an anxiety neurosis with guilt feelings to its core, and sometimes even a profound psychotic reaction. In this context we may note the significance of statements by women suffering from depression during the climacteric, who sometimes a decade or so after the event remember a terminated pregnancy with regret and feel a belated sense of guilt on this account. ... (26)

Now the objective reality is that induced abortion is the deliberate killing of an unborn child with at least the tacit cooperation of his mother. It is murder most foul, for not only is the unborn child robbed of his physical life but his spiritual life as well for he is deprived of the Sacrament of Baptism, the key to heaven’s door.

Yet, nowhere does Wojtyla mention the unborn child in connection with abortion. Further, while it is true that the killing of one’s own child is an unnatural crime that invites severe “neurosis” and “psychosis” – as virtue is its own reward so sin is its own punishment – it would have been more appropriate as a shepherd of souls, for Wojtyla to remind his readers of the danger of eternal death should the woman and her accomplices die unrepentant and unabsolved of their grave sin.

Then, as if to add insult to injury (especially from a pro-life perspective), Wojtyla ends his above statement with the remark that, “**There are no grounds for discussing abortion in conjunction with birth control. To do so would be quite improper** (emphasis added). (27)

Again, the objective reality is that induced abortion is the intimate handmaiden of contraception and sterilization. All are mutually stimulating as well as mutually

competitive. To paraphrase Planned Parenthood, abortion is always necessary as a back up for faulty or omitted contraception.

Wojtyla was gravely mistaken when he denied the inherent connection between abortion and birth control. [In Part II of this series we will re-examine this specific point in connection with the Kraków Commission.]

In the eighteen years that transpired between the publication of *Love and Responsibility* and the completion of TOB, what events contributed to Wojtyla's evolving views on sex and marriage?

There are at least three which come to mind:

- Wojtyla's participation in the Second Vatican Council, especially his influence on *Gaudium et Spes*.
- The creation of a special in-house study group known as the "Kraków Commission," by Wojtyla in 1966 for the purpose of re-examining the Church's teachings on conjugal love.
- Cardinal Wojtyla's contribution to the encyclical *Humanae Vitae* released by Pope Paul VI on July 25, 1968.

Did Wojtyla play a major role at the Second Vatican Council?

Not initially, but his influence grew slowly during the second half of the Council after his appointment as Archbishop of Kraków on January 13, 1964. It should be remembered that Wojtyla did not receive the red biretta from the hands of Pope Paul until June 26, 1967, long after the Council had closed. (28)

From January 31 to April 6, 1965, Wojtyla participated in the drafting of Schema XIII, *Gaudium et Spes*, the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, but he was not a major architect of the document as would later be claimed. (29)

Nevertheless, his influence, as well as those of the Council Fathers who shared some of his revolutionary ideas on marriage such as Leo Jozef Cardinal Suenens of Malines-Brussels and Paul-Émile Cardinal Léger of Montreal, can be seen in *Gaudium et Spes*,

Part I, Chapter 1 “The Dignity of the Human Person,” and Part II, Chapter I “Fostering the Nobility of Marriage and Family,” with its heavily “personalist” overtones; in the description of conjugal love as “a primary form of interpersonal communion”; and in the obvious absence of the terms “primary” and “secondary” with regard to the ends of marriage in the actual text of the decree. (30)

It may be helpful at this point to recall that by the opening of the Second Session of the Council on October 6, 1963, there was **already** talk among the Council Fathers that a paradigm shift on marriage and the ends of marriage was in the wind.

This speculation was further fueled when Pope John XXIII in March 1964, only months before his death, with the approval of Cardinal Giovanni Battista Montini, his heir apparent, ordered the creation of a special Pontifical Commission to study recent developments in hormonal contraception and to re-examine the Church’s opposition to contraception in light of new demographic trends. (31)

Pope Paul VI removed the issue of “birth control” from the Council’s agenda didn’t he?

Yes. On June 23, 1964, one year after the death of Pope John XXIII, Pope Paul announced the reformulation and reorganization of the Pontifical Commission for the Study of Problems of the Family, Population, and Births which, in effect, removed the dual time bombs of “birth control” and “population control” from consideration by the Council Fathers.

When *Gaudium et Spes* was promulgated by Paul VI on December 7, 1965, it carried the famous footnote 14 in which Pope Paul VI stated: “Certain questions which need further and more careful investigation have been handed over, at the command of the Supreme Pontiff, to a commission for the study of population, family, and births, in order that, after it fulfills its function, the Supreme Pontiff may pass judgment. With the doctrine of the Magisterium in this state, this holy synod does not intend to propose immediately concrete solutions.” (32)

Did Pope Paul select Archbishop Wojtyla to serve on the Pontifical “Birth Control” Commission?

Pope Paul did appoint Wojtyla to join the Commission’s deliberations during its fifth, final, and most important meeting in June 1966, but Wojtyla chose not to attend either because of sensitive political difficulties involving Primate Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski and the Communist regime, or because he had already developed a more direct and efficacious pipeline to the pope.

Endnotes Part I

1. This paraphrasing by the author is a play on words of a *Si Si No No* (St. Pius X Society) nine-part series titled “They Think They’ve Won” by an anonymous author, “Hirpinus” and translated from *Courrier de Rome*. It is available at http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/1993-August/They_Think_Theyve_Won.htm. For an incomparable CAT Scan of the Modernist mind of Maurice Blondel and Fr. Henri de Lubac see Saint Pius X’s encyclical, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (1907).
2. Born on May 18, 1920 in Wadowice (Kraków), Poland, Wojtyla lost his mother, and his brother Edmund before coming of age. Shortly before the start of the Second World War, he enrolled at Jagellonian University in Kraków where he studied philosophy, literature and the humanities, wrote poetry, and joined the *avant-garde* Rhapsodic Theatre Group “Studio 38.” With the war came the Nazi occupation and then Soviet rule. In October 1942, he was accepted as a candidate for Holy Orders at the clandestine seminary organized in Kraków under Archbishop Adam Sapieha. He was ordained on November 1, 1946. Two weeks later, having obtained permission from Stalin to leave Poland, he departed to Rome to study at the Angelicum. Two years later he returned to Kraków, and in 1954 he qualified to teach undergraduate and graduate classes at the Catholic University of Lubin (KUL). Here his academic career grew along with his reputation for new and bold philosophical speculation. Even after his appointment as Auxiliary Bishop of Kraków in 1958, Wojtyla’s penchant for philosophical novelty continued to flourish as evidenced by his sensational lecture series on sex, sexology and sexual ethics at Lubin from 1958-1959.
3. Giovanni Paolo II, *Uomo e donna lo creò: Catechesi sull'amore umano*. Rome: Città Nuova and Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1985. As noted by Michael Waldstein, the original Polish has the same title, but not the subtitle.
4. *John Paul II, Man and Woman He Created Them: A Theology of the Body*, translated by Michael Waldstein, Pauline Books & Media, Boston, 2006.
5. Pope Benedict XVI, “Authentic Love Is Transformed Into a Light,” (Zenit News) at <http://www.zenit.org/article-15995?l=english>
6. John F. Crosby, “The Mystery of ‘Fair Love’” at <http://www.catholic.net/rcc/Periodicals/Igpress/cwr4-99/essay.html>.
7. John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, edited by Vittorio Messori; translated from the Italian by Jenny McPhee and Martha McPhee, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1994, p. 123.
8. Karol Wojtyla (Pope John Paul II), *Love and Responsibility*, English Translation, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc., New York, 1981.

9. For a brief description of Karol Wojtyła's 1969 study (incomplete) *Osoba y Czyn (Person and Act)*, which has been retitled *The Acting Person: A Contribution to Phenomenological Anthropology* (Analecta Husserliana) see http://www.amazon.com/Acting-Person-Contribution-Phenomenological-Anthropology/dp/9027709858/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1202238403&sr=8-1. For background information on *Person and Act* see "Wojtyła's Walk Among the Philosophers," by George Weigel at http://www.eppc.org/publications/pubID.2779/pub_detail.asp.
10. In September 1951, Archbishop Eugeniusz Baziak, the Apostolic Administrator of Kraków gave young Wojtyła leave to complete his qualifying exams for a university position. On December 1-3, 1953, Wojtyła completed that task by presenting his thesis on the ethical system of Max Scheler. In 1960, the same year that *Love and Responsibility* was published, Auxiliary Bishop Wojtyła's dissertation, "Evaluation of the Possibility of Constructing a Christian Ethic based on the System of Max Scheler," was published by the Academy of Sciences of the Catholic University of Lublin. See "Biography (Pre-Pontificate) of His Holiness John Paul II," available from the Holy See Press Office, February 13, 2001.
11. *Gaudium et Spes [Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World]* promulgated by Pope Paul VI, 7 December 1965. Available at http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html.
12. "For the time is coming when people will not endure sound teaching, but having itching ears they will accumulate for themselves teachers to suit their own likings, and will turn away from listening to the truth and wander into myths" (II Tim 4:3-4).
13. Pope Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, 8 September, 1907, "The Modernist as Reformer" (38).
14. See http://www.nfpoutreach.org/Hogan_Theology_%20Body1.htm.
15. Ibid.
16. "Phenomenology Represents an 'Intellectual Charity,' says John Paul II," *Zenit News*, Vatican City, March 24, 2003.
17. Wojtyła, *Love and Responsibility*, 1981, p.15.
18. Ibid, p.18.
19. Ibid., p.15.
20. Ibid., p. 18.
21. Ibid., p. 16.
22. Ibid., p. 10.
23. Ibid., See also "At the Root of Karol Wojtyła's Philosophy," *Zenit News*, 19 February 2006, which contains highlights of the three-day congress in Madrid on "The Personalist Philosophy of Karol Wojtyła." According to Jarosław Merecki, "experience, the first source of the philosophy of man, and the encounter with phenomenology are the sources of Karol Wojtyła's philosophy."
24. The entire Chapter 5, "Sexology and Ethics" starting with Wojtyła's loose employment of terms such as "sexology" and "birth control" and continuing through to its sexual explicitness, is very problematic, not just the example of abortion which is cited.
25. Ibid., p. 284.
26. Ibid., 284-285.
27. Ibid. 285.
28. After the death of Adamo Stefano Cardinal Sapieha on 21 July, 1951, Eugeniusz Baziak, Archbishop of Lviv (Ukraine) was appointed Apostolic Administrator of Kraków, a position he held until his death on 15 June 1962. On July 16, 1962, Wojtyła was named Vicar Capitular, and in December of the following year was designated Metropolitan Bishop of Kraków.
29. Wojtyła's name is not indexed by Fr. Ralph M. Wiltgen in his classic work *The Rhine Flows Into The Tiber*, Tan Books, Rockford, Il., 1985.

30. See the footnotes of Donald R. Campion, in *The Documents of Vatican II* (Walter M. Abbott, S.J., General Editor, American Press, 1966, pp. 249, 250, 252, 254, and 256) who strongly concurs in this assessment without mentioning Wojtyla by name.
31. The six members of the original Commission met in October 1963 at Louvain. An expanded, three-tiered Commission created by Pope Paul VI met in Rome in April and June 1964, once in 1965, and held their final meeting in April 1966 with 72 members present.
32. *Gaudium et Spes*, Part II, Chapter 1, footnote no. 14.

Copyright Randy Engel 2008

Copyright 2008 Randy Engel

Catholic Family News
June 2008

“John Paul II and the ‘Theology of the Body’ – A Study in Modernism ”

By Randy Engel

Part II

The Kraków Commission, *Humanae Vitae* and Other Considerations

What is the significance of the “Kraków Commission” in the life of TOB?

Created by Archbishop Wojtyla in 1966, the Kraków Commission, as it is known, brought together a small group of moral theologians from Kraków and Tarnow to whom Wojtyla gave the task of examining the theological foundations of the Church’s ethical norms of conjugal life. That Wojtyla carefully directed and controlled the direction of the Commission’s work, using it more as a sounding board for his own ideas on TOB rather than a major source of input from his conferees, is obvious even from a superficial reading of the final report of the Commission. The report, “The Foundations of the Doctrine of the Church Concerning the Principles of Conjugal Life” (English title), was completed in February 1968. (1) An unofficial English translation of the Kraków Commission final report, originally published in French, has been made by Father Roger J. Landry, and is available online. (2)

Can you highlight some of the positive aspects of the Kraków Commission?

To their credit, Wojtyla and his fellow theologians acknowledged the God-given right and duty of the Church to speak with absolute authority on matters of faith and morals, and they upheld the Church's immutable and continuous condemnation of contraception based on Natural Law and other considerations as proclaimed in the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church. (3)

The authors also expressed the hope that Paul VI's anticipated pronouncement to the Universal Church on the issue of contraception would reaffirm and strengthen this traditional teaching. (4) Again, to their credit.

The solid opposition of the Kraków Commission to contraception clearly contradicted that of the majority of the members of the advisory Pontifical Commission for the Study of Problems of the Family, Population, and Births, who favored a change in the Church's prohibition against contraception. A copy of the Majority and Minority Report of the Pontifical Commission had already been leaked to the international press, and was published by the *National Catholic Reporter* on April 19, 1967, so Wojtyla's group had the advantage of studying it in preparation for its own report.

However, the fact that the members of the Kraków Commission came down in opposition to contraception, does not mean their report was free from error, including errors of omissions as well as commission, some gravely so.

What are some examples of the Commission's "sins of omission?"

One serious "sin of omission" is its failure to include even a single direct reference to the writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Augustine on marriage and sexual morality in either the text of the Commission report or in its footnotes. Considering the task assigned to it, what better "foundations" could the Commission members have sought than the writings of Saint Thomas and Saint Augustine? This omission appears all the more objectionable when one considers that the authors managed to find space for a

reference to the International Planned Parenthood Federation and to the works of sexual pervert Alfred Kinsey. (5)

Not surprisingly, the Commission report is dominated by *Gaudium et Spes*. Yet, even this Conciliar decree at least footnoted the masterwork of Saint Augustine on marriage, *De bono conjugii* (The Good of Marriage), and the expositions on the conjugal life taken from the *Summa Theologica* of Saint Thomas.

The Commission report does footnote Pope Leo XIII's *Arcanum* (1890) and Pope Pius XI's *Casti Connubii* (1930) two of the Church's great encyclicals on Christian marriage, as well as the many allocutions of Pius XII on marriage and childbearing, but these references, especially the encyclicals, are largely incidental to the body of the text.

Did the Kraków Commission Report make reference to the primary and secondary ends of marriage?

No, it did not. As was the case with *Gaudium et Spes*, the report was silent on this traditional formulation preferring to put the procreative, unitive and social ends of marriage all on an equal footing.

Does the Commission report contain any important themes from *Love and Responsibility* and/or *Theology of the Body*?

Yes, Wojtyła's *Love and Responsibility* is footnoted in the section dealing with the functions of sexuality which are divided into three categories in the Commission text-

- The biological function of procreation.
- The trans-individual function, which is interpersonal and social.
- The function of a sign, an element of communication between human beings in the formation of their social bonds. (6)

Important themes from TOB are found throughout the report most especially in its hyper-accentuation on “the human person, his dignity and his genius”; in its emphasis on the primacy of the personalist norm within the conjugal relationship; and its insistence

that “Every sexual relation of the spouses should ... be a ‘reciprocal gift,’ a bodily expression of their love.” (7)

Are there any statements found in the Commission report that stand in opposition to traditional Catholic teachings on marriage?

Yes. One appeared in the Commission’s pronouncement on the so-called “regulation of births.”

The Kraków Commission clearly rejected contraception, direct sterilization and induced abortion as a means of “birth control.” However, the Commission came out strongly in favor of the **ideology** of the systematic “regulation of births,” aka ‘responsible parenthood,’ ‘planned parenthood,’ ‘family planning,’ and ‘birth control, albeit by “moral means.” Under the heading “Responsible Parenthood” we read:

The couple fulfills its duty of transmitting life and raising children in the concrete conditions in which it finds itself. Wishing to respond to this duty in an adequate way, and in accord with the divine plan, the spouses must with prudence and conscious of their responsibility, weigh all the circumstances and take account of the demands they face. **This is why the number of children called into existence cannot be left to mere chance. On the contrary, because of all the human values that are engaged in this matter, the number of children must be consciously decided by the spouses.** This is a work that engages them as persons, so that their decision might be an act of human responsibility (emphasis added). (8)

While the above statement does shed some light on why Wojtyla, in *Love and Responsibility*, was so adamant in his belief that it is “quite improper” to discuss abortion in the same breath as birth control, it is **not** Catholic teaching. (9)

The Church teaches that every child is a gift from God. When a man and a woman engage in the conjugal relations, they, by the very nature of the act, extend an **invitation** to new life – be that invitation sincere or insincere, conscious or without premeditation, planned or unplanned. But it is **God and God alone**, who is the Author of Life. It is He who calls a new human being into existence and endows him with an immortal soul. The very idea that any human being ever came into this world by “mere chance” borders on blasphemy.

I trust it has not escaped the reader's attention that once the **principle** of "family planning" has been enshrined as an "inalienable right," and couples become the final arbitrator of how many children they will or will not have and when they will have them, how is it possible to deny couples the right to abortion to eliminate any "errors" in their plan? (10) It is no coincidence that so-called "unplanned pregnancies" are the number one reason why women undergo abortion. As the feminist lawyer Sarah "Roe" Weddington explains, she traveled at age twenty-six to Mexico in 1967 to kill her one and only child, yet unborn, because "like many other women" there were other things she "needed to do right then." (11)

How alien the precept of "planned parenthood" is to the truly Catholic mind is reflected in Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani's rebuttal to Cardinal Suenens's attack on the primacy of procreation and education of children in marriage in late October 1964 during the Council debate on Article 21, "The Sanctity of Marriage and the Family":

I am not pleased with the statement in the text that married couples may determine the number of children they are to have. Never has this been heard of in the Church. I was the eleventh son in a family of twelve children. My father was a laborer, and the fear of having many children never entered my parents' minds, because they trusted in Providence. ... [I am amazed] that yesterday in the Council it should have been said that there was doubt whether a correct stand had been taken hitherto on the principles governing marriage. Does this mean that the inerrancy of the Church will be called into question? Or was not the Holy Spirit with his Church in past centuries to illumine minds on this point of doctrine? (12)

Concerning the contraceptively "planned" family, but applicable also to cases where spouses habitually employ what has been dubbed "natural family planning" to achieve the perfectly "planned" family, the late English Catholic writer, Christopher Derrick writes:

It is often argued that the contraceptively 'planned' family is likely to be a happy family; that the child who is planned into existence is likely both to feel and be better loved than the child who just blossomed out of love and a habit of mutual surrender. Social science hardly bears this out: unless the picture is complicated by overcrowding and hunger, it seems that the happy and loving families are mostly the chaotic ones and very often the large ones. **The icy hand of planning** tends to blight what it touches. ... (bold type added) (13)

There is no little encouragement in the text of the Commission report for Catholic couples to cooperate with Nature by marrying and having children early in life, when fertility is at its peak. There is no warning that putting off having children for months or years after marriage may close the narrow window of opportunity to conceive a child for the subfertile couple. Nor is there any mention of Nature's means of child-spacing – exclusive breastfeeding.

Much of the second half of the Commission report is given over to the discussion and citation of medical aspects of the “body-temperature method,” which the Commission states “is sufficiently sure, simple and inexpensive that **each family of good will that has been adequately instructed can make use of it.** (emphasis added) (14) There is no doubt that the Commission firmly believed the regulation of births to be a norm of the conjugal life, not merely an exception brought about by grave necessity. (15)

Did the findings of the Kraków Commission and Cardinal Wojtyla's on-going work on the Theology of the Body influence the direction and content of *Humanae Vitae*?

Father Andrzej Bardecki, the editor of the Polish magazine *Tygodnik Powszechny* and a long-time associate of Wojtyla, claims that sixty percent of the text of *Humanae Vitae* can be traced back to the work of the Kraków Commission and later papers which Wojtyla prepared and sent to Pope Paul in support of the Church's prohibition against contraception.(16) However, the fact that Wojtyla was not listed as a key drafter of the encyclical, until **after** he became pope would seem to cast doubt on Bardecki's claim that Wojtyla's contribution to the encyclical, officially titled *On Rightly Ordering the Propagation of Human Offspring*, was a definitive one. (17)

Although it was not public knowledge at the time, after the Papal “Birth Control Commission's Majority and Minority Reports were presented to Pope Paul on June 28, and July 1, 1966 respectively, the pope went about setting up his own in-house group of theologians to further advise him on key doctrinal and theological questions regarding contraception.

Among his chief advisors were Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, Prefect (later Prefect Emeritus) of the Holy Office, Franciscan theologian, Fr. Ermenegildo Lio, consultant to Ottaviani and author of the treatise *De Castitate* in defense of *Casti Connubii*, and the French Jesuit, Père Gustave Martelet, Professor of Theology at Fourvière in Lyons. Lio helped with the initial draft of the doctrinal section of *Humanae Vitae*, and Martelet worked on the final draft along with Bishop Carlo Colombo, the pope's personal theologian.

Other important advisors included the Spanish Jesuit, Fr. Marcelino Zalba of the Gregorian University, Rome, Fr. Jan Visser, a Redemptorist priest from the Urban University, Rome and Msgr. (later Archbishop of Città della Pieve) Ferdinando Lambruschini, a *periti* to the Council. Zalba and Visser were both signatories to the Papal Commission Minority Report and closely allied with Lio. (18)

We know that Pope Paul also received input from non-Curial sources, solicited and unsolicited. This would have included the recommendations of the Kraków Commission headed by Cardinal Wojtyła who sent Pope Paul VI the report in February 1968. But, more than this we do not know.

Can you cite some similarities as well as differences between *Humanae Vitae* and the Kraków Commission Report?

Obviously, both documents ask the same essential question, “is contraception *intrinsically* evil?” Both answer, “yes.”

Both documents are dominated by Conciliar decrees, most especially *Gaudium et Spes*, and both share “personalist” themes from the decree including references to intercourse as a “mutual gift.” Most importantly, both Pope Paul and Wojtyła give parity to the “unitive **meaning**” and “procreative **meaning**” of the conjugal act, dispensing altogether with the formulation of the primary and secondary **ends** of marriage, thus marking a major break with traditional Catholic teaching on marriage and family. (19)

As for differences, the Kraków Commission Report did not deal with the issue of population control, that is, government control of births. *Humanae Vitae* did, but in an incomplete and insufficient manner with a false optimism that belied the imminent dangers posed by world-wide government programs of mass abortion and sterilization that were already underway by the mid-1960s.

Also, *Humanae Vitae* does not carry **all** the heavy Sangerite ideological baggage which the Kraków Commission Report carried or implied. The encyclical does not make birth planning a universal obligation. On the other hand, Pope Paul's decision to use the term "responsible parenthood" (*paternitatis sui officii consciae*), as it was used in the Kraków Commission Report, with all its anti-life implications, rather than a genuinely Catholic term such as "generous" parenthood, does contribute to the overall Malthusian tone of the encyclical.

To what extent did Wojtyla's TOB and his special interest in human sexuality and marriage carry over into his pontificate as Pope John Paul II?

I think the historical record is very clear on this point. Throughout his twenty-six year reign as pope, John Paul II methodically used his office to promote and popularize his new theology on sex and marriage. His efforts have been so successful that, outside of a few Traditional Catholic circles, TOB has become the post-Conciliar Church's defacto theology on sex and marriage. It is only recently, however, that the Catholic faithful have become aware of the impact of TOB on the life of the Church – for good or ill.

As *CFN* readers will recall from the introduction to this series, John Paul II began his marathon "meditations" on Theology of the Body on September 5, 1979, less than one year in office, as part of his Wednesday General Audience talks.

One year later, on September 26 - October 25, 1980, John Paul II held the Synod on the Role of the Christian Family in the Modern World (Rome), and followed it up with the promulgation of his massive Apostolic Exhortation, *Familiaris Consortio* in December 1981. (20) The release of the Charter on the Rights of the Family by the Holy See on October 22, 1983 completed this trilogy on marriage and family. (21)

Did Pope John Paul incorporate concepts from Theology of the Body into *Familiaris Consortio*? How about the Charter of the Rights of the Family?

Familiaris Consortio is saturated from beginning to end with numerous TOB references. (20)

Sandwiched in between *Familiaris Consortio*'s opening call for a new post-Conciliar universal humanism, and its final invitation to the family to cooperate with "a new international order," to bring about justice, freedom and peace, we find such statements as:

35. ...With regard to the question of lawful birth regulation, the ecclesial community at the present time must take on the task of instilling conviction and offering practical help to those who wish to live out their parenthood in a truly responsible way. ... This implies a broader, more decisive and more systematic effort to make the natural methods of regulating fertility known, respected and applied.

37. ...education for chastity is absolutely essential, for it is a virtue that develops a person's authentic maturity and makes him or her capable of respecting and fostering the 'nuptial meaning' of the body.

66. ...This [marriage] preparation will present marriage as an interpersonal relationship of a man and a woman that has to be continually developed, and it will encourage those concerned to study the nature of conjugal sexuality and responsible parenthood, with the essential medical and biological knowledge connected with it.

The Charter of the Rights of the Family shares similar weaknesses.

In connection with the convening of the Synod on the Family, on May 9, 1981, the pope issued the motu proprio *Familia a Deo Instituta* which replaced Pope Paul VI's Committee for the Family with the Pontifical Council on the Family. In 1992, the pope established the first John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and the Family as an annex of the Pontifical Lateran University, in Rome.

Both the Pontifical Council and the world-wide network of John Paul II Institutes, established by John Paul II before his death, have become important conduits for the promotion and dissemination of TOB.

One final question before you begin your analysis of TOB in next month's CFN - Would you clear up the confusion that seems to exist concerning the official "status" of TOB?

First, we know that *L'Osservatore Romano*, the Vatican newspaper, in its multi-language editions, did run the full text of the pope's TOB talks as he delivered them, and that these translations later became the basis for the first English translation of the Theology of the Body in 1997 by the Daughters of Saint Paul. This alone was sufficient to secure world-wide coverage for TOB.

Second, we also know that John Paul II's talks on TOB delivered at the Wednesday General Audience from 1979 to 1984 do **not** appear in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (A.A.S.) the "official and authoritative" record of the Holy See published by the Secretariat of State. Instead, the text of TOB appears in the *Insegnamenti di Giovanni Paolo II*, a compilation of the more informal writings of the pope, published by the Holy See Press Office, an in-house public relations entity.

In his introduction to the new and superior translation of *Man and Woman He Created Them – A Theology of the Body* (2006), and later in his gracious e-mail correspondence to this writer, Michael Waldstein, confirms these facts. At the same time, Waldstein believes that the teaching authority of TOB remains relatively high because the pope intended to use his TOB "meditations" as a form of universal catechetical instruction, not just a recitation of his private theological works composed prior to his becoming pope. (22)

Interestingly, Waldstein does acknowledge that much of the content of pope's discourses on TOB was not well understood by the pilgrims in attendance at the Wednesday Audiences. (23) Although, as Waldstein says, certain portions of the text are simple and direct, as a whole, TOB is difficult enough to read, much less trying to make sense of it from a first hearing.

To the possible objection that even Our Lord spoke in parables so that the multitudes might understand him, and that the pope should not have used the General Audiences as a means of promoting his own esoteric views on sex and marriage, Waldstein gives a rather interesting response:

... The true intended audience is the universal Church. In studying TOB, one has the impression that John Paul II is speaking for the full array of intellectual resources available to him, as if he were keeping a personal theological journal. At the same time, however, he is speaking consciously as the successor of Peter to the universal Church. ... Speaking to the whole Church on such a level can be fruitful, provided there are persons who help others to understand what is said. ... (24)

I take this response to mean that Waldstein believes that shortly after becoming pope, John Paul II made the decision to promote his teachings on TOB as a universal teaching of the Catholic Church and to use the Wednesday General Audience as the initial vehicle to accomplish this task. I think it is an accurate assessment.

To what degree, then, does TOB demand our assent as Catholics?

Here, I think the old tried and true criteria for discernment applies.

To the extent that TOB expresses doctrines and teachings of the Church that are part of the Deposit of Faith that has come down to us from the Apostles and are based on Holy Writ, Tradition and the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium of the Church - then they must be believed. To the degree that the Theology of the Body departs from these teachings and doctrine, it must be refuted and opposed.

Given the sheer amount of verbiage and ambiguity that characterizes TOB, this discernment is no easy task especially when the Theology of the Body is put forth, in perfect Modernist fashion, as an “authentic development, not a departure” from traditional Church teachings on sex, marriage and the family. (25)

When TOB leading light Christopher West, assures us that that John Paul II’s TOB insights “are sure to leave the Church reeling in self-discovery for centuries to come,” he (West) isn’t just whistling Dixie.” (26)

1. A French translation of “Les Fondements de la Doctrine de L’Église concernant les principes de la vie conjugale” appeared in the *Analecta Cracoviensia*, Societas Theologorum Polona Cracoviae Sumptibus Curiae Metropolitanae Cracoviensis, Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, Krakow 1969, pp. 194-230.
2. Father Roger Landry, a priest of the Diocese of Fall River, translated the Kraków Commission report in preparation for a special meeting with Boston members of a *Love and Responsibility* study group on 2 March 2003. See www.catholicpreaching.com/content/docs/Analecta.pdf. Fr. Landry received his graduate degree in moral theology and bioethics from the John Paul II Institute for Marriage and Family in Rome, and is an advocate of TOB.
3. Landry, pp. 1-4.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 4. With regard to “contraception,” it is unsettling that the Commission report refers to “the pill” and intrauterine device as contraceptives when, in fact, the primary mode of the latter is abortifacient, and “the pill” is also known to possess abortifacient properties. The abortive nature of IUDs was public knowledge as early as the turn of the 20th century, and that of the pill was well known in Catholic medical circles by the mid-1960s.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 13, fn. 58, p. 15, fn. 66.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 11.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
9. *Love and Responsibility*, p. 285.
10. The term “inalienable right” is used by John Paul II in *Charter of the Rights of the Family* in connection with the right to found and plan a family using methods which are in accord with the moral order. See Art. 3 at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/family/documents/rc_pc_family_doc_19831022_family-rights_en.html.
11. “Sarah Weddington: Private Choices, Public Change,” Michelle Moon Reinhardt, *Good Life Magazine*, May, 2003 at <http://www.newmoonproductions.com/weddington.pdf>.
12. Fr. Ralph. M. Wiltgen, *The Rhine Flows Into the Tiber – A History of Vatican II*, Tan Books, Rockford, IL, 1967, p. 269.
13. Christopher Derrick, *Honest Love and Human Life*, Coward-McCann, Inc., NY, p. 116.
14. Landry, p. 15.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
16. Carl Bernstein and Marco Politi, *His Holiness: John Paul II and the Hidden History of Our Time*, Doubleday, NY, 1996, p. 113. Hans Kung, in a Beliefnet interview with Laura Sheahen in February 2004 affirms that Wojtyla played a behind-the-scenes role in the drafting of *Humanae Vitae*. See http://www.beliefnet.com/story/142/story_14204.html.
17. “De propagatione humanae proles recte ordinanda,” AAS 60 (1968), p. 481. My thanks to Rev. Brian W. Harrison, O.S., for this important clarification. See “Infallibility of *Humanae Vitae*” at <http://www.catholicculture.org/library/view.cfm?RecNum=7599>.
18. See Robert McClory, *Turning Point*, Crossroad Publishing Co., NY, 1995. Also James Arraj, *The Church, the Council and the Unconscious*, online at <http://www.innerexplorations.com/catchtheomor/ccu3.htm>
19. *Humanae Vitae*, AAS 60 (1968), 12: loc cit. 488-489.
20. *Familiaris Consortio* at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_19811122_familiaris-consortio_en.
21. See *Charter of the Rights of the Family*. Addressed by the Holy See primarily to governments and public authorities, the Charter contains Wojtyla’s redefinition of marriage in terms of an “intimate union of life”... “between a man and a woman”... which is “open to the transmission of life.” (B) It supports the right of couples to plan their children, but only by moral means. Governments proved happy to oblige the pope by promoting “natural family

- planning” right along side abortion and sterilization for couples who, under the rubrics of “religious freedom” decide to contracept, abort and sterilize themselves and their offspring into oblivion.
22. *John Paul II, Man and Woman He Created Them: A Theology of the Body*, translated by Michael Waldstein, Pauline Books & Media, Boston, 2006, pp. 14-18.
 23. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.
 24. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
 25. Quotes from an electronic version of Christopher West, “Why a Theology of the Body?” *Inside the Vatican*, November 1998 at <http://www.catholicculture.org/library/view.cfm?recnum=965>. P. 9.
 26. *Ibid.*, p. 1.

Copyright Randy Engel 2008

Copyright 2008 Randy Engel

“John Paul II and the ‘Theology of the Body’ – A Study in Modernism”

By Randy Engel

Part III

The Cycles, Themes and Texts of TOB

We have already established that the Theology of the Body began as a private work authored by Karol Wojtyla when he was Archbishop Cardinal of Kraków; that, as Pope John Paul II, he reworked his original and unpublished manuscript into a series of 129 catechetical talks which he delivered publicly for the first time to Wednesday General Audiences starting September 5, 1979 and ending November 28, 1984; and finally, that a definitive translation of these talks was compiled under the original title *Man and Woman He Created Them* by Michael Waldstein in 2006 which opened the door to a more detailed and accurate study of John Paul II’s major opus on sex and marriage.

Would you describe the general presentation of TOB found in the Waldstein translation?

As has already been noted, in designing TOB, Wojtyla depended heavily upon selected Scriptural passages on marriage and sex taken from the Old and New Testament which he viewed through a synthesized phenomenological lens with an emphasis on subjective, inductive, and experiential knowledge rather than objective, deductive, and principled

reasoning. He also drew heavily from the decrees of the Second Vatican Council, most especially *Gaudium et Spes*, and from Pope Paul VI's *Humanae Vitae*. A remarkable omission from TOB is that there is not a single reference to the Gospel story of the wedding feast at Cana of Galilee (St. John 2:1-11) where Christ worked his first miracle and raised matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament.

For *CFN* readers who have never seen or read Pope John Paul II's massive work, the text of TOB is presented below as six sections or cycles, each cycle reflecting a major theme or themes based on TOB. Key texts or phrases from each cycle are included to give the reader a sampling of John Paul II's new thinking on sex and marriage. The Daughters of St. Paul translation of the one hundred and twenty-nine General Audience discourses on TOB are available online. (1)

Cycle I – TOB Lectures No. 1 to 23 were delivered by John Paul II at his General Audiences in St. Peter's Square and Paul VI Audience Hall from 9/5/79 to 3/26/80. These introductory lectures center on "God's plan for human love," human love interpreted by the pope primarily in terms of conjugal or sexual love.

Cycle 1 opens with Christ's dialogue with the Pharisees on the matter of divorce and the unity and indissolubility of marriage (Matthew 19:3-9) and (Mark 10:1-12), but almost immediately refers us back to "the beginning," that is *Genesis* (1:26-28, 2:7,15-25) in the Old Testament. (2) The pope acknowledges his preference for the more anthropomorphic and imaginative Yahwist text over the decidedly sober, moralistic, and juridical Elohist text in "getting to the truth of things." (3)

"On Original Solitude" (G.A. October 10, 1979), 5:6. ...When we analyze the text of *Genesis*, we are in some way witnesses of how man, with the first act of self-consciousness, "distinguishes himself" before God-Yahweh from the whole world of living beings (*animalia*), how he reveals himself to himself and at the same time affirms himself in the visible world as a "person."

"On Original Unity" (G.A. November 21, 1979), 10:2. The unity about which *Genesis* 2:24 speaks ("and the two will be one flesh") is without doubt the unity that is expressed and realized in the conjugal act. The biblical formulation, so extremely concise and simple, indicates sex, masculinity and femininity, as that characteristic of man — male and female — that allows them, when they become one flesh, to place their whole humanity at the same time under the blessing of fruitfulness. Yet, the

whole context of the lapidary [sharply delineated] formulation does not allow us to stop on the surface of human sexuality; it does not allow us to treat the body and sex outside the full dimension of man and the “communion of persons,” but imposes on us from the “beginning” the obligation to see the fullness and depth proper to this unity, the unity that man and woman must constitute in light of the revelation of the body.

“The Meaning of Original Nakedness” (December 12, 1979), 11:2. ... In fact, Genesis 2:25 [Now both were naked, the man and his wife, but they did not feel shame.] presents one of the key elements of the text (Gen 2:20, 23) that have already allowed us to determine the meaning of man’s original solitude and original unity. To these one must add, as a third element, *the meaning of original nakedness*, which is clearly highlighted in the context; *in the first biblical sketch of anthropology, it is not something accidental*. On the contrary, it is precisely the key for understanding it fully and completely.

11:4. ... *Thus, shame is not only one of man’s original experiences, but it is also a “boundary” experience.*

“Dimension of Gift” (January 16, 1980), 15:1. ... The human body, with its sex – its masculinity and femininity – seen in the very mystery of creation, is not only a source of fruitfulness and of procreation, as in the whole natural order, but contains “from the beginning” the “spousal” attribute, that is, *the power to express love: precisely that love in which the human person becomes a gift* and through this gift - fulfills the very meaning of his being and existence. **We recall here ... the Council text [*Gaudium et Spes*]... that man is the only creature in the visible world that God willed “for its own sake,” adding that this man cannot “fully find himself except through a sincere gift of self (bold type added).”**

John Paul II concludes this series of reflections on marriage, defined both as a “union of persons in love” and as a source of human generation, with a call for an “integral vision of man” as envisioned by Paul VI in *Humanae Vitae*, 7. (4)

Cycle II – TOB Lectures No. 24 - 63 were delivered by John Paul II from 4/16/80 to 5/6/81. They center on the Sermon on the Mount, specifically the issue of adultery, (Matthew 5: 27-28), and the sixth Beatitude “Blessed are the clean of heart: for they shall see God (Matthew 5: 8).”

“Whoever Looks to Desire...” (April 16, 1980), 24:1 ... “You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall not commit adultery.’ But I say to you: Whoever looks at a woman to desire her [in a reductive way] has already committed adultery with her *in his heart*” (Mt 5:27-28). [Note: The Latin Vulgate text uses the word “lust” which is always immoral rather than John Paul II’s translation as “desire” which may or may not be legitimate.]

24:3 We thus find ourselves at the heart of ethos, or, as it could be defined, the inner form, the soul, as it were, of human morality. Contemporary thinkers (e.g., Scheler) see in the Sermon on the Mount a great turning point precisely in the field of *ethos*.

“Commandment and Ethos” (October 8, 1980), 43:2 ... It seems that the moral evaluation of concupiscence (of “looking to desire”), which Christ calls “adultery committed in the heart,” depends above all on the personal dignity of the man and the woman. This holds both for those who are not joined in marriage, and—perhaps even more so—for those who are husband and wife. ... Adultery “in the heart” is not committed only because the man “looks” in this way at a woman who is not his wife, but *precisely because he looks in this way at a woman*. Even if he were to look in this way at the woman who is his wife, he would commit the same adultery “in the heart.”

John Paul II caused an immediate international media incident when he stated that, according to the principles laid down by TOB, a man could commit adultery with his own wife, and the editors of *L'Osservatore Romano* were left to pick up the pieces.(5)

Cycle III – In TOB Lectures No. 64 to 86, delivered from 11/11/81 to 7/21/82, John Paul II first takes up a new theme based on the “Resurrection of the Body.” (6) Christ’s dialogue with the Sadducees, on the law of “levirate marriage” is recorded in all three Synoptic Gospels. The Sadducees, who, unlike the Pharisees, did not believe in life after death, posed the question to Jesus concerning seven brothers who married the same woman and left no issue. At last the woman also died. “In the resurrection therefore, when they will rise again, whose wife will she be of them? For the seven had her to wife. (Mark 12:23).” “And Jesus answering, saith to them: Do you not therefore err, because you know not the scriptures, nor the power of God? For when they shall rise again from the dead, they shall neither marry, nor be married, but are as the angels in heaven (Mark 12:24-25).” The pope goes on to compare the “anthropology” that emerges from these Synoptic Gospel texts to that of the “Pauline anthropology concerning the resurrection (1 Cor. 15:42-46),” and to “the mystery of the redemption of the body.”(7) This cycle ends with a lengthy section on “contenance for the kingdom of heaven.”

“The Resurrection of the Body as a Reality” (December 16, 1981), 68:3 The reciprocal gift of oneself to God—a gift in which man will concentrate and express all the energies of his own personal and at the same time psychosomatic subjectivity—will be the response to God’s gift of himself to man. In this mutual gift of self by man, a gift that will become completely and definitively beatifying as the response worthy of a personal subject to God’s gift of himself, the “virginity” or rather the virginal state of the body will manifest itself completely as the eschatological fulfillment of the

“spousal” meaning of the body, as the specific sign and authentic expression of personal subjectivity as a whole. ...

“Continence for the Kingdom of Heaven” (July 7, 1982), 84:8 Does the Apostle in 1 Corinthians see marriage *only from the point of view of a “remedium concupiscentiae [remedy for concupiscence,”* as one **used to say** in traditional theological language? (bold type added)

“The Redemption of the Body” (July 21, 1982), 84:4 To understand all that “the redemption of the body” implies according to Romans, an authentic theology of the body is necessary.

Cycle IV – In TOB Lectures No. 87 – 102, delivered by John Paul II from 7/28/82 to 12/15/82, the pope centers his attention on Saint Paul’s famous and familiar instruction on the great sacrament of marriage found in his Epistle to the Ephesians which begins with the general instruction “Being subject one to another, in the fear of Christ,” and to wives, “Let women be subject to their husbands, as to the Lord,” and ends with the beautiful words from Genesis “*For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh,*” and Saint Paul’s words, “This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the church. Nevertheless let every one of you in particular love his wife as himself; and let the wife fear her husband (Eph. 5:21-33).” In his General Audience of August 11, 1982, we see a rejection of the ‘lapidary’ formulation from Scripture that gives a husband dominion over his wife, and of Saint Paul who places the husband at the head of the family.

“The Spouses: ‘Reciprocally Subject in the Fear of Christ’” (August 11, 1982), 89:3 The expression that opens our passage of Ephesians 5:21-33...has an utterly unique eloquence. The author speaks about the mutual submission of the spouses, husband and wife, and in this way shows also how to understand *the words* he writes afterward *about the submission of the wife to the husband.* ...Husband and wife are, in fact, “subject to one another,” mutually subordinated to one another. *The source* of this reciprocal submission lies in Christian *pietas* and *its expression is love.*

“Sacrament and ‘Redemption of the Body’” (December 15, 1982), 102:8 ... Through the “great mystery” discussed in Ephesians, through the New Covenant of Christ with the Church, marriage is inscribed anew in the “**sacrament of man,**” which embraces the universe; it is inscribed in **the sacrament of man and of the world,** which thanks to the “redemption of the body,” is formed according to the model of the spousal love of Christ and the Church, until the measure of definitive fulfillment is reached in the kingdom of the Father (bold type added).

Cycle V – TOB Lectures No. 103-117 began on at the start of a New Year on 1/5/83 and concluded on 7/4/84. They include a number of written but undelivered TOB

meditations on the “Language of the Body” with reference to the *Song of Songs* (*Solomon’s Canticle of Canticles*), and the *Book of Tobias*, a historical book of the Old Testament which has always been esteemed by the Church for the example of great piety, extraordinary patience and of a perfect resignation to the will of God suffered by the elder Tobias, his son Tobias, and Sara, whom the younger Tobias took to wife. It is in the section on Tobias (Tobit) that John Paul II introduces the exegesis that equates “in some sense” conjugal sex with liturgy. (8)

“When the Language of the Liturgy Becomes the ‘Language of the Body,’” 117b:6 (Not delivered) ... through the “language of the body,” man and woman encounter the great “*mysterium*” in order to transfer the light of this mystery, a light of truth and beauty expressed in liturgical language, into the “language of the body,” that is, into the language of the praxis of love, of faithfulness, and of conjugal integrity, or into the ethos rooted in the “redemption of the body (See Rom 8:23). On this road, conjugal life in some sense becomes liturgy.

Cycle VI – In his final series of TOB Lectures No. 118-129, and 133-135, delivered from 7/11/84 and ending 10/31/84, John Paul II focused on *Humanae Vitae*, and practical ethics related to the conjugal life. In line with *Gaudium et Spes* and *Humanae Vitae*, marriage is discussed in terms of “meanings” rather than “ends,” Waldstein’s attempt to prove otherwise notwithstanding. (9)

“The Moral Norm and the Truth of the ‘Language of the Body’” (July 11, 1984), 118:2 “*The Church...teaches* that each and every marriage act... must remain through itself open to the transmission of life. That teaching, often set forth by the magisterium, is founded upon 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 and the procreative meaning***” (HV11-12) (bold type added).

“The Ethical Problem” (August 8, 1984), 122:5... The theology of the body is not merely a theory, but rather a specific evangelical, Christian pedagogy of the body.

“The Ethical Problem” (August 22, 1984), 123:7 One can say that in the case of an artificial separation of these two meanings in the conjugal act, a real bodily union is brought about, but it does not correspond to the inner truth and dignity of personal communion, “*communio personarum*.” ... Such a violation of the inner order of conjugal communion, a communion that plunges its roots into the very order of the person, ***constitutes the essential evil of the contraceptive act*** (bold type added).

“Conclusion” (November 28, 1984), 133:2 ...The doctrine contained in this document [TOB] of the Church’s **contemporary teaching** remains in organic relation both with the sacramentality of marriage and the whole biblical problematic of the theology of the body, which is centered on the “key words” of Christ. In some sense, one can say that all the reflections dealing with the “Redemption of the Body and the Sacramentality of Marriage” *seem* to constitute *an extensive commentary on the doctrine contained precisely in Humanae Vitae* (bold type added).

133:3 The analysis of the *biblical aspects* speaks about the way of rooting the teaching proclaimed by the Church in revelation. This is important *for the development of theology*. Development or progress in theology takes place, in fact, through continually taking up again the study of the deposit of revelation. ... The analysis of the *personalistic aspects* contained in this document has an existential meaning for establishing what *true progress* consists in, that is, the development *of the human person*. ...

Key promoters of TOB such as Christopher Cardinal Schönborn, O.P. of Vienna, Christopher West, and Michael Waldstein have described John Paul II’s Theology of the Body primarily as a defense of *Gaudium et Spes* and *Humanae Vitae*. (10) Do you agree?

No, not entirely. Statements such as these are rather superficial and misleading.

First, because we know that long before *Gaudium et Spes* and *Humanae Vitae* were written, Wojtyla, was unhappy with the Church’s teachings on sex and marriage, and that he was determined to construct a new theological and ethical foundation for the re-formulation of these teachings. This unhappiness is clearly evident in *Love and Responsibility*, based on university lectures delivered by Wojtyla between 1958 and 1959:

Sexual morality and therefore conjugal morality consists of a stable and mature *synthesis of nature’s purpose with the personalistic norm*. If any one of the above-mentioned purposes of marriage is considered without reference to the personalistic norm... this is bound to lead to some form of utilitarianism... . To regard procreation in this way leads to the rigorist distortion, while the ‘libidinic’ distortion is rooted in a similar attitude to the tertiary end of marriage – *remedium concupiscentiae* (emphasis in original). (11)

Second, because it is well known that Wojtyla was dissatisfied with the **manner** in which Pope Paul VI presented the arguments against contraception in *Humanae Vitae*. Wojtyla believed he could greatly improve these ‘staid,’ ‘dogmatic’ arguments by

presenting them in a more contemporary setting based upon an “adequate anthropology, which seeks to understand and interpret man in what is essentially human.” (12)

In short, TOB was and is designed to complete the task already set in motion at the Second Vatican Council, that is, the replacement of the Church’s traditional contractual-procreative model of marriage in favor of an inter-personalist covenant model as conceived in part by Wojtyla in the *Theology of the Body*.

John Paul II’s biographer, George Weigel, who had unprecedented media access to the pope, confirms this assessment in *Witness to Hope*.(13)

... In developing his idea of human sexual self-giving as an icon of the interior life of God, John Paul II was working out the implications of the very same concept of human dignity and human freedom with which he challenged communism in east central Europe.

When he was elected to the papacy, Karol Wojtyla knew that the Church’s last effort to address the sexual revolution and its relationship to the moral life, Pope Paul’s 1968 encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, had been a pastoral and catechetical failure - however correct he thought it was on the specific question of the morally appropriate means of regulating fertility.

John Paul II believed it was the time to put the entire discussion on a new footing. The Church had not found a voice with which to address the challenge of the sexual revolution. John Paul thought that he and his colleagues in Lublin and Krakow had begun to do that, in the understanding of human sexuality expressed in *Love and Responsibility* and in the work of the archdiocesan family life ministry under his leadership. Now it was time to deepen that analysis biblically and bring it to a world audience.

The Church and the world will be well into the twenty-first century, and perhaps far beyond, before Catholic theology has fully assimilated the contents of these 130 general audience addresses. If it is taken with the seriousness it deserves, John Paul’s *Theology of the Body* may prove to be the decisive moment in exorcising the Manichaeic demon and its deprecation of human sexuality from Catholic moral theology. ... John Paul’s *Theology of the Body* has ramifications for all of theology.

George Weigel sums up the radical nature of TOB when he states, “These 130 catechetical addresses, taken together, constitute a kind of **theological time bomb** set to go off, with dramatic consequences, sometime in the third millennium of the Church (bold type added).” (14)

Endnotes

1. The text of the 129 General Audiences on TOB as they originally appeared in *L’Osservatore Romano* and were later compiled by the Daughters of Saint Paul are available at <http://www.ewtn.com/library/PAPALDOC/JP2TBIND.HTM>. A portion of the texts are available in English from www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/audiences/index.htm.

- Portions of the talks that were prepared by John Paul II, but not delivered, are found in Waldstein.
2. John Paul II used the official translation of the Holy Bible made by the Italian Bishops Conference in 1971 which follows the Latin Vulgate text. This writer uses the Douay-Rheims Version (1899).
 3. Waldstein, pp. 134-141. The phenomenological phrase “getting to the truth of things” is taken from a keynote address delivered by George Weigel on December 1, 2006 at a Duquesne University conference exploring “The Phenomenology of John Paul II.” The full text is available at http://www.eppc.org/publications/pubID.2779/pub_detail.asp.
 4. Ibid., p. 220.
 5. Adultery, as the very etymology of the word implies “is access to another’s marriage-bed, *ad alienum torum*, (St. Thom., II-II: 154:8). It is always a mortal sin, a grievous sin which offends God and a grave sin against chastity, justice, and religion. Traditionally, adultery has been defined by the Church as a carnal connection between a married person and one unmarried, or between a married person and the spouse of another. This definition rules out the possibility that a husband can commit ‘**adultery**’ with his own wife.* A husband can, however, commit the sin of **carnal lust** against his wife. The sin is judged to be venial or mortal depending upon whether or not the conditions for the latter, i.e. grievous matter, sufficient reflection, and full consent of the will, were present. The Church lists lust as one of the seven capital vices, capital because it engenders other sins, other vices. (*Saint Alphonsus Liguori and Saint Thomas Aquinas and other Church Fathers include in the definition of adultery, the husband who commits sodomy or other unnatural acts against his own wife.)
 6. This series of TOB Lectures was interrupted for a six-month period on May 13, 1981, Feast Day of Our Lady of Fatima, following the attempted assassination of Pope John Paul II who was on his way to deliver a General Audience talk on TOB.
 7. Waldstein, pp. 403, 462.
 8. On October 26, 2007, Monica Ashour, co-founder of TOBET (Theology of the Body Evangelization Team) based in Carrollton, Texas, delivered a talk at the Fourth National Theology of the Body Forum in Dallas titled “Teaching Adults how to Teach Teens the Theology of the Body. (9) Describing to potential teachers of TOB the fourth “essential” doctrine of Pope John Paul’s TOB “the sacredness of marriage and of sexuality,” Ms. Ashour states: “Pope John Paul says that those couples who live out the language of their body and make it the content of their lives **will fulfill the very meaning of their existence**. He says that marriage is the best natural sign of who God is...and even enters into being a liturgical action! Think about Mass. We use our bodies to glorify God and be in a deeper union and communion with Him and the whole Church. In the marital embrace, the couple glorifies God by their bodily union and communion which effects what it signifies (definition of a sacrament); marital love brings more grace into the world. **The pope says marital intercourse, next to the Mass, is the most powerful way to combat the devil. ... (bold type added).**” See: <http://www.tobet.org/adultstoteachteens.asp>.
 9. Ibid., p. 618. In the translator’s note, Waldstein attempts to defend John Paul II’s new theology of marriage which substitutes “means” for “ends” by referring to an earlier lecture (TOB 35:2) and by stating that the Council Father in *Gaudium et Spes* (see TOB 127:3) supported the traditional hierarchy of the ends of marriage. In fact, both citations indicate just the opposite. Concerning the latter, the text states clearly, “According to the traditional language, love, as a superior ‘power,’ coordinates the acts of the persons, of the husband and wife, *in the area of the ends of marriage*. Although in approaching the issues **neither the conciliar constitution nor the encyclical use the traditional language (defining the hierarchy of ends: ‘procreation,’ ‘mutual aid,’ and ‘remedy of concupiscence’)**, they nevertheless speak about that to which the traditional expressions refer (bold type added).” Regarding Waldstein’s reference to TOB 35:2, this section does **not** affirm John Paul II’s

- belief in procreation as the primary end of marriage. This is because the pope is not referring to “procreation” within the context of a traditional monogamous relationship. Rather, he is talking about “procreation” within the context of the Old Testament and the adoption of the practice of polygamy by the Chosen People. He states, “The desire was so deep, and procreation, as the essential end of marriage, was so evident,” that a wife without issue would have her husband bed a maid servant or take on an additional wife in order to produce children. We should note here that while the primary end of marriage is, in fact, procreation, the rights of spouses in this regard are not **absolute**. For example, modern reproductive techniques such as artificial insemination, and *in vitro* fertilization, in which children are produced outside the womb, are condemned by the Church.
10. See Waldstein, Preface, xxvii, Introduction, p. 99, and Christopher West, “A Response to Luke Timothy Johnson’s Critique of John Paul II’s ‘Disembodied’ Theology of the Body” available at <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/sexuality/se0111.html>.
 11. Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility*, 67.
 12. Wojtyla, General Audience, January 2, 1980, 13:2.
 13. Quotes taken from the online version of Chapter 10 of *Witness to Hope* by George Weigel at <http://www.viastuas.net.au/bc/TTofB.html>.
 14. Ibid.

Copyright Randy Engel 2008

“John Paul II and the ‘Theology of the Body’ – A Study in Modernism”

By Randy Engel

Part IV

Dealing With a Stacked Deck

As we begin to examine the Theology of the Body in depth, are there any dangers against which the reader should be forewarned and forearmed?

Yes, there are a number of dangers found in TOB of which the reader should be aware. In Part III of this series, I closed with a quote from papal biographer George Weigel who describes TOB as “a kind of theological time bomb set to go off...” I do not think this an exaggeration, but rather an understatement. (1)

I think the reader needs to examine TOB with both eyes wide open and with the realization that he is dealing with a stacked or rigged deck of cards, so to speak. This is why *adepts* of TOB like Christopher West insist that one must be initiated into the *gnosis* of TOB in order to fully appreciate its meaning. (2)

Below West explain the rules of the game:

The TB calls us to look deeply into our own hearts, to look past our wounds and the scars of sin, past our disordered desires. If we're able to do that we discover God's original plan for creating us as male and female still “echoing” within us. By glimpsing at that “original vision,” we can almost taste the original experience of bodily integrity and freedom - of nakedness without shame. And we begin to sense a plan for our sexuality so grand, so wondrous, that we can scarcely allow our hearts to take it in. But getting “behind those fig leaves,” so to speak, is difficult. It demands a **radical paradigm shift**. It demands that we recognize that the way men and women relate today — what we just consider “normal” — is so often based on the loss of the original grace of our creation. ... If someone

approaches the TB without a willingness to let go of “life as he or she knows it,” that person will miss altogether the revolution that the TB affords (bold type added). (3)

How do proponents of TOB aim to achieve this “radical paradigm shift?”

This task is achieved largely by controlling the language of discourse. The language of TOB is not the language of classic Scholasticism, but an alien language based on a synthesis of modern philosophical errors, especially phenomenology. In any battle, especially the battle against Modernism, it is always foolish for faithful Catholics to use the language of the enemy.

As psychiatrist Dr. Joost Meerloo reminds us in *The Rape of the Mind*, a classic work on brainwashing, the words we use determine the thoughts we have. Since man thinks in terms of words, he who controls language can control how man thinks. “The formulation of big propagandistic lies and fraudulent catchwords has a very well-defined purpose in Totalitaria, and words themselves have acquired a special function in the service of power, which we may call verbocracy,” Meerloo explains. (4)

The “verbocracy” and “semantic fog” of TOB is indeed very large and the tightly controlled. TOB texts and lectures are filled with numerous verbal gimmicks, slogans and catch phrases such as the oft-repeated reference to “gift” as in “Man in the Dimension of Gift” and “Gift - Mystery of a Beatifying Beginning.” (5)

TOB also turns traditional ecclesiastical definitions on their heads.

Can you cite an example of a definition turned on its head?

One important example would be the redefinition of the word “sacrament.”

The Catechism of Trent uses the definition of St. Augustine and adopted by all Scholastic writers - “A Sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, instituted for our justification.” (6)

In his TOB General Audiences of on October 20, 1982 (98:7, 98:8), John Paul II admits:

Up until now, in fact, we have been using the term “sacrament” (in agreement with the whole biblical and patristic tradition) in a wider sense than the one characteristic of traditional and contemporary theological terminology, which uses the word “sacrament” to indicate the signs instituted by Christ and administered in the Church, which express and confer divine grace on the person who receives particular sacraments... .

In comparison with this restricted meaning, we used a *wider perhaps an older and more fundamental meaning of the term* “sacrament” in our considerations... Ephesians, and especially 5:22-23, seems to authorize us specifically in this use. Here “sacrament” means the very mystery of God, which is hidden from eternity, yet not in an eternal

concealment, but first in its very revelation and realization... . In this sense, we also speak about the sacrament of creation and the sacrament of redemption. ...

Under this new definition, marriage was a “sacrament” **before** the coming of Christ. In addition to the new “sacrament of creation” and the “sacrament of redemption” John Paul II introduces us to the “sacrament of man” (102:8); the “sacrament of man in the world” (19:5, 102:8) and the “sacrament of man and the world” (102:7).

Would you cite other possible dangers or difficulties facing the TOB reader?

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges facing TOB readers is that of being able to successfully separate the traditional teachings of the Church on matters of sexual morality, marriage and family life from the new and alien teachings of the theology of the body. Since both are commingled throughout the entire text of John Paul II’s *Man and Woman He Created Them*, this is a particularly arduous task.

My advice to the TOB novice is to first familiarize himself with the authentic teachings of the Church on marriage as found, for example, in:

- *De bono coniugali* (Of the Good of Marriage), the wonderful and practical treatise of Saint Augustine on the good of marriage - offspring, conjugal faith, and sacrament and *On Marriage and Concupiscence*. (7)
- *The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas* with its sublime teachings On Creation, On Man, and On Passions and On Marriage as an Office of Nature and a Sacrament. (8)
- *Arcanum* (1880), the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on Christian Marriage with its tribute to the marriage with its gifts of “holiness, unity, and indissolubility,” and its condemnation of the great evil of divorce. (9)
- *Casti Connubii* (1930), the unsurpassable encyclical of Pope Pius XI on Chaste Wedlock. Intent on keeping “the flock committed to Our care from poisoned pastures,” Pius XI reminds us that conjugal love is first and foremost to be found in the will -“By matrimony... **the souls of the contracting parties are joined and knit together more directly and more intimately than are their bodies**, and that not by any passing affection of sense of spirit, but by a deliberate and firm act of the will; and from this union of souls by God’s decree, a sacred and inviolable bond arises (bold type added). (10)

How original is the Theology of the Body? Did it originate solely with Wojtyla (later Pope John Paul II), or were there others who helped shape his new configuration for Catholic marriage?

Many of the major premises and themes of TOB are not original to Wojtyla.

By the time Wojtyla delivered his talks on *Love and Responsibility* at the University of Lublin in 1958 and 1959, there was already a strong movement in certain Catholic circles to realign Catholic marriage along more ‘personalist’ lines, led in part by the

German philosopher **Dietrich von Hildebrand** and the German Benedictine priest **Dom Herbert Doms**.

Dietrich von Hildebrand was a phenomenologist like Wojtyla was he not? (11)

Yes. From 1909 to 1911, von Hildebrand was a student of Edmund Husserl, the founder of phenomenology at the University of Göttingen, but, his philosophical mentor and friend was Adolf Reinach, a jurist and phenomenologist who later adopted Husserl's philosophy to the law, philosophy, morals and ethics but along more 'objective' and 'realistic' lines. (12)

Also, Max Scheler, the German phenomenologist who taught at the University of Munich, played an important role in von Hildebrand's early intellectual formation. (13) Von Hildebrand credits Scheler with his conversion to Catholicism, although Scheler himself left the Church in 1924. Both men were part of the well-known phenomenological circles that developed at the University of Munich and the University of Göttingen, but in the end each followed a different path. The influence of Scheler upon the young Wojtyla has already been noted earlier in this series.

Like Wojtyla, Von Hildebrand attempted to form an original philosophical system which incorporated contemporary philosophies including phenomenology and personalism. He believed that these new system offered valuable insights and truths which could be used to form a truly Christian Humanism and make the Gospel more fully intelligible to the modern world. (14)

John H. Crosby, founder of the Dietrich von Hildebrand Legacy Project, says von Hildebrand "...contributed to a new Christian humanism in which all human goods and values are redeemed. This humanism can be seen in his rich philosophy of love; for he does not think that only Christian love of neighbor counts as love, but he takes seriously all the kinds of human love, giving particular attention to the love between man and woman." (15)

When did von Hildebrand's begin to formulate his new theology of marriage?

According to his widow, Alice von Hildebrand, her husband had acquired a special interest in human love and conjugal relationships long before his conversion to Roman Catholicism in April of 1914 at the age of 30. (16)

In 1923, he delivered a lecture on marriage and the value of conjugal sex in Ulm Germany on the occasion of a meeting of the Catholic Academic Association. In 1925, he delivered a similar address in Innsbruck, Austria, to the Federation of Catholic Students' Unions. In these lectures he argued that there was a distinction between love as the **meaning** of marriage and procreation as its **purpose** or **end**. In his work, *Marriage: The Mystery of Faithful Love*, von Hildebrand states that "As marriage is, in its nature, principally a communion of love, so the meaning of physical consummation is not restricted to its function as a means of procreation. ... But this primary *end* is not the only

meaning of the physical act. **Subjectively speaking, it is not even its primary meaning** (bold type added).” (17)

Von Hildebrand taught that, “The marital embrace - a sacrament – has its own value, *but to choose to sever it from the fruitfulness that God has linked to it*, is a grave sin which inevitably saps the beauty of the mutual self-donation of the spouses. (18) He insisted that, “The marital embrace is the sacrament, not procreation.” (19)

In fact, the seventh sacrament of the Church is Matrimony, not conjugal sex. The very definition of the word “matrimony” is derived from the fact that the principal object which a female should propose to herself in marriage is to become a mother; or from the fact that to a mother it belongs to conceive, bring forth and train her offspring. As confirmed in the *Catechism of Trent*, the Christian sacrament of Matrimony is sealed when the husband and wife freely give their mutual consent in an exchange of vows of life-long fidelity and exclusiveness, each yielding to the other the dominion of their body. (20)

Alice Von Hildebrand says that her husband believed that the Church’s position on the procreation and education of children as the primary end of marriage diminished the value of the interpersonal and unitive aspects of marriage, and that it was timely and necessary to introduce a corrective to remedy the situation. (21)

Crosby, who directs the Legacy Project to promote the philosophy and works of Dietrich Von Hildebrand concurs:

For centuries Catholic writers had stressed almost exclusively the procreative meaning of the marital act. Von Hildebrand was one of the first to see that over and above the procreative meaning there is also the unitive meaning of the marital act - the enactment of the love of the spouses for each other. ... **With his writings on man and woman in the 1920s he prepared the ground in the Church for the teaching of Vatican II on the dual meaning of the marital act** (bold type added). (22)

What was the reaction of Church officials to von Hildebrand’s views on the centrality of the marital embrace over and beyond the procreative purpose of marriage?

Alice von Hildebrand says her husband was conscious that “he was breaking new ground in making so explicit the distinction between the purpose and the meaning of marriage,” so he turned to Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli, then the Papal Nuncio in Munich, whom he had befriended, for confirmation of his views. She says that her husband “received from the future Pontiff a full endorsement of his position.” (23)

However, as is clear from *Casti Connubii* written in 1930, the Holy See did not endorse the paradigm shift in marriage as entertained by von Hildebrand. In his encyclical, Pope Pius XI clearly cites the 1917 Code of Canon Law formulation based on

the writings of Saint Thomas and Saint Augustine - “The primary end of marriage is the procreation and the education of children.” (24)

Furthermore, as we shall document shortly, after Pacelli ascended the papal throne as Pius XII in 1939, he changed his earlier opinions which were said to have favored a ‘personalist’ view of marriage. The radical writings on marital sex by the German priest Dom Herbert Doms may have forced his hand on the matter.

What was Father Herbert Doms’ teaching on the purpose of marriage?

Father Herbert Doms, a philosopher and theologian and an admirer of Max Scheler, gave primacy to conjugal love (sex) over childbearing. In 1935 he wrote *Vom Sinn and Zweck der Ehe*, (*About the Meaning and Purpose of Marriage*) in which he claimed that sexual union, which makes possible the total gift of self, was the aim of marriage. He argued that since every act of coitus does not result in offspring, the primary purpose of conjugal sex must lay outside of procreation, that is, in the personal fulfillment of man and woman as persons:

In the perfect act, worthy of human beings, the two partners grasp each other reciprocally in intimate love; that is spiritually they reciprocally give themselves in an act which contains the abandonment and enjoyment of the whole person and is not simply an isolated activity of organs. (25)

Doms taught that the dignity of the sexual act is rooted in its unitive rather than its procreative meaning and that this principle of unity is derived from the nature of conjugal love and not from any connections external to the spouses, such as children. (26) Like Wojtyła, he emphasized the sexual act as a “gift” from one person to another. (27) For the record, Doms, like von Hildebrand, opposed contraception.

Doms also taught that the physical union in marriage completed the moral participation in the life of the other, just as physical union with Christ in the Eucharist completed the moral union with Christ. (28)

Did the Holy See take action against Father Doms?

Yes. As early as 1939, the Holy Office ordered the removal of Doms’ doctrinally unsafe work from public circulation and sales. (29)

On April 1, 1944, under Pope Pius XII, the Holy Office issued a decree on the ends of marriage which specifically rejected the thesis put forth by Doms and others that the secondary ends of marriage can be considered as independent from the primary end and not subordinated to it. Even though Doms was not specifically named in the pronouncement, it was understood that the edict was a repudiation of his opinions on the matter. (30)

And on October 29, 1951, at the end of his famous “Address to Members of the Congress of the Italian Association of Midwives,” Pius XII warned against an inversion

of the Church's formulation on the ends of marriage, a warning that was applicable, in part, to both Doms' and von Hildebrand's new theology of marriage.

Here are the pope's main arguments in favor of the traditional formulation of the primary and secondary ends of marriage and in opposition to the teachings that put "personalism" on an equal and independent footing with procreation and the institution of family life:

The order of values **PERSONALISM**

"Personal values" and the need to respect such are a theme which, over the last twenty years or so, has been considered more and more by writers. In many of their works, even the specifically sexual act has its place assigned, that of serving the "person" of the married couple. The proper and most profound sense of the exercise of conjugal rights would consist in this, that the union of bodies is the expression and the realization of personal and affective union. ...

The primary end of marriage

Now, the truth is that matrimony, as an institution of nature, in virtue of the Creator's will, has not as a primary and intimate end the personal perfection of the married couple but the procreation and upbringing of a new life. The other ends, inasmuch as they are intended by nature, are not equally primary, much less superior to the primary end, but are essentially subordinated to it. This is true of every marriage, even if no offspring result, just as of every eye it can be said that it is destined and formed to see, even if, in abnormal cases arising from special internal or external conditions, it will never be possible to achieve visual perception (bold type added).

It was precisely to end the uncertainties and deviations which threatened to diffuse errors regarding the scale of values of the purposes of matrimony and of their reciprocal relations, that a few years ago (March 10, 1944), We Ourselves drew up a declaration on the order of those ends, pointing out what the very internal structure of the natural disposition reveals. We showed what has been handed down by Christian tradition, what the Supreme Pontiffs have repeatedly taught, and what was then in due measure promulgated by the Code of Canon Law. **Not long afterwards, to correct opposing opinions, the Holy See, by a public decree, proclaimed that it could not admit the opinion of some recent authors who denied that the primary end of marriage is the procreation and education of the offspring, or teach that the secondary ends are not essentially subordinated to the primary end, but are on an equal footing and independent of it** (bold type added).

Would this lead, perhaps, to Our denying or diminishing what is good and just in personal values resulting from matrimony and its realization? Certainly not, because the Creator has designed that for the procreation of a new life human beings made of flesh and blood, gifted with soul and heart, shall be called upon as men and not as animals deprived of reason to be the authors of their posterity. It is for this end that the Lord desires the union of husband and wife. Indeed, the Holy Scripture says of God that He created man to His image and He created him male and female, and willed—as is repeatedly affirmed in Holy Writ—that "a man shall leave mother and

father, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh.”

All this is therefore true and desired by God. But, on the other hand, it must not be divorced completely from the primary function of matrimony—the procreation of offspring. Not only the common work of external life, but even all personal enrichment—spiritual and intellectual—all that in married love as such is most spiritual and profound, has been placed by the will of the Creator and of nature at the service of posterity. The perfect married life, of its very nature, also signifies the total devotion of parents to the well-being of their children, and married love in its power and tenderness is itself a condition of the sincerest care of the offspring and the guarantee of its realization. ... (bold type added) (31)

Did John Paul II ever acknowledge either Doms or von Hildebrand for their contributions to his own master work – the Theology of the Body?

The pope never publicly mentioned Doms in connection with TOB, but from just the few quotes mentioned above, one can see many similarities between John Paul II’s TOB and Doms’ *Vom Sinn and Zweck der Ehe* with its heavy personalist emphasis on “self-giving” and conjugal sex as sacrament.

Regarding von Hildebrand’s influence on John Paul II, John Crosby states that the pope said that von Hildebrand’s writings on love and marriage heavily influenced his own master work, the Theology of the Body.” (32) Further, one cannot discount von Hildebrand’s important influence on *Love and Responsibility*, *Gaudium et Spes* and *Humanae Vitae*, three of the foundation works that John Paul II used to undergird TOB.

This writer did not know von Hildebrand personally, but for many years has had the pleasure of knowing his widow, Alice. Von Hildebrand’s writings in opposition to classroom sex instruction which he co-authored with Professor William Marra of Fordham University are very good, but on the question of marriage and its ends, I believe that von Hildebrand took a wrong and deadly turn in the road. (33)

Acting the role of Devil’s Advocate for the moment, from the very beginning of this series on TOB you have hammered away at the importance of the Church’s traditional formulation on the primary and secondary ends of marriage. Meaning – ends - primary – subordinate - what harm does a little verbal gymnastics do?

Well, I wish Saint Athanasius was here to answer that question. After all, he went to war against Arius and turned an empire upside down over just *one* word “*homoousios*” – the one word that could not be understood to mean what the Arians meant.(34)

Let me repeat the words of Pope Pius XII – “... the truth is that matrimony, as an institution of nature, in virtue of the Creator’s will, has not as a primary and intimate end the personal perfection of the married couple but the procreation and upbringing of a new life. The other ends, inasmuch as they are intended by nature, are not equally primary, much less superior to the primary end, but are essentially subordinated to it.”

In short, Pius XII is reminding ‘modern man’ that matrimony and sexual relations, by God’s will, are about BABIES and RAISING A FAMILY.

For while it is true that sacramental marriage is **more** than solely a vehicle to reproduce offspring, it is never **less** than that. The problem with von Hildebrand and Doms and other personalists is not that they advance love, unity and fidelity within marriage, but that they do so at the expense of undermining or denying the objective order and the true end of marriage which is the procreation and the education of children.

And what does the Theology of the Body have to say about the love and blessings and joy and wonder that children bring to the marriage table and the role that children play in the maturation and sanctification of their parents?

Let me put it this way. If I were to hold my breath between TOB’s in-depth discussion of the importance of babies and children and family life in connection with marriage and conjugal sex, I’d asphyxiate myself.

Endnotes Part IV

1. See online version of Chapter 10 of *Witness to Hope* by George Weigel at <http://www.viastuas.net.au/bc/TTofB.html>.
2. Christopher West, “A Response to Luke Timothy Johnson’s Critique of John Paul II’s ‘Disembodied’ Theology of the Body,” p. 9, available at <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/sexuality/se0111.html>. West’s exact wording is very instructive: “John Paul II imparts a secret wisdom, hidden in God from all eternity and destined for our glorification before time began. He imparts it in words not taught by men, but taught by the Spirit. ...”
3. Ibid., p.2.
4. See Chapter VII “The Intrusion by Totalitarian Thinking,” in *The Rape of the Mind - The Psychology of Thought Control, Menticide, and Brainwashing* by Joost A. M. Meerloo, M.D., (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1956). Online text is provided at <http://www.ninehundred.net/control/forward.html>.
5. See G.A. of 1/2/80, “Intimacy – The Hidden Meaning of Vision,” 13:2 and G.A. of 1/9/80, 14:2.
6. See <http://www.catholicapologetics.info/thechurch/catechism/Holy7Sacraments.shtml>.
7. Full and partial texts are available at www.ewtn.com/library/PATRISTC/PNI3-12.HTM and <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/aug-marr.html>.
8. The *Summa Theologica* is available in a very easy to use and readable format at <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/>
9. Text of *Arcanum* available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_10021880_arcanum_en.html.
10. Text of *Casti Connubii* available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_31121930_casti-connubii_en.html.
11. Dietrich von Hildebrand was born in Florence, Italy on October 12, 1889, the only son of the famous German sculptor Adolf von Hildebrand. He grew up in an affluent, cosmopolitan European environment that later centered in Munich, Germany. He came to

- the United States in 1940 with financial assistance from the Rockefeller Foundation and taught at Fordham University until his retirement in 1959. He died on January 26, 1977.
12. For biographical information on Edmund Husserl, a Jewish convert to Lutheranism under whom von Hildebrand completed his Ph.D., see http://www.husserlpage.com/hus_bio.html. For an excellent biographical sketch of Adolf Reinach, whom von Hildebrand first befriended in Munich in 1907, see http://ontology.buffalo.edu/smith/articles/reinach_biography.pdf.
 13. Scheler and von Hildebrand first met at a party in 1907, shortly after the former had joined the teaching staff at the University of Munich. Von Hildebrand was 17 years old at the time. Scheler's inner philosophical circle included Edmond Husserl, Theodor Lipps, Johannes Daubert, Theodor Conrad, Hedwig Conrad-Martius, Alexander Pfander, Alexandre Koyre, student Edith Stein, and of course, von Hildebrand. Edith Stein, a Jewess, converted to Catholicism in 1922 and eventually entered the Carmelite Order. She was canonized on 11 October 1998 as St. Teresa Benedicta of the Cross, confessor and martyr, by Pope John Paul II. In 1910, Scheler lost his position at the University after he was accused of adultery and the charge was upheld by the courts. In 1912, he married for the second time. Scheler died in 1928 at the age of 54.
 14. See comments of Pope Benedict XVI praising the "personalism" of Von Hildebrand at <http://zenit.org/article-19869?l=english>. Note: Many Church Fathers including Saint Ambrose, Saint Augustine, and Saint Thomas were influenced by and used non-Catholic sources, but they never compromised Church teachings on faith and morals in doing so.
 15. Ibid.
 16. Alice von Hildebrand, "Introduction - Marriage: the Mystery of Faithful Love" at <http://catholiceducation.org/articles/marriage/mf0003.html>.
 17. Dietrich Von Hildebrand, *Marriage: The Mystery of Faithful Love*, excerpt online at <http://www.ewtn.com/library/Marriage/SIPMARRG.HTM>.
 18. Alice von Hildebrand, "Personalist Responds to Critic of Paul VI," *Pro Ecclesia*, 2002, Vol. XXXIII No. 3, p. 7.
 19. Ibid.
 20. See <http://www.catholicbook.com/AgredaCD/Trent/tsacr-m.htm>. "Hence pastors should teach the faithful that the nature and force of marriage consists in the tie and obligation; and that, without consummation, the consent of the parties, expressed in the manner already explained, is sufficient to constitute a true marriage. It is certain that our first parents before their fall, when, according to the holy Fathers, no consummation took place, were really united in marriage. Hence the Fathers say that marriage consists not in its use but in the consent. This doctrine is repeated by St. Ambrose in his book *On Virgins*."
 21. Alice von Hildebrand, "Introduction... ."
 22. Crosby.
 23. Alice von Hildebrand., "Introduction... ."
 24. *Casti Connubii*, 17.
 25. John T. Noonan, *Contraception: A History of Its Treatment by the Catholic Theologians and Canonists*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1966, p.497.
 26. Rolando B. Arjonillo Jr., *Conjugal Love and the Ends of Marriage – A Study of Dietrich von Hildebrand and Herbert Doms in the Light of the Pastoral Constitution Gaudium et spes*, European University Studies, Series XXIII, Vol./Band 619, Peter Lang, Bern, 1998, p. 160.
 27. Ibid. 171.
 28. Noonan, p. 498.
 29. Arjonillo, p. 227.
 30. Ibid., 224.
 31. For full text of Pope Pius XII's "Address to Midwives" see <http://www.catholicculture.org/library/view.cfm?recnum=3462>.

32. Stephanie Tracy, "Resurrecting a thinker," *Arlington Catholic Herald*, January 31-February 6, 2008.
33. I am joined in this opinion by Dr. Herbert Ratner, the great prolife physician and defender of family life from Oak Park, Ill. In private conversations during the early 1970s, he was the first to alert me to the dangers of von Hildebrand's new thinking on marriage which he (Ratner) believed would ultimately destabilize marriage and undermine the value of children and family life.
34. See <http://elvis.rowan.edu/~kilroy/JEK/query.cgi?5+2>.

Copyright Randy Engel 2008

Copyright 2008 Randy Engel

“John Paul II and the ‘Theology of the Body’ – A Study in Modernism ”

By Randy Engel

Part V

TOB - A New Doctrine on Marriage

[Author’s note: The Catholic Church is a hierarchical Church. Any paradigm shift in doctrine or morals requires, at the very least, the tacit cooperation of the reigning pope. As Catholics we firmly believe that God will not permit any pope from imposing formally, *ex cathedra*, his own erroneous theology and opinions upon the whole Church, but this does not mean that a pope intent on introducing his own doctrinal fancies and utopian ideas into the content of Faith is without recourse to other ecclesiastical avenues by which he may achieve this end. (1) Pope John Paul II’s Theology of the Body, which has become the post-Conciliar Church’s defacto theology on sex and marriage, is a case in point.

As noted in Part IV of this series, TOB was not a solitary achievement of John Paul II. By the early part of the 20th century there was already a prominent movement within Catholic academic and theological circles directed at reformulating the Church’s teachings on marriage and sexual ethics along more personalist and existentialist lines. That this movement met with only limited success was due to the succession of uncooperative pontiffs and to the vigilance and resistance of the Italian-dominated Curia which traditionally has protected the Deposit of Faith from erroneous doctrinal inroads from within and without Holy Mother Church. All this changed with the election of Pope John XXIII and the convening of the Second Vatican Council. (2)]

The Council debate on the marriage schema as part of *Gaudium et Spes* - The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World - took place during the Third Session in the fall of 1964. Would you highlight the doctrinal differences between the warring factions engaged in that debate?

Truly “warring” is not too strong a word. The debate on marriage which began at the Council’s 112th General Congregation on October 29-30 in connection with Article 21 “The Sanctity of Marriage and the Family,” was certainly hot and furious, an indication

of the great importance that the Modernist elements within the Church attached to the final outcome.

In the Traditionalist camp, leading the battle in support of the common doctrine of the Church on marriage were Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, Pro-Secretary of the Holy Office and the Irish-born Michael Cardinal Browne, O.P., Cardinal-Deacon of Chiesa di S. Paola alla Regola. They were joined by a number of bishops, including many from non-Western countries. They opposed any change in the hierarchical ends of marriage, especially any shift in doctrine which gave undue emphasis to the inter-personal relationships of the spouses at the expense of the child. (3)

You used the term “common doctrine? in connection with the Council debate on marriage. Would you explain what you mean?

I am referring to the teachings of the Church on marriage based on the Natural Law, Scripture and the Magisterial teachings of the Church as articulated by the Patristic and Scholastic theologians especially Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Augustine. In particular, I am referring to “the existence of a hierarchy among the ends of marriage, dividing them into primary and secondary ends and attributing the primacy to the procreation of children.” (4) The specific formulation “The primary end of matrimony is the procreation and education of offspring; the secondary end is mutual help and the remedy of concupiscence” which first appeared in the 1917 Code of Canon Law did not expound a new doctrine, but one taught by the Church from the time of the Apostles.

I think that the following explanation made by the well-known Italian moral theologian Most Rev. Antonio Lanza (1905-1950) on the objective and specific end of marriage as used in the above formulation will be helpful to the reader:

Every activity of the spouses in the marital life, as in every activity of a religious, priest or soul consecrated to God through virginity etc., is in the ultimate analysis, directed to the personal perfection of the person...; however, the *specific end* of a determinate institution or of a determined work cannot be deduced from this finalistic orientation, *ultimate and common* to every form of activity. Only when the objective end of this said institution or activity is known by another way, can the judgment relative to its relationship with the perfection of the person be formulated. In other words, the perfection of the person, understood in its widest meaning, is not that which conditions our knowledge with regard to the manner by which we can obtain our perfection. Hence, in the problem which concerns us, once the *objective* and *specific* end of marriage and of the conjugal act is known, we can deduce the order of sexual life in general, and the order of that marriage in particular; and knowing the order, we can also determine the manner through which the spouses can attain their perfection in marriage; but from the simple desire of perfection, common to every form of activity and which constitutes the *finis agentis* of that spouse, the specific finality of marriage, i.e., its *finis operis* and the order which is derived from it, cannot be deduced. (5)

In short, when we speak of the *primary end* of marriage we are **not** talking about the ultimate end of the husband or wife, but rather of the *essential end* to which the institution of marriage is ordained by God. (6)

Let's move on to the opposing Modernist camp, aka, the Rhine Group. What did the 'progressive' members of the Council hope to achieve in terms of changes in the Church's doctrine on marriage at the Council?

The 'progressive' entourage at the Council led by Leo Jozef Cardinal Suenens of Malines-Brussels and Paul-Émile Cardinal Léger of Montreal, assisted by an army of liberal *periti*, opposed the 'institutional' view of marriage believing it to be 'outdated,' if indeed it had *ever* been correct. They argued that the old formulation of primary and secondary ends put too much emphasis on procreation and not enough on the interpersonal relationship of spouses, especially the positive aspects of conjugal sex. Moreover, they claimed that the old formulation did not take into consideration new insights into human sexuality and equality of the sexes based on the latest scientific and theological findings.

In keeping with the basic themes of the Council - "renewal" and "communio" - the liberals were able to persuade the majority of Council Fathers to abandon both the concept of a hierarchy of ends and the notion of primary and secondary ends based on the belief they represented a legal rigorism which was demeaning and unsuited to modern man. This resulted in the complete redrafting of the original schema on marriage which was criticized for its negativity and suspicious attitude toward human sexuality and its excessive juridical precision which "lacked the necessary pastoral warmth intended by the Council." (7) The Council committed itself to a new vision of marriage which was essentially personalist. They were successful, probably beyond their wildest dreams. (8)

How is marriage described in *Gaudium et Spes*?

As an "intimate partnership" of "life and love" that "has been established by the Creator and qualified by His laws, as is rooted in the conjugal covenant of irrevocable personal consent" (GS 48). In an earlier section on the dignity of the human person, the relationship between Adam and Eve is identified as "the primary form of interpersonal communion" (GS 12).

What about the "ends" of marriage?

The document refers neither to the "ends" of marriage nor to a "hierarchy of ends." Instead it states, "For God Himself is the author of matrimony, endowed as it is with various benefits and purposes" (GS 48). However, these not spelled out.

The statement that marriage and conjugal love "are ordained for the procreation and education of children" is repeated twice (GS 48, GS 50) although it is made clear that this purpose holds no primacy over other purposes. (GS 50).

Conjugal intercourse is defined as "an intimate union of persons" and as "mutual gift of two persons" (GS 48) and is described as a love which is an "eminently human one since it is directed from one person to another through an affection of the will; it involves the good of the whole person, and therefore can enrich the expressions of body and mind

with a unique dignity, ennobling these expressions as special ingredients and signs of the friendship distinctive of marriage. ... Expressed in a manner which is truly human [*modo vere humano*], these actions promote that mutual self-giving by which spouses enrich each other with a joyful and a ready will. (GS 49).” These sentences would later have a deep impact on canon law and the issue of nullity which will be discussed shortly.

This language appears to be very similar to that found in the Theology of the Body is it not?

Yes, almost identical. It is instructive to note that in both *Gaudium et Spes* and the Theology of the Body many classical terms traditionally associated with the Sacrament of Matrimony have been jettisoned.

You mean words like “contract” as in “marriage contract” or “marriage as a natural contract”?

That’s right. “Contract” is out – too legalistic and commercial. “Covenant” is in (GS 48).

How about “marriage debt?”

“Debt” is out. It smacks of duty. “Gift” is in.

Is there any reference to “concupiscence” as in “marriage as a remedy for concupiscence?”

No. The final drafters of *Gaudium et Spes* found this term extremely distasteful no doubt as it served as a reminder that modern man still suffers from the effects of Original Sin especially in regard to his carnal desires. And we know that the young Wojtyla despised the term *remedium concupiscence*. (9)

In retrospect, I think that this omission was especially unfortunate as the traditional reference to concupiscence in marriage, correctly understood, pays a genuine tribute to the married state.

Saint Augustine understood this very well. In *Of the Good of Marriage* he writes:

Marriages also have the benefit that sensual or youthful incontinence, even though it is wrong, is redirected to the honorable purpose of having children, and so out of the evil of lust sexual union in marriage achieves something good. Furthermore, parental feeling brings about a moderation in sexual desire, since it is held back and in a certain way burns more modestly. For a kind of dignity attaches to the ardor of the pleasure, when in the act whereby man and woman come together with each other, they have the thought of being father and mother. (10)

Following the close of the Second Vatican Council, what was the Church’s next major pronouncement on marriage?

That would be Pope Paul VI's *Humanae Vitae* which came out July 25, 1968, and which quoted extensively from *Gaudium et Spes*. In the encyclical, the pope states that the Second Vatican Council taught "with the highest authority in its Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today (*HV* II.7)."

In *Humanae Vitae* the break with tradition regarding the primary and secondary ends of marriage is formalized.

Paul VI quotes from *Gaudium et Spes* – "Marriage and conjugal love are by their nature ordained toward the procreation and education of children." He also refers to the "unitive significance and the procreative significance" of the marital act and to the unitive and the procreative" qualities inherent in the act (*H.V.* 12), but there is no reference to ends or a hierarchy of ends.

Was the new doctrine on marriage incorporated into the 1983 Code of Canon Law?

Yes. Most assuredly. The new Code of Canon Law fully implemented the new personalist theology and ecclesiology on marriage as set forth by the Second Vatican Council, as well as that of the Theology of the Body of John Paul II.

According to canonist Rev. Cormac Burke, a supporter of TOB:

A whole new approach characterizes the 1983 Code. On the one hand, in its structure and exposition of law, it departs from the more traditional juridic scheme based on a roman law model. It is rather built on an ecclesiological basis, the mystery of the Church... . no small number of legal norms have been created or rewritten in a personalist key. ... the most notable of these in the field of matrimonial law. The great challenge here has been to work from an adequate ecclesiological-personalist basis, without thereby rendering the final exposition less juridic. (12)

You will recall that it was Pope John XXIII who called for a complete revision of the Church's 1917 Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law, about the same time he called for a General Council.(11) However, after Pope John's death, Pope Paul VI put the project on hold until the Council ended. It took another 20 years, until January 25, 1983, for the monumental undertaking to be completed and promulgated under a new supreme legislator and interpreter, Pope John Paul II. The Code of Canon Law is the Church's fundamental legislative document.

What are the major differences between the canons on marriage found in the 1917 Code of Canon law and the 1983 revised version?

Fundamentally, the former embraces an "institutional" and "procreative" model of marriage and the latter represents a "personalist" model as envisioned by the Conciliar Fathers and by John Paul II. The contrast between the two is immediately evident in their respective canons.

In the opening canons on the Sacrament of Matrimony to the **1917** Code (Book III, Part I, Title VII) we read:

Canon 1012. Christ our Lord raised the actual marriage contract between baptized persons to the dignity of a sacrament. Wherefore, there can be no valid matrimonial contract between baptized persons which is not also necessarily a sacrament.

Canon 1013. The primary purpose of marriage is the procreation and education of children. The secondary purpose is to furnish mutual aid and a remedy for concupiscence. The essential characteristics of marriage are its unity and indissolubility, which obtain a special stability in Christian marriage by virtue of the sacrament. ...

Canon 1015. A valid marriage of the baptized is called ratified if consummation has not yet been completed. It is called ratified and consummated if between the spouses the conjugal act has taken place, to which the contract is ordered by its nature and by which the spouses become one flesh.

Contrast this with the following canons of the **1983** Code (Book IV, Part I, Title VII)(13):

Can. 1055 §1. The matrimonial covenant, by which a man and a woman establish between themselves a partnership of the whole of life and which is ordered by its nature to the good of the spouses [*bonum coniugum*] and the procreation and education of offspring, has been raised by Christ the Lord to the dignity of a sacrament between the baptized. (14)

Can. 1057 §2. Matrimonial consent is an act of the will by which a man and a woman mutually give and accept each other through an irrevocable covenant in order to establish marriage.

Can. 1061 §1. A valid marriage between the baptized is called *ratum tantum* [merely ratified] if it has not been consummated; it is called *ratum et consummatum* [ratified and consummated] if the spouses have performed between themselves in a human fashion [*se humano modo*] a conjugal act which is suitable in itself for the procreation of offspring, to which marriage is ordered by its nature and by which the spouses become one flesh.

Note that in Can. 1055 §1 a new **end** - the *bonum coniugum* or the “good of the spouses” is created and given first place, but it is undefined (15) Obviously, the entire concept of “*remedium concupiscentiae*” has been eliminated.

It appears that in Can. 1057 §2 and Can. 1061 §1 the definition of consummation has been redefined?

This is true. Under the old Code (Canon 1015) the consummation of marriage was defined simply as an act of normal intercourse between husband and wife. This traditional and common sense view, however, was rejected as being too biological and anti-personalist because it supposedly suggested a Gnostic or dualistic view that the

conjugal act is merely a joining of two *bodies* as opposed to two *persons*. So it was changed.

In line with *Gaudium et Spes*, the new canon redefines consummation as the joining of a man and a woman who “mutually give and accept each other” and who perform “between themselves in a human fashion [*se humano modo*] a conjugal act which is suitable in itself for the procreation of offspring ...”

Under these personalist norms the physical union of a husband and wife is not sufficient to qualify for “consummation.” The new criteria must also include a union of mind, soul and affections. Never mind that this is the work of a lifetime. The fact that marriages of long-standing which have resulted in children, have been nullified on the basis of these new standards points out the dangers posed by personalist-based canon law to the sanctity and stability of marriage. (16)

Did Pope John Paul II approve of the new canonical status given to the personalist model of marriage?

Yes. And in doing so, he secured for his new theology on marriage and conjugal sex the force of Church law.

What’s the next watershed Church document that adopts John Paul II’s Theology of the Body?

That would be the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* published in 1993.

Like the new Code of Canon Law, the *Catechism* embraces the new ecclesiology and doctrine on marriage and conjugal sex of the Second Vatican Council and of John Paul II.

The definition and ends of marriage found in the Paragraph 1601 (Part II, Sec. II, Chap. II, Art. 7) of the *Catechism* are identical to that found in Can. 1055 §1 of the 1983 Code. (17)

The Paragraphs on “The Love of Husband and Wife” (Part III, Sec. II, Chap. II, Art. 6) are pure TOB.

§2360. **Sexuality is ordered to the conjugal love of man and woman.** In marriage the physical intimacy of the spouses becomes a sign and pledge of spiritual communion. Marriage bonds between baptized persons are sanctified by the sacrament (bold added).

§2361 “Sexuality, by means of which man and woman give themselves to one another through the acts which are proper and exclusive to spouses, is not something simply biological, but concerns the innermost being of the human person as such. It is realized in a truly human way only if it is an integral part of the love by which a man and woman commit themselves totally to one another until death.” [quote taken from *Familiaris Consortio* 11).

§2362 “The acts in marriage by which the intimate and chaste union of the spouses takes place are noble and honorable; the truly human performance of these acts fosters the self-giving they signify and enriches the spouses in joy and gratitude.” [GS 49 #2] Sexuality is a source of joy and pleasure. ...

So far there has been no mention of the connection between conjugal sex and procreation. When does the *Catechism* get around to mentioning what was formally the *primary* end of marriage?

In the fourth Paragraph on sexuality, §2363, mention is made of the “twofold end of marriage: the good of the spouses themselves and the transmission of life.” Later, in §2366, fecundity is said to be “a gift, an end of marriage. ...”

As they stand, §2360, §2361 and §2362 could have been written by Dom Herbert Doms, whose new theology of marriage as documented in Part IV of this series, was rejected by Pope Pius XI and Pius XII as being contrary to Catholic doctrine.

Further, there is a gross mistranslation in the Scriptural passage taken from the *Book of Tobias* which follows §2361.

The actual text taken from the *Douay Rheims* version reads: “And now, Lord, thou knowest, that not for fleshly lust do I take my sister to wife, but only for the love of posterity, in which thy name may be blessed for ever and ever.” *Tob 8: 9*

In other words, Tobias is proclaiming that he intends to enter into the marriage act with Sarah for the purpose of bringing forth children for the honor and glory of God.

What is the *Catechism* translation? The TOB translation?

“I now am taking this kinswoman of mine, not because of lust, but with sincerity.”

In John Paul II’s undelivered TOB lecture No. 114, “When the ‘Language of the Body’ Becomes the Language of the Liturgy (Reflections on Tobit),” the same sentence is translated “Now it is not out of lust that I take this sister of mine, but with rightness of intention.” *Tob 8:9. (18)*

In this highly personalist interpretation of the marriage and wedding night of Tobias and Sarah by John Paul II, it appears, that the even the mention of children in connection with conjugal sex is unwelcomed. This omission remains a sad yet symbolic commentary of the dangers posed to the Faithful by the Theology of the Body.

Endnotes Part V

1. See “Pope John Paul II’s Pontificate: A Period of Gravest Tribulation for the Church” by Hirpinus,” *Si Si No No*, August 1994, No. 9 at http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/1994_August/They_Think_Theyve_Won_PartVII.htm.
2. See “Pope John XXIII – The Interim Pope,” *The Rite of Sodomy – Homosexuality and the Roman Catholic Church*, Randy Engel, NEP, Box 356, Export, PA 15632, pp. 1129-1137.
3. *The Rhine Flows Into The Tiber*, Fr. Ralph M. Wiltgen, Tan Books, Rockford, Il., 1985, p. 269.
4. See Rolando B. Arjonillo Jr., *Conjugal Love and the Ends of Marriage – A Study of Dietrich von Hildebrand and Herbert Doms in the Light of the Pastoral Constitution Gaudium et Spes*, European University Studies, Series XXIII, Vol./Band 619, Peter Lang, Bern, 1998, pp. 240-241, ft. 88.
5. Quote of Most. Rev. Antonio Lanza, who publicly opposed Father Herbert Dom’s new doctrine on marriage, is taken from Arjonillo, p. 223.
6. Arjonillo, p. 223.
7. See comments of Fr. Giuseppe De Rosa as quoted in Arjonillo, p. 6.
8. The chapter on marriage was approved as a whole on November 15-17, 1965, 1596 to 72 with 484 yes votes with qualifications. One hundred and ninety Conciliar Fathers wanted a more traditional statement on the ends of marriage but the subcommission which processed the qualifications told them to go fly a kite. See Wiltgen, p. 270.
9. See Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility*, p. 67.
10. This translation was taken from an excellent lecture by David G. Hunter, PhD, “Sex, Sin and Salvation: What Augustine Really Said” available at <http://www.jknirp.com/aug3.htm>. For a translation of the full text see <http://www.ewtn.com/library/PATRISTC/PNI3-12.HTM>
11. The primary architect of the 1917 Code of Canon Law was Pietro Cardinal Gasparri, a specialist on the sacrament of marriage and matrimonial law. Gasparri’s two volume *De Matrimonio* was published in 1891.
12. See Rev. Cormac Burke, “Renewal, Personalism and Law,” at <http://www.cormacburke.or.ke/node/392>. Father Burke is an Opus Dei priest. It is worth noting that Cormac admits that the concept of personalism is an “open notion” and he warns that certain characteristics of personalism can be emphasized, “as long as one does not want to completely reduce his or her personalism to one’s own way of thinking.” See <http://www.cormacburke.or.ke/node/205>.
13. Text of 1983 Code of Canon Law taken from http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_P3V.HTM.
14. Unlike *Gaudium et Spes*, the 1983 Code retains the terminology of the marriage contract as in Can. 1015 §2 and uses it interchangeably with marriage covenant.
15. The term “good of the spouses” is used in *Gaudium et Spes* in § 48 but in a different context, that is, not as an end.
16. See <http://www.cormacburke.or.ke/node/179>. See also http://canonlaw.wikispot.org/Book_4.
17. See http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P50.HTM.
18. Waldstein, p. 592.

Copyright Randy Engel 2008

Catholic Family News
October 2008

“John Paul II and the ‘Theology of the Body’ – A Study in Modernism”

By Randy Engel

Part VI

Christopher West and Co. –

The Marketing of the Theology of Sexuality

Catholicism A Sensual Religion

Far from eschewing the body, Catholicism is a very physical, sensual—dare I say sexual—religion—much more so than some kinds of piety might wish it to be. Indeed, when the real richness of Catholic ceremonies, symbols, and sacraments is unveiled, it often scandalizes people. For instance, have you ever noticed the symbolism of the blessing of the baptismal waters at the Easter Vigil? As one priest I’ve read about describes it, “Oh, that erotic rite!” Here, at the highlight of the most solemn liturgy of the year, the Easter candle is plunged in and out of the baptismal font as a symbol of Christ impregnating the womb of the Church from which many children will be “born again.” I’m not making this up! In fact, Catholicism sees the whole relationship between God and Man in quasi-sexual terms. (1)

Christopher West
“Naked Without Shame: A Crash
Course in the Theology of the Body”

Three questions immediately pop into my mind concerning your subtitle and the quote attributed to Christopher West –

First, is that a misprint in the subtitle “The Marketing of the Theology of Sexuality”?

No, it is not a misprint. Rather, it is simply an acknowledgement that the so-called “Theology of the Body” of John Paul II is a “Theology of Sexuality.”

Second, do you know the origin of the story about the Easter Vigil candle?

Mr. West does not name his particular source. However, I recognized the story immediately. The first and actually only time I ever saw it in print, before reading the West article, was in Nancy Hennessy Cooney’s vile sex manual for Catholic school children titled *Sex Sexuality and You – A Handbook for Growing Christians* published in 1980 by the notorious Wm. C. Brown Company of Dubuque, Iowa. (2) According to Cooney:

... During the holiest season of the year, we even celebrate our sexuality. It happens this way. During the Easter vigil, the service opens with the lighting of the Pascal Candle, which symbolizes Jesus passage [sic] from death to life. After all the other candles in Church are lit, the large candle is plunged into the just-blessed baptismal water. This is a symbol of sexual intercourse, and serves to remind us how close Christ (the light) is united with his people in the Church (symbolized by the water). From this union is created a new community of believers. (3)

Third, what are Christopher West’s credentials?

Christopher West, an American and a Conciliar Catholic, is the leading proponent of Theology of the Body world-wide.

His official biographical and promotional materials state that West was born in 1969, and is a native of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. He graduated from the University of Maryland with a BS in Anthropology in 1992.

One year after his graduation, West says he discovered TOB. He left his day job with a phone company and his night job as a rock musician to pursue a career devoted to the teachings of John Paul II on human sexuality and marriage.

West enrolled at the John Paul II Institute for Marriage and Family at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. and in 1997 obtained a Master of Theological Studies, a basic pontifical degree program for students who have completed an undergraduate liberal arts curriculum. That same year he resettled in the Archdiocese of Denver under Archbishop Charles J. Chaput, O.F.M.Cap, where he served as a faculty member on the Archdiocese’s Catechetical School and later became an Instructor on human sexuality and marriage for the Diaconate Formation Program, and Instructor on TOB at St. John Vianney Theological Seminary in Denver. In 2001, West formed the GIFT Foundation to promote John Paul II’s Theology of the Body.

In 2004, West left the Denver Archdiocese to devote full time to the promotion of TOB. He co-founded the Theology of the Body Institute in his home state of Pennsylvania. Since that time, he has expanded his TOB lecture series throughout the United States and abroad. His books include the Catholic “best-seller” *Good News About*

Sex and Marriage and Theology of the Body for Beginners. (4) He is also a regular on EWTN.

A self-admitted casualty of the “sexual revolution” and post-Conciliar Church morality, West says his childhood was marked by exposure to heavy metal rock, porn and homosexual advances by a male babysitter. His teen and college years were spent in a struggle to establish his sexual identity and resist the sins of the flesh. He won the first battle and lost the second. (5) Looking back over these years, West says the rock n’ roll revolution was born “of the explosion of sexual repression” and “... the often repressive approach of previous generations of Christians (usually silence or, at most, ‘Don’t do it’) is largely responsible for the cultural jettison of the Church’s teaching on sex. ...” (6) West says he is now in the business of selling “sexual salvation without condemnation” via John Paul II’s TOB. (7)

When and/or how did you first hear about Christopher West?

Shortly after the publication of my new book *The Rite of Sodomy* (www.riteofsodomy.com) in the summer of 2006, I was contacted by a Canadian Catholic, Donna O’Connor, who asked if I would examine some of the erroneous teachings of Christopher West on TOB, specifically those related to sodomy. I agreed to look into the matter. She, in turn, kindly provided me with West’s books, his 12 CD set “Naked Without Shame,” and later, the study materials for *Theology of the Body for Teens*. The fact that TOB was being marketed as the new sex instruction program for Catholic school children was of special interest to me as my first two books, *Sex Education – The Final Plague* and *The McHugh Chronicles* were written in opposition to classroom sex instruction. (8)

Was this the first time you heard about the Theology of the Body?

Amazingly, yes. And the first time I had heard or read about Mr. West. It didn’t take me long to figure out that my Canadian friend was really on to something, although, at the time, I seriously underestimated how complicated the whole subject was.

I started my investigation by reading both editions of Christopher West’s *Good News About Sex & Marriage – Answers to Your Honest Questions About Catholic Teachings* which is copyrighted by the author and the Archdiocese of Denver. Both the 2000 and the 2004 editions bear the *Nihil obstat* of Rev. Gerard Beigel, S.T.D., Censor Librorum, and the *Imprimatur* of Archbishop Charles Chaput of the Archdiocese of Denver, indicating that the book is free from doctrinal or moral error. (9)

And was this the case?

No, it was not. There was, if fact, one particularly serious moral error in the text regarding the act of sodomy.

In Chapter Five, crudely titled “I DO”-ing It,” in response to a question on the morality of anal sex for married couples, West states “There’s nothing *inherently* wrong with anal penetration as foreplay to normal intercourse.” (10) This is a false teaching.

The Catholic Church has always defined sodomy as anal penetration, with or without ejaculation. (11) The act of sodomy, whether carried by homosexuals or by spouses, is *intrinsically* evil and a perversion. (12) A married couple who engages in anal penetration and then goes on to normal coitus has engaged in two separate acts - the first, sodomy, is a grave sin, whether or not ejaculation has occurred. Further, the physiology of anal copulation is such that it would be most difficult to prevent ejaculation.

Was this error corrected in the revised edition?

No, although the text was reworded After pointing out that anal penetration is unsanitary and unaesthetic, West asserts:

Perhaps in some abstract, objective sense, there is nothing to condemn mere penetration of the anus as absolutely and in every case immoral. But subjectively speaking... it is very difficult to justify anal penetration as a loving act of foreplay to the marital embrace. It is an act that seems to stem much more from the disorder of lust than from a genuine desire to symbolize and renew the marriage commitment. (13)

There are many other troubling aspects to West’s book, as well as his lecture series and tapes on TOB, including his sophomoric and often vulgar asides, but this particular error is among the more serious.

Who endorsed West’s book?

Good News About Sex and Marriage carries the endorsement of Archbishop Chaput who characterizes the book as “A ‘kind of catechism of Catholic teaching on sex and marriage... perfect for marriage prep courses, RCIA, adult education and marriage enrichment. ...” (14)

The back cover of West’s book contains endorsements by William May, Professor of Moral Theology at the John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and Family, Janet E. Smith of the University of Dallas, and Rev. Richard Hogan, founder of NFP Outreach. All are avid promoters of John Paul II and the Theology of the Body.

Among West’s other writings, which do you find the most objectionable?

One of the most disturbing of West’s articles, “Naked Without Shame: Behind the Fig Leaves,” based on his interpretation of John Paul II’s TOB, appeared in 2000, while West was still employed by the Archdiocese of Denver. (15) In the upper left-hand corner of the opening paragraph titled “The Naked Christ” there is a picture of a Renaissance crucifix on which a nude Christ is suspended on the cross. (16)

This gratuitous display of a naked Christ is justified by West in order to demonstrate that man has become “detached” from his own humanity, “from the sacramentality” of his body, “that we find it terribly difficult to face what Christ’s naked body actually reveals about the meaning of life.” (17) He continues:

What if I told you that the key to understanding God’s plan for human life is to go behind the fig leaves and behold the human body, naked and without shame? What if I told you that the only way to see the invisible mystery of God is through the vision of the human body in its masculinity and femininity? What if I told you that the Christian mystery itself is simply unintelligible – unless we understand the meaning of sexual difference and our call to sexual union?

You’d probably think I was obsessed with sex and naked human bodies. ...

But what if the Vicar of Christ, Pope John Paul II, were telling you these things. Would you accuse him of the same? More likely, you’d sit up, take notice, and ... begin reevaluating your own view of the human body and sexuality. (18)

It is true that, “naked without shame” was how Adam and Eve saw each other at the time of Creation - as man and woman, as husband and wife - but this was **before the Fall, before sin came into the world**. Through Baptism the guilt of original sin is wiped out and sanctifying grace infused into the soul, but the sacrament does not free us from concupiscence (in its strict and specific sense). We will never be entirely free from the assaults of the flesh as our first parents were in their original innocence - TOB notwithstanding. Hence, the need for constant prayer, fasting and the mortification, **not the exaltation**, of the flesh as promoted in TOB.(19)

Christopher West appears to have a world-wide network of institutions, groups and prominent individuals backing him.

So it seems. However, I think it is important to point out that the infrastructure for the popularization of TOB was in place long before West came upon the scene.

During his lengthy pontificate, John Paul II established all the necessary organizational structures and apparatus necessary for the continued promotion of his Theology of the Body, including numerous Pontifical Institutes.

The first Pontifical Institute for Studies on Marriage and Family was created in 1982 as an annex of the Pontifical Lateran University, in Rome. The Institute has branches (sessions) in Washington, D.C.; Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey, and León, Guanajuato, Mexico; Valencia, Spain; Cotonou, Benin; Salvador, Bahia, Brazil; Changanacherry, India; Melbourne, Australia; and Gaming, Austria.

The Institutes works closely with the Pontifical Council for the Family, established by John Paul II, in 1981. You may recall that Michael Waldstein, the author of *Man and Woman He Created Them* and a pivotal figure in the promotion of TOB is the first President of the International Theological Institute for Studies on Marriage and the

Family in Austria, founded at the request of John Paul II. Waldstein's book carries a Preface by West, and West was a featured speaker at the TOB International Symposium held at the Gaming Institute in May 2007.

The John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and Family in the United States was founded in 1988 by James Cardinal Hickey, Archbishop of Washington, D.C., and the Knights of Columbus. The first Vice President of the Institute was Carl A. Anderson, a prominent Knight and member of Opus Dei. His association with OD is relevant to this article because these powerful sects including Opus Dei and the Legionaries of Christ and the Regnum Christi Movement who form part of the "Cult of John Paul II the Great" have, not surprisingly, become key outlets for the transmission of TOB.

From an organizational perspective, the International Natural Family Planning Movement has played an important role in the promotion of TOB and top TOB personalities like Christopher West. TOB has provided the movement with an ideology to accompany the practice of NFP as a "way of life" for Catholic couples.

As noted earlier in this series, Wojtyla, as a young bishop, believed strongly in the primacy of the "deliberate regulation of procreation" by married couples. (20) In *Love and Responsibility*, he states that unless couples are aware of and practiced effective methods of pregnancy prevention based on natural biological fertility rhythms of the female, "there can be no thought of birth control and planned parenthood by natural methods." (21)

According to Dr. Joseph Santamaria, the well-known Australian surgeon and writer, Drs. John and Evelyn Billings, founders of the Ovulation Method of NFP, "were the first lay persons to articulate what is now known as the Theology of the Body." (22)

Anna Krohn of the John Paul II Institute for Marriage and Family, Melbourne, in her obituary on Dr. John Billings, who died in April 2007, recalls:

In the early 1950s, the future John Paul II (then Fr Karol Wojtyla), the receptive pastor and brilliant academic, found himself drawn to the anthropological and theological depths revealed within the concrete 'experiences' of human spousal love. Along the way he was concerned to understand the link between sexuality and fertility. Wojtyla's struggle to answer Nazism and Marxism drew him to articulate with a Christian voice, the 'inalienable' dignity of the human person and human decision-making. This passion and genius would flower during his papacy with his global advocacy of the 'Gospel of Life' and his 'explosive' catechesis 'on human sexuality, embodiment and love' called 'the Theology of the body.' (23)

Other international, national and local institutions and organizations promoting TOB include the Center for Research on the Thought of John Paul II, Kraków, Poland; International Academy of Philosophy, Liechtenstein; the Theology of the Body International Alliance, Minooka IL, Women of the Third Millennium, Tempe, AZ; Franciscan University, Steubenville, OH; Tabor Life Institute, Homer Glen, IL; Imago

Dei: Theology of the Body Study Groups, Washington, D.C; Love and Responsibility Foundation, Cold Spring, NY; TOBET - Theology of the Body Evangelization Team, Carrollton, TX; NFP Outreach, Oklahoma City, OK; Our Father's Will Communications – TOB Media Outlet; and Sisters of Life, New York City, NY.

Finally, there are the various TOB centers either created by West including the GIFT Foundation, Carpentersville, Illinois which markets West's TOB materials and the Theology of the Body Institute (TOBI), Exton, Pennsylvania. The latter was incorporated as a non-profit in April 2004 and it remains the epicenter of TOB activities in the United States. David Savage, a West protégé and marketing specialist is Chairman of the Board of TOBI. Another early Board member is Matthew Pinto, who founded Ascension Press in 1998. TOBI and Ascension work together very closely.

TOBI Episcopal advisors include Chair, Justin Cardinal Rigali of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Eminence George Cardinal Pell, Archbishop of Sydney, Most Reverend Samuel J. Aquila, Bishop of Fargo, Most Reverend Robert Baker, Bishop of Birmingham, Most Reverend John M. Dougherty, D.D., V.G. Auxiliary Bishop of Scranton, Most Reverend Victor Galeone, Bishop of Saint Augustine, Most Reverend Alfred C. Hughes, Archbishop of New Orleans, Most Reverend William E. Lori, Bishop of Bridgeport, Most Reverend John Myers, Archbishop of Newark, Most Reverend Joseph F. Naumann, Archbishop of Kansas City, Most Reverend Kevin C. Rhoades, Bishop of Harrisburg, and Most Reverend Charles J. Chaput, Archbishop of Denver.

West's long-term collaboration with Archbishop Chaput has given him an entrée into many Catholic dioceses across the United States as well as diocesan seminaries and parishes.

For example, on May 11, 2007, Archbishop Chaput's fellow Capuchin, Sean Cardinal O'Malley invited West to lecture on TOB at the Boston Archdiocese's scandal-ridden St. John's Seminary in Brighton. The following day, West addressed a crowd of 300 Catholic laity and religious at the diocesan Spiritual Life Center. West said that Pope John Paul II's Theology of the Body can bring healing to the troubled Archdiocese and Catholics of Boston, and through them, to the world – an amazing statement indeed given the late pope's abysmal track record of failing to discipline criminal sexual deviants in the priesthood and religious life who prey on the young and vulnerable, as well as his appointment of numerous homosexual predators to the American hierarchy and Cardinalate. (24)

West has also addressed Catholic laity, clergy and religious in the Dioceses of Fargo, Bridgeport, Philadelphia, Harrisburg, St. Louis, Toledo, Madison, and Kalamazoo. Some dioceses now mandate TOB courses for engaged couples. Others, like the Diocese of Toledo is considering implementing TOB courses in all its high schools. In March and April of 2008, TOBI launched its first Diocesan Priests Training Program in Philadelphia for 450 priests.

Two of West's books *Good News About Sex & Marriage* and *Theology of the Body Explained* are recommended by the USCCB in its statement "Married Love and the Gift of Life," which was approved by the American bishops at their November 2006 General Meeting in Washington, D.C. and last July, Christopher West was invited to lecture to youth on TOB at World Youth Day in Sydney. (25)

Although TOBI is a "not-for-profit organization," its courses carry a hefty price tag. For example, West offers a "TOB 'Head and Heart' Immersion Course," a five day classroom program (including room and board) at the Christian Black Rock Retreat Center in Lancaster County, PA, for \$895. An additional \$300 is charged if one is taking the course for graduate or undergraduate credit. Each session is limited to 40 persons, and they are generally sold out.

The cost for TOBI/Ascension Press's Full-Day Training Program for two diocesan instructors in "**Theology of the Body for Teens: Discovering God's Plan for Love and Life**" is \$1,095, excluding transportation and lodging and Leaders' materials. Additional sessions are available for \$250. (26)

TOB for Teens? I thought John Paul II's Theology of the Body was for engaged and married couples and young adults of college age?

You are correct. The target audience for TOB was originally designed by Pope John Paul II for an adult population. Today, West and Co. are marketing TOB for high school teens, and Ascension Press recently announced that it is in the early stages of developing a **TOB program for pre-teens and younger children**. TOB has replaced abstinence-based programs as the latest form of sexual catechetics in parochial schools, CCD programs, parishes, and youth ministries, and for home schoolers. (27)

Does TOB for Teens carry an Imprimatur?

The original 2006 edition of Student Workbook does not. However, according to Ascension Press, an *Imprimatur* has been granted by Justin Cardinal Rigali, Archbishop of Philadelphia. In any case, we are assured that "the program has been carefully reviewed by theologians and experts" in TOB including Christopher West. (28)

So Christopher West is connected to the TOB for Teens Program?

Yes. In their acknowledgments, the authors of *TOB for Teens*, more casualties of Vatican II, credit West for helping them understand TOB and for the expertise he lent to the project. West's writings are scattered throughout the Student Workbook, and his books are listed as resources. It is significant that Ascension Press holds the copyright for *TOB for Teens*. This suggests that the authors were working for the Ascension Press, rather than being independent writers and thinkers.

Have you reviewed the TOB for Teens program?

I have studied the 210-page Student Workbook and the Parent's Guide as well all the promotional and marketing materials provided by Ascension Press on their web site including "46 FAQ's" and "20 Reasons Why It Is So Effective with Teens." (29)

What is your evaluation of the program?

I'm sorry, but I think you are making a common mistake in asking me to evaluate a sex instruction program initially by the content of the program.

What do you mean?

What I mean is that the specific curriculum of any systematic and public (open) sex instruction program, including *TOB for Teens*, is **secondary** to the destructive process of sexualization and desensitization **inherent** in all such programs **regardless** of program content.

The prominent Manhattan psychiatrist, Dr. Walter Bruschi, a convert to Catholicism, who was a vociferous opponent of so-called "sex education" describes the innate dangers posed to children and youth by open classroom sex instruction this way:

With today's biological knowledge and knowledge of the human nervous system which provides control over biological impulses, we can state with certainty that the more you stimulate the sexual function, the more it is going to want to be expressed. We also have learned that this sexual stimulation is accumulated within the central nervous system and when a certain level is reached it has to be discharged.

Therefore, the less exposure there is to information – any books, talking about sex, exposure to sex or any other acts which stimulate the sexual drive, the better. **In short – the less sex instruction, the less sexual stimulation – the better (emphasis added).** (30)

The fact that *TOB for Teens* is wrapped in "God language" and quotes Scripture does not protect students nor give them immunity from the dangers posed by extended exposure to open-ended classroom sex programs and discussions. Rather than fortifying young people against impure thoughts, inclinations and acts, *TOB for Teens* is a stimulation and inducement of them. Parents, of all people, should appreciate the conflict that is set up in a child's mind when he reads texts or views visual materials which stimulate him sexually at the very time that he is being told that these materials are intended to help him be chaste.

TOB for Teens is a Pandora's Box of sexual references including references to marital sex, casual sex, sexual union, sexual intercourse, sexual desire, sexual pleasure, "getting sex," "having sex," sexual organs, homo sex, sexually transmitted diseases, sexual repression, multiple sex partners, and sexual addictions. Add references to masturbation, nakedness, out-of-wedlock pregnancy, abortion, rape, pornography, prostitution, birth control pills, condoms, "family planning," and you are dealing with a

powder keg of sexually stimulating topics and information which can violate and deform youthful consciences.

TOB for Teens employs intrusive “journaling” techniques, a favorite tool of sexual predators, and Q&A “Truth Quizzes” related to personal and intimate experiences such as a student’s masturbatory habits. (31) The text is interspersed with bizarre sexual scientific trivia (aka, Medical Pre-Optic Nucleus (MPN) related to sexual pleasure and mental imprinting; and oxytocin, a neuro-peptide related to maternal and sexual bonding.) (32)

Also, listed among the student resources is Wojtyla’s *Love and Responsibility* with its extensive discussion of sexual coitus. (33)

Didn’t Henri-Marie Cardinal de Lubac, S.J., ask Cardinal Wojtyla to remove these explicit sexual references when the French edition of *Love and Responsibility* went to press?

Yes, in 1965, Cardinal de Lubac requested that the book’s addendum titled “Sexology and Morality” not be included in the French edition. De Lubac argued that priests and bishops should not be so concrete or explicit in treating certain questions of marital relations. Cardinal Wojtyla insisted that the addendum be retained, and it was. When French writer recounted the incident with Wojtyla in a later interview, the future pope retorted, “... if certain prudes are there to object, too bad for them!” (34)

What does *TOB for Teens* say is the primary purpose of marriage and sex?

In keeping with John Paul II’s new doctrine on marriage, *TOB for Teens* stresses the “personalistic norm” in marriage. Marriage is discussed in terms of “communion” and “gift of self,” not in terms of having children and raising a family. For example, like John Paul II, the authors retell the Biblical story of Tobias and Sarah, but leave out the key reference to posterity or offspring. (35)

Are there some positive aspects to *TOB for Teens*?

Certainly. For example, it offers good advice on the dangers of early dating, on the need for modest dress and deportment, and the need for youth to have constant recourse to prayer and the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist.

But this information could have been communicated, as it has been in the past, in the traditional Catholic way through sound religious catechetical instruction without exposing school children to the dangers of the new adult-oriented sexual catechetics of John Paul II. Does not the Church teaching that “the body is the temple of the Holy Spirit” say it all?

In my opinion, as written, *TOB for Teens* is **not** Catholic and it is **not** suitable for children and teens.

One final question regarding Christopher West. Is he distorting the message of John Paul II's Theology of the Body?

No. I don't believe so. As I indicated earlier, the John Paul II's Theology of the Body, is in fact, the Theology of Sexuality, and West is simply following it to its logical conclusion.

Which is?

I'm afraid that you will have to wait until the final installment of this series for the answer to that question.

Endnotes Part VI

1. Christopher West's "Naked Without Shame: A Crash Course in Theology of the Body" is available at <http://www.nd.edu/~afreddos/papers/cwest-tob.htm>.
2. Nancy Hennessy Cooney with Anne Bingham, *Sex Sexuality & You*, Wm. C. Brown, Dubuque, Iowa, 1980. The book bears the Imprimatur of the Archbishop James J. Byrne, and Nihil Obstat of Rev. Robert L. Spaight, both deceased. Cooney served as a member of the select United States Catholic Conference Committee which drafted the infamous 1981 USCC Sex Education Guidelines. See *Sex Education – The Final Plague* by Randy Engel available from Tan Books & Publishers, Rockford, IL.
3. Ibid., p. 81.
4. Christopher West's Curriculum Vitae is available at http://www.christopherwest.com/christopherwest_cv.pdf.
5. Exposed at a very young age to heavy metal rock and porn and later to the sexual advances of a male babysitter, West states that as a teen he suffered from a sexual identity crisis. See *Good News About Sex & Marriage*, Servant Publications, Ann Arbor, MI, 2000, pp. 100, 146..
6. Christopher West, "The Redemption of Rock Music" at <http://www.theologyofthebody.com/page.asp?ContentID=66>, and Christopher West "The new Language: A Crash Course in the Theology of the Body at <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/sexuality/se0108.html>.
7. See "God brings meaning to sex and life," Jackie Fritzke, *The Aquinas*, St. Thomas University, St. Paul, February 20, 2004, p. 4.
8. See Randy Engel, *Sex Education -The Final Plague*, Tan Books, Rockford, IL, 1989. Also Randy Engel, *The McHugh Chronicles*, NEP, Box 356, Export, PA 15632, 1997.
9. The original edition of *Good News About Sex* was published in 2000 by Servant Publications of Ann Arbor. The revised edition was published in 2004 by St. Anthony Messenger Press , Cincinnati, Ohio.
10. West, *Good News* (2000), pp. 93-94.
11. At different periods of Church history, the Church's definition of sodomy included male oral copulation and bestiality.
12. For a lengthy history of the Church's teachings on sodomy see Randy Engel, *The Rite of Sodomy*, NEP, Box 356, Export, PA, 2006. Also www.riteofsodomy.com.
13. West, *Good News* (2004), pp. 93-94.

14. Ibid., back cover.
15. See http://www.alliancenet.org/CC/CDA/Content_Blocks/CC_Printer_Friendly_Version_Util/1,,PTID5339|CHID27|CIID120840|CPATH,00.html.
16. Ibid. The pictured wooden crucifix, a source of scandal even in its own day, thought to be lost, was discovered in 1962 and is generally attributed to the Italian sculptor Michelangelo who completed the work in 1493 at the age of 18. Today, the crucifix hangs in the sacristy of the Church of Santo Spirito in Florence. The portrayal of a naked Christ was not unusual during the Renaissance period with its penchant for nudity, naturalism, and humanism. In some cases, popes, and other Church authorities ordered loincloths to be fashioned to cover the naked body of Christ, out of respect and reverence for the Lord and Savior of the world.
17. Ibid., Waldstein's translation of John Paul II's TOB contains 144 references to "original nakedness."
18. Ibid.
19. Saint Paul, chosen vessel that he was, acknowledged the constant battle between the flesh and the spirit in his Epistle to the Romans: "For I am delighted with the law of God, according to the inward man: But I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is in my members." (Romans 7:22-23).
20. See Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility*, p. 284.
21. Ibid.
22. *Bulletin on the Ovulation Method*, Vol. 34, No. 2, July 2007, p. 9.
23. Ibid., p. 21.
24. See Engel, *The Rite of Sodomy*, for full documentation of these charges against John Paul II.
25. See <http://www.usccb.org/laity/marriage/MarriedLove.pdf>, pp. 10, 11.
26. Brian Butler, Jason Evert, and Crystalina Evert, *Theology of the Body for Teens*, Ascension Press, West Chester, PA, 2006.
27. A number of "chastity educators" such as Mary Beth Bonacci, who earned her Masters from the John Paul II Institute for Marriage and Family at Lateran University, Rome, are now selling TOB.
28. See www.TOBFforTeens.com.
29. Ibid.
30. Undated paper on sex education sent to author by Dr. Walter Bruschi.
31. *TOB for Teens - Workbook* p. 84.
32. Ibid., pp. 96, 128.
33. Ibid., pp. 180, 206.
34. Yves Semen, *La Séxualité selon Jean-Paul II*, Presses de la Renaissance, Paris, 2004, pp. 49-50, 53 as cited in "A Brief Critique of John Paul's Theology of the Body," Ann Marie Temple, Paris, 2007, pp. 4, 35. Unpublished manuscript.
35. Ibid., p. 103.

Copyright Randy Engel 2008

“John Paul II and the ‘Theology of the Body’ – A Study in Modernism ”

By Randy Engel

Part VII Conclusion – “Where is the ‘Theology of the Body’ Leading Us?”

Warsaw (AFP) - He has been dubbed the high priest of Catholic Kama Sutra, but Polish Friar Ksawery Knotz says that by giving married couples tips on how to practice divine sex he is simply doing God's work. ... Knotz has held retreats with more than 3,000 devoutly Roman Catholic couples in Poland since 2000... . The monk explains he was originally inspired by the open atmosphere of his family home and the early teachings of late Polish-born Pope John Paul II who broached the subject of sexuality in his book *Love and Responsibility*, first published in 1960. “The Holy Father’s ‘theology of the body’ and other philosophical and theological works delve deeply into the divinity of sexual relations in marriage – I’m just making these complex ideas more accessible to average Catholics,” Knotz says.

“Polish monk preaches divine sex -- with Church’s blessing”
by Mary Sibierski (1)

When we receive Holy Communion, we also remember to be faithful to God, just as God is faithful to us. And finally, we allow God to work within our lives through the spiritual graces we receive when we receive the physical body of Christ. If we agree with all this, we declare it loudly to the priest or communion minister when we say, “Amen!” Understanding this totally changes the way we receive Holy Communion. Each time we receive it, it is almost like, “I’m having sex with Jesus” because I give myself totally and freely to him, and only him, just as he gives himself totally and freely to me, his church, so that our love can produce many fruits in the world. (2)

I understand that this title of me of “having sex with Jesus” is foreign to Catholic teaching, and may be misleading if one does not read the entire post before

commenting. If you had, you will find that the article draws the link between the Sacrament of Holy Matrimony and the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, a link that Pope John Paul II himself draws in his ‘theology of the body.’ (3)

David Tay
Catholic Writer blog

In 1946, the eminent Dominican scholar and theologian Father Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., raised the question of where the “New Theology” (*La nouvelle théologie*) of Maurice Blondel, Father Henri de Lubac, Father Teilhard “beam me up” de Chardin and their contemporaries was taking us. Father Garrigou-Lagrange’s answer was – “to Modernism.”(4)

I would like to ask you the same question – where is John Paul II’s Theology of the Body leading us?

I would have to give the same answer as Father Garrigou-Lagrange, “to Modernism.” If you follow TOB’s signposts they will lead you to the same lethal form of “skepticism, fantasy and heresy” which Father Garrigou-Lagrange described with uncanny accuracy more than a half-century ago. (5)

This is hardly surprising as John Paul II himself was the quintessential Modernist and a self-professed Man of the Second Vatican Council. It is no coincidence that the late pope “rehabilitated” all three men, Blondel, de Lubac and de Chardin, whose works were censored by Father Garrigou-Lagrange in his 1946 essay, along with other ‘progressives’ such as Father Hans Urs von Balthasar and Yves-Marie-Joseph Congar, O.P. (6)

In reading and re-reading John Paul II’s Theology of the Body, I recalled the warning of Father Garrigou-Lagrange that Modernism, dressed up as the “New Theology” would leave no stone of Catholic dogma unturned, but would expose every dogma, “whether it be regarding original sin, *cosmic evil*, the Incarnation, Redemption, the Eucharist, the final universal reintegration, *the cosmic Christ*, the convergence of all religions toward a universal cosmic center,” to new and novel interpretations. (7) A similar warning by Saint Pius X against the partisans of Modernism is found in *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*:

Moreover, they lay the ax not to the branches and shoots, but to the very root, that is, to the faith and its deepest fibers. And once having struck at this root of immortality, they proceed to diffuse poison through the whole tree, so that there is no part of Catholic truth which they leave untouched, none that they do not strive to corrupt. (8)

I take it then that you consider John Paul II’s Theology of the Body to be a species of the “New Theology” condemned by Father Garrigou-Lagrange?

I do. And in a back-handed way, my opinion is echoed by many proponents of TOB, although they obviously believe that John Paul II's "New Theology" on sex and marriage is a good thing and therefore should be praised and promoted, not condemned.

For example, Angelo Cardinal Scola, Patriarch of Venice and author of *The Nuptial Mystery* based on John Paul II's Theology of the Body, publicly assures us that "virtually every thesis in theology – God, Christ, the Trinity, grace, the Church, the sacraments – could be seen in a new light if theologians explored in depth the rich personalism implied in John Paul II's Theology of the Body. (9)

Christopher West, a leading proponent of TOB warns, "Brace yourself! If we take in what the Holy Father is saying in his Theology of the Body, we will never view ourselves, view others, view the Church, the Sacraments, grace, God, heaven, marriage, the celibate vocation... we will never view the world the same way again." (10)

According to Father Richard M. Hogan, a prolific writer on TOB, "The new 'twist' in John Paul II's Theology of the Body is precisely the application of a new theological synthesis to the problem of sexuality, marriage and family life. Through the use of a philosophical movement called phenomenology, John Paul has been able to present the content of Christ's Revelation in a subjective, inductive, and experimental way **without doing damage to its contents** (emphasis added)." (11)

Is that actually possible, I mean, to abandon Scholasticism, as all Modernists are wont to do, "without doing damage" to Revelation, Tradition and Dogma?

No. Certainly Father Garrigou-Lagrange did not think so, nor did Popes Innocent VI, Clement VIII, Paul V, Leo XIII, and Saint Pius X.

I think this is one reason why TOB is so lacking in a true ontology, that is, a lack of a firm grasp of the fixed and unchanging nature of being and existence, that one finds, for example, in the writings of Saint Thomas.

Looking back on my study of the Theology of the Body, I am convinced that these "meditations" revised, rewritten and delivered by John Paul II very early in his pontificate were a kind of trial balloon for the pope's New Theology not only in the realm of human sexuality and marriage, but in other areas of Catholic teachings as well.

Throughout the series you have emphasized the profoundly anthropomorphic character of TOB. This puzzles me. Isn't TOB based on the Old Testament and the New Testament, both of which are theocentric, God centered?

It is true that John Paul II quotes Scripture throughout the Theology of the Body, but that does not necessarily mean that he **based** his work on Scripture. Rather, I would say, the pope **uses** Scripture for his own purpose.

I am not the first Catholic writer to make these charges.

For example, in 1998, the German theologian Father Johannes Dörmann made charges similar to mine in his critique of John Paul II's Encyclical *Dives in Misericordia* (On Divine Mercy)(1980). (12)

Dörmann argues that the pope's teachings on The Parable of The Prodigal Son found in *Dives in Misericordia* completely distort the traditional interpretation of the well-known parable which expresses in a unique way "what contrition, penance, return and conversion mean for Jesus and the New Testament." (13) According to Dörmann:

... by importing analogies that are foreign to the text of the biblical parable the pope has brought in the principles of knowledge of his *nouvelle théologie* loaded with his own favourite philosophical ideas. Thus he himself has laid the foundation for his own exegesis. On this foundation Jesus' parable becomes an allegory of the pope's theology. At the same time, the biblical parable, which is a paradigm for the New Testament, **is simply the supplier of material for the presentation of his own theology.** The "fundamental content of Christ's messianic message" undergoes in this way **a radical and profound change** (emphasis added). (14)

Can you provide an example of how TOB misrepresents or undermines the Gospel?

One such example, which we briefly touched earlier would be TOB's obsessive anthropomorphic character which constantly focuses on man, man's "greatness," man's "inviolable" dignity, and man's relentless search for self-knowledge and self-fulfillment. This exaltation of man is accompanied by an excessive, almost irrational optimism regarding man's innate ability to eschew sin, especially sexual sins, and thus escape hell and attain eternal salvation.

Speaking of heaven and hell, this is as good a time as any to point out that the very concept of eternal damnation and divine retribution for grave, unrepented sins committed by man is so alien to TOB that *Theology of the Body for Teens* has rewritten the classic Eschatological doctrine of the "Four Last things" - Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell - to read "death, judgment, and the final destiny of our lives." (15)

How different is the Gospel of Jesus Christ which approaches man as a sinful creature in need of redemption? Whereas TOB is concerned primarily with the carnal, the Gospel is concerned primarily with man's spiritual life. As with the Parable of the Prodigal Son, it stresses the need for man to turn away from sin, to convert, to repent, to believe, to be baptized, to be redeemed. God did not send His Only Begotten Son into the world to die an ignominious death on the Cross in order that man may 'realize' himself, but that man may sanctify himself and thus win his eternal reward.

Does TOB's interpretation of Genesis found in the Old Testament suffer from the same fate as the Gospel?

Yes, perhaps even more so. In TOB, *Genesis* is entirely recast to fit John Paul II's *nouvelle théologie*.

Having discarded the traditional Scholastic method of objectivization specific to metaphysics, John Paul II invites us to view *Genesis* in a new way, that is, through an existential/phenomenological/personalist prism, as we accompany our first parents on their triptych voyage of self-consciousness, self-discovery and self-actualization. (16)

Thus we find Adam, aka, “original man,” and Eve in Paradise busily seeking out their own “identity,” each revealing themselves to themselves and affirming themselves as persons. (TOB 5:5; 5:6; 6:1; 7:1; 17:5). Their “original happiness” we are told is based on “the revelation and discovery of the spousal meaning” of the body [masculinity and femininity] which “constitutes the fundamental component of human existence in the world.” (15:5) Adam and Eve each become more of a person through the “personal intimacy” of “reciprocal communication.” (12:1-12:5) Adam and Eve are naked, but they feel no shame, due to their “‘state of consciousness’ or ‘even better, their reciprocal experience of the body’” that is, their experience of their respective sexualness as man and woman. (11:3) Thus woman is not an “object” for the man, nor he for her and they have “a reciprocal awareness of the spousal meaning of their bodies, in which the freedom of the gift is expressed and the whole inner richness of the person as subject is shown.” (19:1).

In TOB we learn that “The account of the creation of man in *Genesis* 1 affirms from the beginning and directly that man was created in the image of God inasmuch as he is male and female. ... [that] man became the image of God not only through his own humanity, but also through the communion of persons, which man and woman form from the very beginning.” (9:3) Later, we are reminded that “... Man appears in creation as the one who has received the world as a gift, and vice versa, one can also say that the world has received man as a gift.” (13:4) The state of “original innocence” of our first parents ... “makes it possible for man to live the meaning of the primary gift of the world and in particular the meaning of the reciprocal gift of one person to another... nevertheless, this innocence seems to refer first of all to the interior state of the human ‘heart,’ of the human will.” (16:4)

Unhappily, all this ‘communal bliss’ is shattered when Adam and Eve transgress God’s command: “Of every tree of paradise thou shalt eat: But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat. For in what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death (*Gen:2:16-17*).

TOB provides a novel interpretation of the essential **nature** of Original Sin which it characterizes in terms of “the casting of doubt on the Gift,” and a breach of trust leading to “a fundamental loss of the primeval community-communion of persons.” (26:4; 30:4)

This novelty also extends to TOB’s interpretation of the effects of Original Sin on man. For example, in his exegesis on “Original Nakedness,” the pope refers to the “sexual” character of the shame experienced by Adam and Eve after the Fall. He describes shame as “a specific *fracture of the personal integrity of his own body*” especially in its sexual aspect. (28:5)

Concerning the “disfigurement” of original man by Original Sin (*G.S.* 22), the pope states that “Although there are deep differences between the state of original innocence and the state of man’s hereditary sinfulness, that “image of God” constitutes a basis of continuity and unity.” (21:7)

How do TOB’s teachings on Creation, Original Sin and the Fall compare with traditional Church teachings?

I find the contrast very striking, but I’ll let the reader be the judge.

On the subject of the Creation, the Church teaches us that the primary purpose of God’s creation of the visible world out of nothing is to show forth God’s perfections and thereby to give to God the glory which is due to Him. The secondary purpose of creation is the bestowal of benefits on creatures, but especially the calling of rationale creatures to the beatific vision. (17) These ends and the hierarchy of ends are totally lost in TOB which speaks of man being made “for himself” or “for marriage” or for “reciprocal communion.”

In *Gen.* 1: 26, God said “Let us make man to our image and likeness,” and it was done. (18) The *imago*, man’s *natural* resemblance to God, was made manifest in man’s soul which is a spiritual substance, endowed with intelligence, reason, and free will, with only traces of God’s image in his lower nature. The *similitudo*, man’s *supernatural* resemblance to God, manifested itself in God’s free gift of sanctifying grace by which He assimilates the soul in higher union with Him. It was to this divine grace which God added to Adam and Eve’s natural integrity and perfection that our first parents owed their “original happiness,” not to “the spousal meaning of the body” or any other novel sexual revelation conjured up by TOB.

We know, of course, that as a consequence of Original Sin (held to be the sin of pride without any sexual connotation whatsoever), “original happiness” came to an end.

Adam’s *image* to God was wounded. His human nature (and, by generation, that of all mankind) was ontologically changed forever. Man would no longer be immune from concupiscence, ignorance, pain and death. His mind was darkened, his will weakened, and his passions separated from right reason.

But it was in his spiritual *likeness* to God, that man experienced his greatest loss and suffering. God withdrew the supernatural gift of sanctifying grace which was not part of man’s innate nature but rather a purely gratuitous gift bestowed upon him by his Creator. The bonds of friendship with God were severed and Adam and Eve were cast out of Paradise, to await the coming of a Redeemer, Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who would save man from his sins and reopen the gates of heaven.

This is what *Genesis* is all about.

Does TOB provide a clear and concise definition of Original Sin?

Not within the actual text of the pope's talks. However, on page 199 (18:3) of the Waldstein translation of TOB (and the *L'Osservatore Romano* text as well), there is a footnote that includes a reference to Original Sin taken from the Council of Trent, and a short but exacting commentary by the Most Rev. Adolphe Tanqueray S.S., D.D.

This footnote, brief as it is, is very important because it indicates that Pope John Paul II **knew** the traditional teaching of the Church on Original Sin. Whether or not he himself **believed** in the traditional doctrine of Original Sin is an altogether different question.

In his trilogy *Pope Paul II's Theological Journey to the Prayer Meeting of Religions in Assisi*, Dörmann answers this question in the negative, that is, "John Paul II did **not** hold to the truth of the Church's doctrine on Original Sin. (20)

Do you agree with Dörmann?

I do. I also think this may be one reason that TOB appears to be so hopelessly muddled on the question of Original Sin., except to the initiated.

Can you identify some other controversial areas in TOB which contradict traditional Church teachings?

Certainly. Let's examine two important themes in TOB - "Original Unity" and "Original Nakedness." I'll deal with each one separately.

In TOB, John Paul II invites married couples to return "to the beginning" in order to recapture that "communion of persons" that "reciprocal enrichment" that "disinterested gift of self" that characterized the spousal relationship enjoyed by Adam and Eve in their original state of innocence. There is, however, one small problem with the pope's invitation and that is that it is not based on reality. The original unity of which the pope speaks is purely hypothetical.

It is hypothetical because, in the opinion of Saint Augustine, backed by Saint Thomas, "our first parents did not come together in paradise because on account of sin they were ejected from paradise shortly after the creation of the woman; or because, having received the general Divine command relative to generation, they awaited the special command relative to time."(20) By the time Adam and Eve consummated their marriage (*Genesis 4*), they were no longer in the state of innocence, and thus, the pope's invitation does not have a Scriptural basis in fact.

In the pope's exegesis on "Original Nakedness" we face a different problem, one of omission rather than commission. What is lacking in this series of embarrassingly prolonged 'meditations' on the relational and sexual dimensions of Adam and Eve's naked state before and after the Fall, is any real appreciation of the fact that the shame exhibited by the unhappy couple had little to do with their physical bodies, and everything to do with the state of their soul which had been stripped of sanctifying grace and now stood naked before God. It is true they suffered an immediate punishment in the

shameful rebellions of their flesh - their “eyes were opened” and they “perceived themselves naked (*Gen. 3:7*)” – but this reality is secondary to the fact that they hid themselves from God because they were **guilty of sin**, they were **unrepentant**, and they were still in the **state of rebellion against God**.

What we are witnessing in the Theology of the Body is the **sexualization** of Scripture. At the same time, TOB is promoting the **spiritualization** of sex.

Wow! I think I understand what you mean by sexualizing Scripture, but what do you mean by spiritualizing sex? Doesn't conjugal intimacy include a spiritual element?

Of course, married love has a spiritual element. After all, man by God's design is an embodied spirit, a body with a soul. But that is not what I mean by the spiritualization of sex.

What I am referring to is the belief, the mind set, which holds sex to be first and foremost a means of self-transcendence and personal fulfillment, of cosmic awareness, and a gateway to heaven – in the tradition of the occult and esoteric religions of the East. (21)

We see a hint of this in the title of Christopher West's latest book *Heaven's Song – Sexual Love as it was Meant to Be*, supposedly based upon John Paul II's “hidden” meditations on the “erotic poetry” found in the *Song of Songs*. (22) According to Stanislaw Cardinal Dziwisz, the pope's personal secretary of 40 years, these undelivered TOB talks were deemed “too delicate” for a General Audience. (23)

TOB theorists George Weigel, Christopher West and Angelo Cardinal Scola, all agree that the young Wojtyla embarked on his new theological journey in order ‘to excise any taint of Manichaeism [Gnosticism] still lurking in the Church.’

However, I believe that to the extent that the Theology of the Body has rejected the traditional doctrine of the Church on marriage which holds that the primary end of marriage is procreation and the education of children, and to the extent that it has emphasized the relational and the transcendent aspects of conjugal sex at the expense of procreation, it can be rightly described as a **new form** of Manichaeism.

The Catholic Church has never taught that sexual love is the most perfect of personal unions, or that conjugal sex is the greatest example of love. On this, we have the pronouncement of Christ Himself: “Greater love than this no man hath, than a man lay down his life for his friends” (*John 15:13*).

Over the last seven months, you've scrutinized many aspects of the Theology of the Body. Can you briefly summarize your objections to TOB?

- TOB IS NOT CATHOLIC because its ‘theology’ it is man-centered, not God-centered.
- TOB IS NOT CATHOLIC because it has abandoned the perennial teachings of Scholasticism in favor of novel contemporary philosophies including Existentialism, Phenomenology (the philosophy of consciousness), and Personalism.
- TOB IS NOT CATHOLIC because it distorts the Gospel message of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.
- TOB IS NOT CATHOLIC because “it denies a fundamental premise of the Faith – the fragility of human nature and its tendency towards sin, which is confirmed by the entire history of mankind and everyone’s individual experience.” (24)
- TOB IS NOT CATHOLIC because it contradicts the traditional teaching of the Church concerning the ends and hierarchy of ends of marriage.
- TOB IS NOT CATHOLIC because it promotes the sensuous over the spiritual.
- FINALLY, TOB IS NOT CATHOLIC because it leads us away from Christ, down the road of Modernism.

Do you have any parting thoughts on the Theology of the Body?

Yes, I would like to conclude with a selection of Scriptural references sent to me by a dear priest friend and confidant from the Archdiocese of Baltimore who has been carefully following this series in *CFN*. I think these passages provide a Catholic antidote to the Theology of the Body as presented by Pope John Paul II, and a perfect ending to the series.

But I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection: lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway (1 *Cor.* 9:27)

But whilst we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord, that we be not condemned with this world (1 *Cor.* 11:32).

For whom the Lord loveth, he chastiseth, and he scourgeth every son, who he receiveth (*Heb.* 12:6)

For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood; but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places (*Eph.* 6:1).

But I see another law in my members, fighting the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is in my members. Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of death? (*Rom. 7:23-24*).

Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh. For if you live according to the flesh, you shall die; but if by the Spirit you mortify the deed of the flesh, you shall live (*Rom. 8:12-13*).

Our Lady of Fatima, pray for us.

I wish to express my appreciation to Nancy Evers, Donna O'Connor, and Andrew J. McCauly, author of the upcoming book *Crossing the Threshold of Confusion*, which has a major section on TOB, for their insights and encouragement and support for this work. Also, my thanks go out to John Vennari, the editor of *Catholic Family News*, for having the courage to publish this controversial series. God bless them all.

Copyright Randy Engel 2008

Endnotes Part VII

1. "Polish Monk Preaches Divine Sex – With Church's Blessing," Mary Sibierski, Warsaw (Agence France Presse), August 2, 2008 at http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20080803/lf_afp/lifestylepolandsexreligioncatholic.
2. "Having Sex With Jesus," Catholic Writer blog, posted October 8, 2006 at <http://catholicwriter.wordpress.com/2006/10/08/sunday-oct-8-having-sex-with-jesus/>. The Catholic Writer blog is maintained by David Tay, a Catholic writer from Singapore, in his twenties, who 'discovered' Christopher West and John Paul II's TOB in late 2005 during a period of spiritual crisis. In August 2008, Tay announced that promoting TOB was no longer his vocation.
3. "I had sex with Jesus!" Catholic Writer blog, October 5, 2007 at <http://catholicwriter.wordpress.com/2007/10/05/i-had-sex-with-jesus/>.
4. See "La nouvelle théologie où va-t-elle?" (Whither the New Theology?), Fr. Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., *Angelicum*, Rome, 1946, translated from the French by Suzanne M. Rini, at <http://www.cfnews.org/gg-newtheo.htm>.
5. Ibid.
6. On February 2, 1983, John Paul II elevated Jesuit Henri de Luback to the rank of Cardinal. On November 18, 2000, the pope addressed the participants of an International Colloquium on Maurice Blondel describing the French philosopher as "an eminent representative of Christian philosophy, understood as rational speculation, in vital union with faith (cf. n. 76), in a twofold fidelity to the demands of intellectual research and to the Magisterium," and "a great master." See vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2000/oct-dec/. Regarding de Chardin, on May 12, 1981, an official directive of the Holy See was delivered by the Secretary of State to Archbishop Paul Poupard, Rector of the *Institut Catholique* of Paris,

- where centenary celebrations for de Chardin were being held. The directive, while not revoking the 1962 *monitum*, flattered the French paleontologist by encouraging a universal study, of his “exceptional” but problematic work. According to Fr. Johannes Dörmann, author of the series *Pope John Paul’s Theological Journey to the Prayer Meeting of Religions in Assisi* (Part II, Vol. 3, p. 29), de Chardin’s theory of evolution heavily influenced the theology of Wojtyła, as well as *Gaudium et Spes*. Father Hans Urs von Balthasar died two days before his elevation to Cardinal on June 28, 1988. John Paul II gave the red hat to Yves-Marie-Joseph Congar, O.P. on November 26, 1994.
7. Garrigou-Lagrange.
 8. Full text of *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (September 8, 1907) available at <http://www.dailycatholic.org/issue/2002May/pascend6.htm>.
 9. George Weigel quotes Cardinal Scola in *Witness to Hope*, Cliff Street Books, New York, 1999, p. 343. See also, “A Brief Critique of John Paul’s Theology of the Body,” Ann Marie Temple, Paris, 2007, p. 2. Unpublished manuscript.
 10. See <http://theologyofthebody.net/>.
 11. Father Richard M. Hogan, “An Introduction to John Paul II’s Theology of the Body” at http://www.nfpoutreach.org/Hogan_Theology_%20Body1.htm.
 12. *Dives in Misericordia* together with *Redemptor Hominis* (On the Redeemer of Man) (1979), and *Dominum et Vivificantem* (On the Holy Spirit in the Life of the Church and the World) (1986) form the “Trinitarian Trilogy” upon which Dörmann bases his own critical three-book study. *Pope Paul II’s Theological Journey to the Prayer Meeting of Religions in Assisi*, Part II, Vols. 1 - 3 and the introductory volume Part I are available from Angelus Press at <http://www.angeluspress.org/>.
 13. Dörmann, Part II, Vol. 2, p. 87.
 14. *Ibid.*, 90.
 15. Brian Butler, Jason Evert, and Crystalina Evert, *Theology of the Body for Teens*, Ascension Press, West Chester, PA, 2006, p. 144.
 16. TOB, 18:1.
 17. See Dörmann, Part II, Vol. I., p.110, footnote 7. Our childhood Catechism says it best: man was put on the earth to know, love and serve God in this life in order to be happy forever with Him in the next.
 18. Note the use of the plural “us” to insinuate the plurality of *persons* – Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the Holy Trinity – in the Deity.
 19. See Dörmann’s critique of *Redemptor Hominis* in Part II, Vol. In *R.H.*, the pope states that man retained “the image and likeness of God” after the Fall. This statement is incompatible with Catholic doctrine. See also “‘New Theology’ Destroys Doctrine of Original Sin” at http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/2004_August/New_Theology_Si_n.htm.
 20. See <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/1098.htm>. The quote originated with Saint Augustine (Gen. ad lit. ix, 4) and is employed by Saint Thomas in *The Summa*, Q. 98, Art. 2.
 21. I am referring to such esoteric practices as chakras, kundalini, and tantra and kabbalistic sex.
 22. See <http://catholicspotlight.com/122/transcript-of-cs67-christopher-west-heavens-song/>.
 23. *Ibid.*
 24. “‘New Theology’ Destroys the Doctrine of Original Sin,” *Si Si No No*, March 15, 2004 at http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/2004_August/New_Theology_Sin.htm.

Copyright 2008 Randy Engel