

THE POPE

Pontiff Speaks on Population Control

Vatican City (NC) — Here is the Vatican text of Pope John Paul II's address to Rafael M. Salas, secretary general of the International Conference on Population and director of the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, during an audience at the Vatican June 7.

I am pleased to welcome you here today and to share with you some reflections on the coming 1984 International Conference on Population, for which you have been designated secretary general. This conference, to be held in Mexico City in August 1984, provides an opportunity for a re-examination of many important issues related to population growth or decline some 10 years after the World Population Conference in 1974. The Holy See has followed the discussions of population during these years, and has studied the implications of the demographic factors for the entire human family. It is readily apparent that the worldwide population situation is very complex and varies from region to region. Behind the demographic facts there are many interrelated issues that have to do with improving the circumstances of living so that people can live in dignity, justice and peace, so that they can exercise the God-given right to form families, to bear and bring up children, and so that they can pursue their eternal destiny, which is union with the loving God who has created them. Thus, the Catholic Church takes positive note of the concern for improving systems of education and health care, recognizing the roles of aging persons, obtaining greater opportunities for people to be active participants in the development process and in constructing a new global economic system based on justice and equity.



The Church recognizes the role of governments and of the international community to study and to face with responsibility the population problem in the context of and with a view to the common good of individual nations and of all humanity ("Populorum Progressio," 37). But demographic policies must not consider people as mere numbers, or only in economic terms, or with any kind of prejudice. They must respect and promote the dignity and the fundamental rights of the human person and of the family.

The "dignity of the human person" — of each and every person — and his or her uniqueness and capacity to contribute to the well-being of society are of primary importance to the Church when entering into discussions about population. For the Church believes that human dignity is based on the fact that God has created each person, that we have been redeemed by Christ, and that, according to the divine plan, we shall rejoice with God forever. The Church must always stand as a sign and safeguard of the transcendent character of the human person (cf. "Gaudium et Spes," 76), restoring hope to those who might otherwise despair of anything better than their present lot. This conviction of the Church is shared by others and is in harmony with the most secret desires of the human heart and responds to the deepest longings of the human person. The dignity of the person, then, is a value of universal importance, one that is upheld by people of differing religious, cultural and national backgrounds. This emphasis on the value of the person demands respect for human life, which is always a splendid gift of God's goodness.

Against the pessimism and selfishness which cast a shadow over the world, the Church stands for life and calls for ever greater efforts to correct those situations that endanger or diminish the value and appropriate enjoyment of human life. Thus, I recall the words of my apostolic exhortation "Familiaris Consortio," which reflect the consensus of the 1980 world Synod of Bishops on the family in the modern world: "The Church is called upon to manifest anew to everyone, with clear and stronger conviction, her will to promote human life by every means and to defend it against all attacks, in whatever condition or state of development it is found. "Thus the Church condemns as a grave offense against human dignity and justice all those activities of governments of other public authorities which attempt to limit in any way the freedom of couples in deciding about children. Consequently any violence applied by such authorities in favor of contraception or, still worse, of sterilization and procured abortion, must be altogether condemned and forcefully rejected; likewise to be denounced as gravely unjust are cases where, in international relations, economic help given for the advancement of peoples is made conditional on programs of contraception, sterilization and procured abortion" (No. 30).

The experiences and trends of recent years clearly emphasize the profoundly negative effects of contraceptive programs. These programs have increased sexual permissiveness and promoted irresponsible conduct, with grave consequences especially for the education of youth and the dignity of women. The very notion of "responsible parenthood" and "family planning" has been violated by the distribution of contraceptives to adolescents.

More often, from contraceptive programs a transition has in fact often been made to the practice of sterilization and abortion, financed by governments and international organizations.

More often, from contraceptive programs a transition has in fact often been made to the practice of sterilization and abortion, financed by governments and international organizations.

More often, from contraceptive programs a transition has in fact often been made to the practice of sterilization and abortion, financed by governments and international organizations.

More often, from contraceptive programs a transition has in fact often been made to the practice of sterilization and abortion, financed by governments and international organizations.

The Church recognizes the role of governments and of the international community to study and to face with responsibility the population problem in the context of and with a view to the common good of individual nations and of all humanity. But demographic policies must not consider people as mere numbers, or only in economic terms, or with any kind of prejudice. They must respect and promote the dignity and the fundamental rights of the human person and of the family.

The Church stresses the importance of the family, which is "the natural and fundamental group unit of society, and is entitled to protection by society and the state" (cf. "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," 16, 3). At the request of the international Synod of Bishops, the Holy See itself has issued a "Charter on the Rights of the Family" in which it "urges all states, international organizations, and all interested institutions and persons to promote respect for these rights and to secure their effective recognition and observance" (preamble).

In this document, the family is recognized as "a community of love and solidarity which is uniquely suited to teach and transmit cultural, ethical, social, spiritual and religious values, essential to the well-being of its own members and of society" (preamble). The family is truly a community of persons bound together by love, by mutual concern, by commitments to the past and to the future. While the primary members of the family are the spouses and their children, it is important to maintain an awareness of the family as a community where the different generations come together, and whose strength it is to provide a place of identity and security for relatives and for those who are assimilated into it.

The family has a unique and irreplaceable role in handing on the gift of life and in providing the best environment for the education of children and their introduction into society. It is in the family primarily that the child finds love and acceptance from the moment of conception and throughout the process of growth and development. Insecurity about the future should not diminish our hope and joy in children. Now more than ever before we must reaffirm our belief in the value of the child, and in the contributions that today's children can make to the entire human family. As I said before the United Nations General Assembly: "...In the presence of the representatives of so many nations of the world gathered here, I wish to express the joy that we all find in children, the springtime of life, the anticipation of the future history of each of our present earthly homelands. No country on earth, no political system can think of its own future otherwise than through the image of these new generations that will receive from their parents the manifold heritage of values, duties and aspirations of the nation to which they belong and of the whole human family. Concern for the child, even before birth, from the first moment of conception and then throughout the years of infancy and youth, is the primary and fundamental test of the relationship of one human being to another."

Yet we all know that the spouses' decision in favor of childbearing and childrearing is not always easy and often occasions sacrifice. The Church is realistically aware of this, and her teaching on responsible parenthood concerns married couples — who, alone, have the right to procreation — to assist them in making what must be a free, informed and mutual decision regarding the spacing of births and the size of the family. This decision should be based on their prayerful and generous appreciation of their association with God in the work of creation, and their responsibilities to themselves, to their children, to their family and to society.

It should be a decision that is based on morally acceptable methods of spacing or limiting births, about which it is the right and duty of the Church to speak. On the other hand, it is the role of governments and of international organizations to assist married couples by creating a socio-economic order conducive to family life, childbearing and childrearing, and by providing accurate information on the demographic situation so that couples may properly assess their duties and their capabilities.

Special attention should be given to the role of women in modern society. Improving the status of women is important. In this regard we should not overlook the contributions that women make in the home and in their unique capacity to nurture the infant and guide the child in the earliest phase of education. This particular contribution of women is often ignored or diminished in favor of economic considerations or employment opportunities, and sometimes even in order to decrease the number of children. Continued efforts should be made to ensure the full integration of women in society, while giving due recognition to their important social role as mothers. This should include maternal and child health care, proper maternal leave, and family income supplements.

The Church is also aware of the initiatives in favor of the aging, sponsored by the UNFPA. The number of aging persons is increasing in most countries. Their needs are often overlooked, and also the contribution they make to society. They bring experience, wisdom and a special patience to the solution of human problems, and they can and should be active members of contemporary society.

Much attention is given to the relationship of population to development. It is widely recognized that a population policy is only one part of an overall development strategy. Once again, the Church emphasizes that the needs of families should be a primary consideration in development strategies, that families should be encouraged to assume responsibility for transforming society and be active participants in the development process. Yet development itself should be more than a pursuit of material benefits; it should involve a more comprehensive approach that respects and satisfies the spiritual as well as the material needs of each person and of the whole of society. In a word, development strategies should be based on a just worldwide socio-economic order directed towards an equitable sharing of created goods, respectful stewardship of the environment and natural resources, and a sense of moral responsibility and cooperation among nations in order to achieve peace, security and economic stability for all. Above all, development should not be interpreted simply in terms of population control, nor should governments or international agencies make development assistance dependent on the achievement of family planning goals.

At this time, Mr. Secretary General, I would appeal to you and through you to all those participating in the 1984 International Conference on Population, to face the issues of population with renewed confidence in the human person, and in the power that moral and spiritual values have to contribute to the true solution of human problems in our day. May God himself assist you to fulfill this important task.

Fr. Louis J. Hohman



The Open Window

Freedom And Public Welfare

There was a letter in the daily paper a little while ago which put out the proposition that John DeLorean (on trial for drug peddling) was the wrong man to be tried. The one which should be tried is John B. (for Busybody) Dogooder.

The writer of the letter goes on to say Dogooder is the self-proclaimed humanitarian who is driven by the ill-conceived notion that he is "his brother's keeper." The writer then says that no individual or group of individuals, whether in a majority or not, has the right to dictate or control the actions of other individuals where such actions do nothing to infringe upon anyone else's right to life, liberty or the pursuit of happiness.

So far, so good. But then the letter-writer goes on to mention some of the areas where Dogooder restricts freedom: minimum wage laws, car passenger restraints and motorcycle helmet laws. He also mentions prostitution and the use of certain drugs.

While it is certainly true that the state need not and should not make laws which involve only private morality, those areas which

do not directly affect other people, nevertheless, the ones mentioned by the letter writer do indeed involve the public welfare and therefore everyone else.

The letter writer is certainly all-out for the freedom of the individual and that freedom should certainly be protected within the bounds of the public welfare and common good.

But it certainly is not the kind of unrestricted freedom which he seems to advocate. He apparently perceives himself as limiting restraints to areas where the common good is involved, but certainly doesn't have much a sense for what does involve the common good.

I would like to add something to this. In our time the passion for freedom is almost always involving simply "freedom from."

It has apparently little to do with "freedom for" and less to do with the dignity of the individual which is the real basis for freedom.

Freedom from restraints has very little value when it is taken in isolation. When it makes us free for something good, and when it promotes human dignity as such, then of course, it is a very high value.

Other wise it is a kind of license and an effort to eliminate any kind of restraint — including self-restraint.