

# THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION

## Part 2: How to Counter It

By John F. Kippley

**Abstract:** *The successful Counter Sexual Revolution will consist of a combination of doctrinal reaffirmation, renewal of prudent pastoral practices, and practical help. The practical help of natural family planning (NFP) has developed from the calendar rhythm of the early 1930s to the systems taught today. Prudent pastoral practices include proper instruction before marriage including the right kind of course on natural family planning (NFP). The right kind of NFP course includes ecological breastfeeding, understandable transmission of Catholic moral teaching, and some form of systematic natural family planning. (This article is scheduled for publication in the *Catholic Social Science Review*, Fall, 2008.)*

*Part I of this two-part article is titled “The Sexual Revolution: How Christians Came to Accept It” and is also available at this website. It describes key events in the gradual shift from the acceptance of biblical norms of sexual behavior to the rejection of those norms and the cultural acceptance of the contemporary sexual revolution.*

We who live in the age of the Sexual Revolution frequently do not realize how radical the change in thinking about love, marriage and sexuality has become since 1920. We are like the frogs in the gradually warming kettle of water. It can be helpful to remember the dictum of the secular humanist Walter Lippmann writing in his 1929 *Preface to Morals*. Reflecting on the theories advanced as “progressive” during the 1920s, he wrote that the problem with the thinking of the progressives was that they had followed the logic of birth control rather than the logic of human nature.<sup>1</sup> To restore a significant part of our culture to following the logic of human nature, we need firm teaching about that human nature, and we also need practical help to put sound teaching into practice. In the Church we have that teaching, and in the natural family planning movement there is a hope, not a promise or guarantee, of the sort of help that is needed.

### Doctrinal reaffirmation

Less than five months after the Church of England accepted marital contraception as morally permissible in August 1930, Pope Pius XI responded on December 31 with his landmark encyclical, *Casti Connubii (Concerning Chaste Marriage)*. The key sentence in this teaching needs to be quoted in full.

“Since, therefore, openly departing from the uninterrupted Christian tradition some recently have judged it possible solemnly to declare another doctrine regarding this question, the Catholic Church, to whom God has entrusted the defense of the integrity and purity of morals, standing erect in the midst of the moral ruin which surrounds her, in order that she may preserve the chastity of the nuptial union from being defiled by this foul stain, raises her voice in token of her divine ambassadorship and through Our mouth proclaims anew: any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of a grave sin” (paragraph 56).<sup>ii</sup>

Three paragraphs later, Pius XI showed his compassion for those who are more “sinned against than sinning,” and then he continued: “Nor are those considered as acting against nature who in the married state use their right in the proper manner, although on account of natural reasons either of time or of certain defects, new life cannot be brought forth.”

In those statements, the Pope first noted that the Anglican acceptance of marital contraception was a revolutionary departure from the previously “uninterrupted Christian tradition” against unnatural forms of birth control. Then, in his affirmation of the right and duty of the Catholic Church to teach on this issue, he used such authoritative language that it still amazes me that theologians 30 to 40 years later were not quoting this as an infallible teaching. Finally, by teaching so clearly and firmly against unnatural forms of birth control, he implicitly laid down a challenge for more help with natural family planning.

With his reference to natural infertility—“natural reasons either of time or of certain defects”—it is not immediately clear from the text alone if the Pope is referring only to times of pregnancy, menopause, and defects in fertility or whether he also meant to include abstinence from the marriage act during the fertile time of the normal female cycle. The historical and theological contexts, however, provide ample reason to include periodic abstinence. First, born in 1857, Pius XI certainly would have been aware of the 1853 and 1880 responses of the Sacred Penitentiary that had accepted the principle of periodic abstinence as a morally upright way for married couples to avoid conception.<sup>iii</sup> Second, he was undoubtedly aware of the medical research about the fertile time that had been published in Germany earlier that year and described below. Third, shortly after the encyclical, the Vatican was again asked about spouses “who, for just and grave causes” wanted to practice periodic abstinence to avoid pregnancy, and in 1932 the Sacred Penitentiary reaffirmed its decision of 1880.<sup>iv</sup> There is no question that in the context of the day, the “natural reasons” of the encyclical include periodic abstinence.

## Help with natural family planning

In the 1920s, research led to unprecedented discoveries about the time of human ovulation and laid the basis for the first form of systematic natural family planning called “rhythm” in the 1930s. In 1923 a Japanese gynecologist, Kyusaku Ogino, published his discovery that ovulation occurs approximately two weeks before the start of the next menstruation.<sup>v</sup> This was the first such demonstration, and it destroyed the previous speculation that menstruation was the fertile time. In 1924, Austrian gynecologist Hermann Knaus began similar studies.<sup>vi</sup> In 1926, Dutch gynecologist Theodor Hendrik van de Velde noted that the temperature rise in the latter part of the female cycle was due to the activity of the corpus luteum, the follicle from which the ovum had been released.<sup>vii</sup> In February, 1930 Ogino published further research in a German medical journal and demonstrated the value of his calendar rhythm calculations.<sup>viii</sup> According to Fr. Anthony Zimmerman, there had been a discussion between Ogino and Knaus about the proper way to calculate the infertile times of the cycle, and this article settled the matter, with Knaus thanking Ogino for his work.<sup>ix</sup>

This news was now known on both sides of the globe. That same year, Dutch neurologist Jan Smulders developed a system of periodic abstinence based on Ogino’s work.<sup>x</sup> Certainly Pope Pius XI was aware of these developments, and it is difficult to believe that the Anglican bishops at the Lambeth conference in August were not also aware. In a very unfortunate irony, the Church of England could have been the first Christian body in history to recommend calendar rhythm for spacing babies, but instead it opted to accept contraceptive birth control.

In 1935, Wilhelm Hillebrand, a German Catholic priest, combined the temperature findings of Van de Velde with the work of Ogino, Smulders, and Knaus to provide the system in which elevated temperatures were used to crosscheck the calendar rhythm calculations.<sup>xi</sup> This became known as the calendar-temperature method and, with a few modifications, is still used by some today. In 1948 Edward F. Keefe, a New York gynecologist, developed a special thermometer for ease in reading a woman’s waking temperatures. In 1953, he began to recommend making observations of cervical mucus along with the temperature observations, thus reviving in America the forgotten findings of W. Tyler Smith in 1855.<sup>xii</sup> At the same time, Dr. John Billings began doing similar work in Australia. In 1962, Dr. Keefe published his findings about physical changes in the cervix around the time of ovulation, thus providing the basis for all three signs used in the complete sympto-thermal method of systematic natural family planning.<sup>xiii</sup>

During the mid-1960s, European researchers published studies on the effectiveness of various forms of systematic NFP. Austrian Dr. Josef Roetzer found a 99% level of effectiveness among couples using his form of systematic NFP.<sup>xiv</sup> French researcher Bernard Vincent found a 99% level of effectiveness among couples who

practiced a temperature-only form of systematic NFP.<sup>xv</sup> Thus, before *Humanae Vitae*, it was known, at least in Europe, that couples could practice systematic NFP at levels of effectiveness that were competitive with the unnatural forms of birth control. My point is that God in his Providence has given us the knowledge we need for our circumstances.

The NFP movement as we know it in North America today got started in Quebec with the founding of SERENA in 1955. It migrated to the East Coast of the United States in the early 1960s, and the Natural Family Planning Association of Connecticut started publishing its newsletter in 1965. In other areas, dioceses supported NFP instruction and follow-up. In the aftermath of *Humanae Vitae*, the American bishops established the Human Life Foundation (1968) to promote a culture of life including an American NFP movement.

The Sixties and Seventies saw a flurry of publications and organizational activity. In 1964, Dr. John Billings authored *The Ovulation Method* that taught the use of mucus and temperature signs in a cross-checking way.<sup>xvi</sup> In 1972, he wrote a second edition in which he placed the emphasis almost exclusively on the mucus sign.<sup>xvii</sup> From that time on, the Billings Ovulation Method became known throughout the world. All throughout the 1970s Fr. Paul Marx, OSB, held an NFP weekend symposium each June at St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota. It was a wonderful gathering of the NFP ghetto. In 1969 my wife Sheila published her book, *Breastfeeding and Natural Child Spacing*.<sup>xviii</sup> In 1971 we founded the Couple to Couple League, and the next year we published *The Art of Natural Family Planning*.<sup>xix</sup> During the Seventies, our organization experienced phenomenal growth, and we taught over 9,000 new couples in 1980, but then something happened.

Beginning in 1981, each year we saw fewer couples being instructed, and I think this was the case throughout the NFP movement. In 1981 we were more than 12 years beyond *Humanae Vitae*. It was increasingly difficult to find young people who had heard anything good about its teaching. The contraceptive introduction to the sexual revolution had been embraced by educators and opinion shapers within the Catholic community as well as by an increasingly secular society. For anyone who wanted to look for help with natural family planning in the Eighties, the help was there, but the NFP movement was in decline for lack of interest on the part of churchmen as well as the laity.

In 1989, the U.S. Bishops' Committee on Pastoral Research and Practices published a small book on marriage preparation, *Faithful to Each Other Forever*<sup>xx</sup> in which they urged that every engaged couple should be required to attend a full course on NFP as a normal part of preparation for marriage. In early 1992, I wrote five carefully selected bishops with the same suggestion. Nothing in any of their replies indicated any acquaintance with the bishops' book on preparation for marriage. My letter stirred up some action, but as of November 2007, only seven dioceses (Amarillo, Covington, Denver, Fargo, Phoenix, Richmond and Rockford) had announced a policy in accord with

the bishops' urgent recommendations, and the announced policies were contingent upon the availability of NFP teachers.

### **Toward reform and renewal**

Authentic reform and renewal of sexual morality within the Catholic Church is highly dependent upon Catholic leadership. Bishops, priests and deacons need to take seriously and adapt the words of St. Paul in *Romans* 10:14-17. How can the laity believe the truth about love and sexuality unless they hear it? How are they to hear it unless it is preached? And how will it be preached unless someone (i.e., a bishop) sends priests and deacons to preach?

Preaching obviously includes speaking from the pulpit, difficult as that can be on matters of love, marriage, and sexuality. (Note to clergy: Experience has shown that you should not use the term “sexual intercourse” from the pulpit. Instead, use “the marriage act.”) We all need to hear on a regular basis the perennial teaching of Christ and the biblical authors about marriage and children. With due caution for young ears and imaginations, we need to hear the call to avoid the evils of fornication, adultery, sodomy, pornography, and divorce and remarriage. Parish bulletins, missions, and retreats can be useful for this. We need to be called to exercise custody of our eyes instead of taking in what passes for being clothed in the visual media. We need to hear about the common temptations and sins to which we are attracted. We need to hear the call to repentance and confession. Once a parish is sensitized to sexual sins, there will be a need to expand the hours of confession. Nothing less is needed than parish evangelization.

### **Marriage preparation**

Evangelization includes adult education and parish policy. Pastors need to make a full NFP course just as much a normal part of marriage preparation as meetings with the priest or deacon, the organist, and other marriage-preparation personnel. The Bishops' Committee on Pastoral Research and Practices had it right, and more and more priests are putting its recommendations into practice even in the absence of a diocesan directive.

Since the Catholic acceptance of the sexual revolution has occurred chiefly through the acceptance of marital contraception, it should be clear that authentic reform and renewal is highly contingent upon the rejection of contraception and the acceptance of the teaching reaffirmed by *Humanae Vitae*. That means that requiring an adequate NFP course as a normal part of preparation for marriage is almost essential for any widespread reform and renewal in the Church. The right kind of NFP course, and this certainly may not apply to every current NFP course, can be an awakening exercise in evangelization. I want to stress “the right kind of NFP course” because it is entirely

possible that a mandatory NFP course can become a vehicle in which only lip service is paid to “official Catholic teaching.” In some dioceses a mandatory pre-Cana lecture on sexuality has been hijacked by those who have no respect for Catholic morality, and the same tragedy can happen with a diocesan or parish mandated NFP course.

***Proper and full NFP instruction.*** Let us assume that pastors require NFP instruction prior to marriage, and let us also assume that the engaged couples have the morality of their parents. That means that at least 90% of the young couples are not being told by their parents to use only NFP when they need baby-spacing, and some high percentage of these engaged couples are living in sin. In short, we can assume that NFP teachers generally don’t have an eager audience. In spite of this, the combination of authentic Christian spirituality (i.e., the realization that Christ has assured us that discipleship will involve a daily cross and that this not infrequently involves sexuality), Catholic teaching, proper and full NFP instruction, and full disclosure about unnatural forms of birth control is a powerful combination and can have lasting effects. Because I think that a mandatory NFP course has great potential for good or evil, I want to describe “proper and full NFP instruction” more fully. What follows is not an advertisement for any particular NFP program. When Sheila and I directed the Couple to Couple League, we put our convictions into practice. Our association with CCL, however, ended in 2003. We know that some significant changes have occurred, but we do not know to what extent those changes affect the current subject.

***1. Catholic morality.*** First, proper and full NFP instruction is not just an anatomy lesson but has to reaffirm Catholic morality dealing both with marital chastity and also the moral use of NFP. This takes only a few words and little time.

If we assume that the attendees have active minds and imaginations, we can safely assume that when they hear about sexual abstinence during the fertile time, some will start to think how they can get around it. Therefore NFP teachers need to be realistic and specific. They need to teach that it is immoral to engage in contraceptive behaviors during the fertile time (as well as at any other time). Contraceptive behaviors include the use of artifacts such as condoms and diaphragms, but they also include behaviors that do not involve such items. That means teachers have to state specifically that it is immoral to engage in masturbation (whether mutual or solitary), and/or sodomy (whether anal or oral) and/or withdrawal (the sin of Onan), as well as teaching against the use of barrier devices.

In the contemporary NFP movement there is, however, considerable diversity about teaching marital chastity. Some eschew teaching it, apparently believing in a quasi-Gnostic way that when couples learn the beauty of God’s design of human fertility they will be virtuous. Others seem to believe that if students hear the right interpretation of the papal theology of the body, they will properly infer that all contraceptive behaviors are immoral without the teacher having to say anything specific. Some find it relatively

easy to caution against barriers and withdrawal because they can give pragmatic, pregnancy-related reasons for avoiding such behavior. However, when it comes to masturbation and sodomy, they would have to give moral reasons, and some NFP teachers find this difficult. Perhaps this is because they know that today it is highly probable that some of their students have experienced these sins, but that makes it even more important to confront the culture. Based on statements by a good priest and from personal accounts of couples who changed from such behaviors once they learned from us that it was wrong, it is by no means guaranteed that every couple who practices “NFP” is practicing “chaste NFP.” For the record, in the program that my wife and I founded in 2004, NFP International ([www.NFPandmore.org](http://www.NFPandmore.org)), we do teach directly that it is immoral to engage in masturbation and/or marital sodomy.

Catholic teaching against marital unchastity can be stated very briefly in a few negatives as above, but this teaching also needs to be placed in the context of Christian discipleship and the call to lives of faith and holiness. However, even among those who believe that a sexual anatomy lesson is quite inadequate as a preparation for Christian marriage, there are serious differences about how to proclaim the positive aspects of Christian sexuality. Some see that John Paul II wrote about the dignity of the human person in his *Theology of the Body*, and they think they can successfully use these human-dignity principles to convey the beauty of Catholic teaching about love, marriage and sexuality. They seem to think that talk about the dignity of the human person will lead NFP course attendees to draw all the proper inferences and conclusions. The problem is that talk about the dignity of the human person is abstract, frequently impersonal, and it applies to every human act. Yes, it is possible that some people in some circumstances can listen to and can infer the evil of contraceptive behaviors from non-specific human-dignity talk, but I seriously doubt that such talk will be effective in an NFP course, given the limited time, the nature of the audience, and the attitudes and educational backgrounds of the attendees, especially those who are there primarily to fulfill a requirement.

Since 1967 I have proposed a covenant theology of sexuality that can be summarized in 17 words: “Sexual intercourse is intended by God to be at least implicitly a renewal of the marriage covenant.” Mention of the marriage covenant lends itself to explaining that the marriage act is a privileged way in which spouses are called to affirm and renew the commitment, fidelity, caring love, and gift of self they made on their wedding day. I have yet to meet anyone who cannot understand this simple explanation that focuses on what each person has done, or intends to do, in making the marriage vows. Ten years after he completed the *Theology of the Body* lectures, John Paul II used the covenant theology of sexuality in his *Letter to Families*: “In the conjugal act, husband and wife are called to confirm in a responsible way *the mutual gift* of self which they have made to each other in the marriage covenant” (his italics).<sup>xxi</sup>

This is not to say that spouses must have such concepts in their minds at the time of the marriage act. In the covenant statement above, the words “at least implicitly” are important. In my opinion, the marriage act is a true marriage act unless one or both of the spouses act *against* the love and self-gift that was pledged at marriage. For example, marital rape is not a true marriage act. Contraception? The body language of marital contraception says, “I take you for better but definitely NOT for the imagined worse of possible pregnancy.” It therefore contradicts the “for better and for worse” of the original marriage covenant and makes the act dishonest and immoral.

Another bone of contention among those who accept *Humanae Vitae* concerns whether to teach the call to generosity in the service of life. Some say there is no need to teach explicitly that you need a sufficiently serious reason to use NFP to avoid pregnancy; they assume that couples who practice systematic NFP will become generous and virtuous without any specific instruction, especially if they have been exposed to a version of the papal theology of the body. I think this is either wishful thinking or fear of offending the audience. Pope John Paul II saw the need to affirm the call to generosity. In his October, 1979 visit to Washington, D.C., he noted in front of a world television audience that “...parents will remind themselves that it is certainly less serious to deny their children certain comforts or material advantages than to deprive them of the presence of brothers and sisters who could help them to grow in humanity and to realize the beauty of life at all its ages and in all its variety.”<sup>xxii</sup> Notice also that in the *Letter to Families* quotation above he added the words “in a responsible way” to the basic covenant statement. Then, in his next sentence he wrote, “The logic of the *total gift of self to the other* involves a potential openness to procreation: in this way the marriage is called to even greater fulfillment as a family” (his italics).

The teaching of the Church as expressed in Vatican II, *Humanae Vitae*, and the general teaching of orthodox moralists makes it clear that systematic NFP is not supposed to be Catholic birth control to fit in with a culturally acceptable family size. Whether we phrase it as serious reason, just cause, plausible reasons, or sufficiently serious reasons, we need reasons well beyond convenience to morally justify the use of systematic NFP to avoid pregnancy.

Given the cultural bias towards the two-child and two-income family, it is naïve to expect the generosity aspect of Catholic teaching to be absorbed by NFP students and users without any specific instruction. In my opinion, anything less than “sufficiently serious reasons” will simply not be heard as a qualification on the use of systematic NFP. In contemporary Western culture, any NFP program—and indeed, any marriage preparation program—that does not explicitly proclaim the call to generosity and the qualifying conditions for the use of NFP is failing in its duties to both the students and the Church. The NFP course that fails in this area is not providing proper and full instruction regarding natural family planning.

**2. Ecological breastfeeding.** The second part of an NFP course that provides proper and full instruction and that seeks to develop good family life is adequate instruction about ecological breastfeeding. Ecology is concerned with the relationships between two organisms and how each affects the other. Ecological breastfeeding is the form of nursing in which the mother fulfills her baby's needs for her full-time presence and for frequent suckling and in which the child's frequent suckling postpones the return of the mother's fertility.

The health world has latched on to breastfeeding for some years, and recently federal agencies have awakened to the health and consequent economic benefits of breastfeeding. This is good, but there is only one form of breastfeeding that has any significant effect on the delay of fertility and is therefore of special interest for natural family planning, and that's ecological breastfeeding. My wife, Sheila, and I coined the term "ecological breastfeeding" in the late Sixties to distinguish it from breastfeeding patterns that have no such effects. (For more information, go to [www.NFPandmore.org](http://www.NFPandmore.org), click on the NFP how-to manual, and select Chapter 3.) If this form of baby care had been widespread during the 1950s, the babies would have been spaced about 24 to 30 months apart instead of 11 to 15 months, and the pressures to change Catholic teaching would have been much less in the 1960s.

**3. Systematic NFP.** Proper and full instruction about natural family planning should include not only one of the common forms of systematic NFP but also sufficient indication that there is more than one way to determine the fertile and infertile times of the cycle. The Diocesan NFP director should not practice favoritism to teachers of the director's particular methodology of systematic NFP. Couples who cannot afford to attend a regular NFP course can download for self-instruction the short and free NFP how-to manual mentioned in the previous paragraph.

**Results.** What effects might pastors expect if they require couples to take a proper and full course on NFP as a normal part of preparation for marriage? I predict that at least 25% of engaged couples who receive proper instruction from their priest and take the right kind of NFP course will say "Yes" to the Holy Spirit and will start their marriages with marital chastity, either deciding to seek pregnancy or using systematic NFP if they need to postpone pregnancy. You may ask, "Only 25% after all that instruction?" Probably, but that's five to ten times higher than it would be otherwise, and the attendees are couples who for the most part have not been evangelized. Further, there will be a significant increase in the rate and duration of breastfeeding, and many parents will come to appreciate the Catholic Church for encouraging this in its pre-marriage instruction.

Among those who choose contraceptive behaviors despite good instruction, I think there will be regular conversions. It is not spiritually satisfying to engage in marital immorality when you know that the marriage act ought to symbolize the faith and love of

your marriage covenant. It is not easy to keep using the Pill, the Shot, or the IUD when you know their abortifacient potential as well as their health risks. It is not easy to put up with barrier contraception when you know there's something so much better. Further, the process of good NFP instruction can develop a new respect for God's order of creation. So I will predict that 45% of that marriage class will opt for NFP-only by their fifth anniversary, and I think that by their tenth anniversaries there will be a 65% acceptance of *Humanae Vitae* in faith and practice, especially if the parish continues to preach the message. Also, if these young married couples got the generosity message at their NFP course and hear it reaffirmed regularly from the pulpit, they're not going to call a family of two or three children a full house. More will have larger families, the pews will be full once again, the schools will survive and be filled, and the seminaries will be full. When even a third of the parish consists of fully believing Catholics who are concerned for the Faith, good things will happen in the parish—from liturgy to religious education.

### **Exemplary positions**

That brings us to a common sense question. Why should those who do not believe and practice as Catholics be running the parish? Why should they be teaching the RCIA group, teaching in the parish school, or making decisions about Catholic life as members of parish council? Why should those who talk openly about having been “fixed” be lectors and extraordinary ministers at the Eucharistic liturgy? Is it sufficient that only engaged couples should be required to learn the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* and how to practice natural family planning?

Pastors cannot realistically require every adult parishioner to attend proper and full NFP instruction because they have no leverage. However, to bring about a believing-Catholic parish, pastors can require everyone involved in the exemplary ministries of the Church to attend a course that explains and defends the teaching reaffirmed by *Humanae Vitae* and then to sign a statement of faith and practice. If some persons after such a course find they no longer have time for such ministry, so be it. The confessional needs to be open. Exemplary ministries include marriage preparation, NFP instruction, adult education, RCIA instruction, distributing Holy Communion, lectoring, membership in the parish council, parish music ministry, and teaching in the parish school. I include NFP instruction because if this becomes a diocesan marriage requirement, it will attract “professionals,” those who will teach for pay but may not believe—as in other parts of Catholic education. They may be knowledgeable about NFP-related physiology, but if they do not accept the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* and live accordingly, they will be as “a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal,” speakers of many words that signify nothing. If this proposal sounds scary, it is only because of a fear that many of the people to whom the parish now entrusts its prophetic and teaching roles are, in fact, living in opposition to the

teaching of the Church. If this is so, is it any wonder that the word of Christ's Church is not getting through to the parish?

The Church in the West has been on a downhill toboggan ride for about 40 years, and it will take another 40 years of effort to make it truly Catholic in practice again. But 40 years go quickly. The summer of 2008 will mark (or has marked) the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of *Humanae Vitae* (July 25, 1968). It's been almost 30 years since Karol Wojtyla became Pope John Paul II. Time flies.

Dioceses and parishes don't need a grandiose plan for renewal. All they need are faith and common sense efforts to make our parishes and schools fully Catholic again. Fingerprinting may be helpful in weeding out a few who should not be active in any kind of youth ministry, but isn't it even more important that every teacher believes and practices in accord with what the Church actually teaches? Without assurances that teachers believe and want to help students to grow in faith and holiness, the current policy can be stated in this way: "Don't you dare touch our children, but it's none of our business if you warp their minds to accept the sexual revolution." If parishes and Catholic high schools cannot find orthodox teachers to staff their schools, then they can certainly find sufficient believing Catholics to support a diocesan-wide and parish program of home education. When dioceses and parishes want to be truly Catholic, God will provide.

\* \* \* \* \*

John F. Kippley is the author of *Sex and the Marriage Covenant: A Basis for Morality* (Ignatius, 2005) that develops more fully some of the themes in this article. He and his wife have formed a new organization, NFP International, and can be contacted through its website, [www.NFPandmore.org](http://www.NFPandmore.org).

Copyright © 2008 by John F. Kippley

### Endnotes

---

<sup>i</sup> Walter Lippmann, *A Preface to Morals* (New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1982 edition; originally published by The Macmillan Company in 1929) 306.

<sup>ii</sup> Pope Pius XI, *Casti Connubii* (*Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI on Christian Marriage*) December 31, 1930, paragraph 56. This is the numbering at the Vatican website. For many years the encyclical printed in the United States did not have paragraph numbers because paragraph 24 was omitted in the initial transmission.

<sup>iii</sup> John T. Noonan, Jr. *Contraception: A History of Its Treatment by the Catholic Theologians and Canonists* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965) 439.

---

<sup>iv</sup> Noonan, 443.

<sup>v</sup> Jan Mucharski, *History of the Biologic Control of Human Fertility* (Oak Ridge NJ: Married Life Information: 1982) 41-42.

<sup>vi</sup> Mucharski, 54.

<sup>vii</sup> Mucharski, 65.

<sup>viii</sup> Mucharski, 42

<sup>ix</sup> “It was after Dr. Ogino published his findings in Germany in 1930 [in] *Sonderdruck Aus Dem Zentralblatt Fuer Gynaekologie*, no. 8, February, 1930 (Leipzig) that his theory found its way into the world medical literature. In it he set forth the Ogino theory for natural family planning.” Fr. Anthony Zimmerman, SVD, STD “Natural Family Planning: Preventive Health Care” 14 May 1991. This article can be found at <http://zimmerman.catholic.ac/nfp-preventive.htm>, but the journal of original publication is not cited.

<sup>x</sup> Mucharski, 44.

<sup>xi</sup> Mucharski, 75.

<sup>xii</sup> The information about Dr. Edward Keefe’s role comes from conversations with Dr. Keefe, usually by phone, during the 1980s and 1990s.

<sup>xiii</sup> Edward F. Keefe, “Self-observation of the cervix to distinguish days of possible fertility,” *Bulletin of the Sloane Hospital for Women*, VII:4 (December 1962) 129-136.

<sup>xiv</sup> Josef Roetzer, “The Sympto-Thermal Method: Ten Years of Change,” *Linacre Quarterly* 45:358-374, 1979. Also, “Supplemented BBT and regulation of conception,” *Archiv fuer gynaekologie* 206:195-214, 1968.

<sup>xv</sup> B. Vincent, A. Aymard, M. Aymard, et al., *Methode thermique et contraception: Approches medicale et psycho-sociologique*, Masson et Ciet, eds. (Paris: Masson, 1967) 52-73.

<sup>xvi</sup> John J. Billings, *The Ovulation Method* (Melbourne: Advocate Press, 1964).

<sup>xvii</sup> John J. Billings, *Natural Family Planning: The Ovulation Method* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1973).

<sup>xviii</sup> Sheila K. Kippley, *Breastfeeding and Natural Child Spacing* (Salina KS: Self-published, 1969).

<sup>xix</sup> John and Sheila Kippley, *The Art of Natural Family Planning*, preliminary edition (Cincinnati: Couple to Couple League, 1972).

<sup>xx</sup> Bishops’ Committee for Pastoral Research and Practices, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Faithful to Each Other Forever: A Catholic Handbook of Pastoral Help for Marriage Preparation* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1989).

<sup>xxi</sup> John Paul II, *Letter to Families*, February 2, 1994 (Boston: Pauline Books and Media) n. 12.

<sup>xxii</sup> John Paul II, “Homily at Capitol Mall,” October 7, 1979. Available in *The Message of Justice, Peace and Love* (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1979) 281-282.