

PERSONALISTIC AND UTILITARIAN VIEW OF MARRIAGE ACCORDING TO EARLY WOJTYŁA

RAFAŁ KAZIMIERZ WILK

Abstract. The main goal of this paper is to present the philosophical (i.e. attained by the light of natural reason) explanation of the marital relationship according to the Polish philosopher Karol Wojtyła. In our research, our attention was focused mainly on his book *Love and Responsibility*; the early philosophical work of a young, 37 year old Professor of Philosophy at the Catholic University in Lublin, Poland. In his writings, Karol Wojtyła – the future Pope John Paul II – presents marriage as a monogamous, indissoluble relationship between a man and a woman, which grows out of mutual love for the purpose of procreation. Such a relationship is ruled by the „personalistic norm” which says that a person can never, under any circumstances, be a mere object of enjoyment for another person, but can only be the object (co-object) of love. Love is a self-giving for the good of one’s counterpart, so Marriage as a personalistic unity persists as long as these persons are alive. Because love is fecund from its very essence, so it is fruitful from its nature. Thus, procreation belongs to the principle ends of marriage. Such an attitude – as K. Wojtyła proves – is opposed to the utilitarian point of view of man and Marriage. According to the utilitarian conception, a person can be used as a means for achieving the highest good, i.e., pleasure.

I.

Within recent years especially in the Western societies, the Christian understanding of marriage has often been questioned and even completely rejected. The Catholic Church, however, incessantly teaches – though sometimes it seems to be „a voice calling on the desert” – that marriage is a monogamous relationship between a man and a woman; it is an inseparable relationship which grows out of mutual love for the purpose of procreation (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 1994, 1601-1666).

Explaining such an understanding of the marital relationship the Church appeals first of all to Revelation as the most important source of Wisdom.

This does not mean that in this teaching explanations arrived at by the light of natural reason, that is, by way of philosophical reflection, are avoided. Such explanations are provided both by the Church, and by individual philosophers. In this paper we are going to present one such philosophical explanation of the marital relationship which was developed by the Polish philosopher Karol Wojtyła, mainly in his book *Love and Responsibility* (1960). Earlier, in the academic year 1958-1959, this material was presented as lectures to the students of the Department of Philosophy of the Catholic University in Lublin (Poland). At that time the future Pope was a young professor of philosophy. Nevertheless the maturity and perspicacity of his thoughts delight and amaze even today. It therefore seems proper and valuable to offer a summary of this work. Perhaps this brief paper might become a seed for thorough studies of such a great philosopher. Maybe it will help us to understand the value of marriage, which is such an important reality for mankind.

II.

Marriage is a monogamous and indissoluble relationship, and the ultimate foundation of this statement is the personalistic dimension of man, which is ruled by the „personalistic norm.” What does the „personalistic norm” mean? Defining it in a negative way, one can say that „the person is the kind of good which does not admit of use and cannot be treated as an object of use and as such as the means to an end.” In a positive way, one can say that „the person is a good towards which the only proper and adequate attitude is love.” (Wojtyła 1981, p. 41). Thus, Wojtyła writes: „If a person can never in any circumstances be a mere object of enjoyment for another person, but can only be the object (or rather the co-subject) of love, the union of man and woman needs a suitable framework, one which permits the full development of the sexual relationship while ensuring the durability of their union. Such a union is, of course, called a marriage.” (Wojtyła 1981, p. 211).

This statement show that personalistic axiology stands in opposition to utilitarian axiology, because each of them grows out of a different ground. According to personalistic axiology the value of the person is always greater than the value of any pleasure. The opposite attitude is assumed by utilitarianism, which maintains that a person should be subordinated to pleasure because, according to this sort of philosophy, pleasure is recognized as the highest value. Thus, according to utilitarianism, a person can be used as a means for achieving the highest good, i.e., pleasure. These basic state-

ments are extremely important because from them originate references to other persons (including human persons and even the Divine Persons). The personalistic norm, in distinction to the utilitarian principle, seeks to treat a person in accord with what this person is, i.e., a being with personalistic value. With regard to another person only such a point of view can be defined as just, right, and fair. Fairness, however, is always of a greater value than usefulness. Yet, utilitarianism perceives only the latter. Suitableness, as such, does not negate usefulness, but rather subordinates it. Everything must be not merely useful, but also fair, and in accord with human dignity. The personalistic norm therefore links with and appeals to justice, for justice means giving others what is rightly due to them. It is appropriate for a person to be treated as an object of love, and never as an object of use. Therefore, we can say, that in a sense, love is the requirement of justice whereas the using of a person as a means to an end is in opposition to justice. After all, it is just to love a person (God or man). Nevertheless, love recognized in its essence is something greater than justice. Justice relates to the material and moral goods relative to a person (e.g., good name), and therefore justice refers to persons rather indirectly. Love, however, concerns persons immediately and directly (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 40-42). Therefore „using” a person is against both: love and justice.

III.

What does the word „to use” mean? It is an ambiguous word. According to one definition, „it denotes a certain objective form of action. *To use means to employ some object of action as a means to an end* – the specific end which the subject has in view. The end is always that with a view to which we are acting. The end also implies the existence of means...” (Wojtyła 1981, p. 25). „Means” from their very nature are subordinated to an „end”, and at the same time they are subordinated to the acting subject as one who acts using the proper means to achieve a goal. So, means play a subservient role. Means are subordinated to the acting subject as well as to the goal. The task of the means is to serve both: the subject and the end. All of the entities of animate and inanimate nature may be used as means for achieving various aims, with the exception of human beings. With regard to the entities of inanimate nature, man is required only to not destroy them, nor to waste natural goods, in order to use them for his personal development. Such a use will also assure peaceful coexistence. With reference to the entities of

animate nature, of course, an additional condition is required, namely that their use cannot be linked with torment or torture.

In the inter-human relationship the situation is totally different. We are not going to deal with all the problems related to such relations but will focus mainly on the case of marital life. Examining such a relationship we have to ask the following: in their marital life, do either of the spouses serve as a kind of means by which the other tries to achieve some individual, egoistic ends? Following Wojtyła's thought we can give a firm and clear answer: „a person must not be merely the means to an end for another person”. Such a rule ascertains that a person cannot be used as a means to an end (Wojtyła 1981, p. 26). Thus, Wojtyła converts Kant's practical imperative „act always in such a way that the other person is the end and not merely the instrument of your action” into a principle: „whenever a person is the object of your activity, remember that you may not treat that person as only the means to an end, as an instrument, but must allow for the fact that he or she, too, has, or at least should have, distinct personal ends.” (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 27-28).

Love is opposed to the negative relation of utilitarian usefulness. Love is constituted around a good; a common good of persons (in the case of marriage of two persons: a wife and a husband). In such a situation it can happen that one may want the other to desire the same good which he or she desires. In all such situations, the other must know this end and recognize it as good and adopt it. If this happens, a special bond is established between these persons: the bond of a common good and of a common end. This special bond does not mean merely that together they aim to seek a common good. Rather it also unites the persons and so constitutes the essential core around which any love must grow. In any case, love between people is quite unthinkable without some common good to bind them together (Wojtyła 1981, p. 28). However, it should be emphasized that here the „common good” is understood in a thoroughly personalistic fashion. This „good” is just this end which in marriage is chosen by both persons. Such a conscious and common choice made by different persons causes these persons to become equal, and this excludes the possibility of the subordination of „the other.” Meanwhile these persons are subordinated to that good which determines their common end. Thanks to his free will, Man is able to love, i.e., he is endowed with the ability to look for a good with others and be subordinate to this good. So, love is exclusively a personalistic ability because such realities as „truth”, „the good”, „freedom” exist only in the world of personalistic entities.

Love is never completed; it is rather a process, something continuously becoming. First of all it is an idea, to which people have to be willing to

subordinate their conduct. Therefore first and foremost people have to free themselves from the consumer and utilitarian attitude. In marriage also only love can exclude using another person. Marriage is one of the most important fields of realization, for choosing and subordinating oneself to the common good. For marriage – as it says in the „Book of Genesis” – is a union of a man and a woman that makes them „one body,” so wife and husband become as if one subject of life including the sphere of sexual life.

What can and should be done to prevent one spouse from subordinating the other spouse, to prevent one from making of the other a means to achieve an end? Only the sharing of a common goal can prevent such an eventuality. In the case of a married couple, such an end can be procreation, the offspring, the family, and also the totality of the continually increasing maturity gained by living together in all fields of life which are proper to a marital community. This objective end of marriage creates the possibility of love, and thus excludes the treatment of another person as a means to an end or as an object of use. It seems, however, that the qualification of this objective advisability alone still does not exclude the possibility of one person treating another as a means, as an object of use in the sexual life. For especially this domain seems to give many possibilities for treating another person – even unintentionally – as an object of use. Nevertheless, if the basic relation between man and woman is treated in its broadest dimensions, then love will be identified with the willingness to subordinate oneself to this good, which is humanity, human nature, or speaking more personalistically, the value of the person. The first meaning of the word „to use” thus appears to be explained. This term, however, has also a second meaning, which is connected with different emotional-affective states, that accompany thinking, and acts of the will. These deeds, mentioned above, appear prior to man’s acting, they accompany his acting, and they are present in man’s consciousness also when his acting is already completed. Many times these states permeate man’s activity by force. If sometimes an activity, which, in itself, would be pale and hardly perceptible, appears in consciousness strongly, this occurs thanks to these emotional-affective states. These emotional states contain a certain, positive or negative weight, where pleasure is positive, and unpleasantness negative. These states appear in a variety of types and shades. Their special range appears when the object for the acting person is another person of the opposite sex. This concerns especially the mutual intercourse of a wife and a husband and their sexual life. The second meaning of the word „to use” is connected with the entirety of the sexual life of the spouses. In this formulation the word „to use” means: to experience pleasure which in its different shades is associated with the

activity as well as with the object of the activity. In the mutual intercourse of a man and a woman as well as in their sexual life the object of activity is always a human person, and this person is the source of pleasure, or even of delight. At the same time one must exclude even the supposition that it would be only sensual pleasure. Such an attitude and supposition would undervalue the inter-personalistic and inter-human character of these relationships. In the human case even pure „bodily” relationships, because of the nature of the subjects involved, cannot cease to be relationships of a personalistic character. For these reasons the sexual life of animals cannot be compared with human sexual life, though in the animal world it is also the base of procreation i.e., of the maintenance and preservation of the species. Yet, in the case of animals, this happens on the level of nature and is connected with instinct whereas in the case of man it occurs on the level of the person and morality. Sexual morality comes into being not only from the fact that persons have a consciousness of the goal of sexual life, but also from the awareness, that they are persons. All these ideas are united with the whole moral problem of using as opposed of loving (Wojtyła 1981, p. 33). Thanks to his rationality man is able to differentiate between pleasure and unpleasantness, therefore he can make each of them a separate end of his activity. He will direct his actions towards a pleasure, which he desires to obtain, or he will make an effort to avoid an unpleasantness. If man's acts in reference to a second person would be executed exclusively, or primarily, for the sake of pleasure, then that second person would be a mere means to this end. Now it is clear that the second meaning of „to use” is a particular case of the first meaning. Unfortunately, it occurs very often in the domain of human sexual life. It does not happen in the animal's life which takes place only on the level of nature and instinct (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 33-34). „At this level sexual pleasure – purely animal sexual pleasure, of course – cannot constitute an end in itself. It is different with man. Here it is easy to see that the fact of being a person, and rational, begets morality. This morality is personalistic both in relation to its subject and in relation to its object – objectively because it is concerned with the proper treatment of a person in the context of sexual pleasure.” (Wojtyła 1981, p. 34).

In the light of the foregoing analysis, an unequivocal criticism of utilitarianism emerges. Though the utilitarian's principle of encouraging the achievement of maximum pleasure at the same time as minimizing unpleasantness seems, at first glance, to be correct and tempting, nevertheless when thoroughly examined its weakness and superficiality become apparent. The essential error of this conception lies in acknowledging pleasure as the greatest good. The utilitarian's attitude threatens man's social life, or

rather we should say that it is first and foremost a threat to the sexual life of the human being (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 34-37. Wojtyła writes: „The greatest danger lies in the fact that starting from utilitarian premises it is not clear how the cohabitation or association of people of different sex can be put on a plane of real love, and so freed from the danger of ‘using’ a person (whether in the first or in the second meaning, of the word) and of treating a person as the means to an end. Utilitarianism seems to be a programme of thoroughgoing egoism... Although in the declarations of its adherents the rule we come across is that of the *maximum* pleasure (‘greatest happiness’) for the greatest number, there is an internal contradiction at the heart of this principle. Pleasure is, of its nature, a good for the moment and only for a particular subject, it is not a super-subjective or trans-subjective good. And as long as that good is recognized as the entire basis of the moral norm, there can be no possibility of my transcending the bounds of that which is good for me alone. We can only close this gap by a fiction, a semblance of altruism.” (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 37-38). „Love” on the utilitarian conception is – not the unification of persons (as it should be) – but „a union of egoisms” (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 38-39).

If one person can in no way be the object of use for another, but must be a „co-subject”, this means that polygamy (as well as polyandry) or impermanence of marriage must be totally excluded. It is impossible to reconcile the personalistic norm either with the „temporary,” or the „permanent” objective treatment of a subject. In the case of polygamy it is impossible to speak about the realization of love in the objective sense i.e., as a virtue (Wojtyła 1981, pp.211-216). If indissolubility and monogamy are not respected then „marriage itself is then only... an institutional framework within which a man and woman obtain sexual pleasure, and not a durable union of persons based on mutual affirmation of the value of the person. For such a union must be durable, must last until one of the parties to the relationship ceases to exist. I am speaking not of spiritual existence, which is above and outside of time, but of existence in the body, which ends with death.” (Wojtyła 1981, p. 212). For marriage as it is, it is not exclusively a spiritual relationship, but also bodily and earthly. We said that man, as a personalistic being, is „his own master”. Being such an entity man cannot give himself away, cannot be replaced by another human person; man is untransferable (*alteri incommunicabilis*). The quest of betrothed love, however, contains a profound paradox. Man, who as a person in the natural order is by his very nature his own master and untransferable, in love agrees „to belong”. Moreover, man in such a relationship finds his fullest development. The fullest and the most uncompromising love then, consists in self-giving,

i.e., in making one's inalienable and non-transferable „I” someone else's property. And this is the paradox of love. Thus, love implies the mutual „giving” and „receiving” of another person. This fact is inseparably linked with responsibility. Such an attitude, however, does not destroy or impair anybody; on the contrary, it enlarges and enriches each of the persons, obviously in a super-physical and moral sense. This mutual, and perfect, self-giving, and self-receiving is impossible when divided between many persons, or is limited. The other big issue appears in relation to the question of doing wrong to children, which can in no way be reconciled with love; love never does any wrong to anyone. Love is self-giving for the good of the other, and can never be understood as utility – even if it would be performed mutually and simultaneously (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 96-100).

Man and woman coexisting in marriage join with each other mutually as persons. So, their unity persists so long as these persons are alive. It is impossible, however, to agree with the statement that their relationship lasts as long as they want. Such an attitude would be in opposition to the personalistic norm whose foundation is the person as an entity. Personalism would oppose such a norm, whose basis is the person as mere existence.

IV.

The above analyses brought us to an understanding of marriage as an institution. Marriage is not an undefined, spontaneously appearing and disappearing reality. It is a personalistic relationship between a man and a woman; it is a kind of institution, as it is „both an inter-personal matter and a social matter.” Marriage, in itself, is an institution, and it is an institution in the presence of other institutions. Marriage is also a unity which transforms into a family. The fruit of sexual relations is a child – a new human being, a new member of the family, but also a new member of the community (a family is also a „little community”). The big community (the state, the nation, the Church) is obliged to guard over the process of its incessant becoming through families. Family is the most elementary institution of society. A family constitutes a big community and at the same time it is separate from that community, because a family has its own character and its own ends. Both of these aspects, i.e., both the immanence of a family in a community as well as its autonomy, must be mirrored in legislation. The basis of family is marriage. It does not, however, mean that marriage is a means to the end of family. Though marriage, in the natural way, leads to family yet marriage does not get lost in family. Marriage, as an institution, possesses its distinct

structure, different from the structure of a family. A family is constituted by a father, a mother, a child (or children). The father and the mother have the authority and the children are subject to this authority. Marriage does not possess the structure of society yet, but it is a unity of two persons with their relationship and unification. Marriage however possesses the character of an institution both when it grows into a family as well as when, for many reasons, it cannot become a family (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 214-218). „The inner and essential *raison d'être* of marriage is not simply eventual transformation into a family but above all the creation of a lasting personal union between a man and a woman based on love. Marriage serves above all to preserve the existence of the species... but it is based on love. A marriage which, through no fault of the spouses, is childless retains its full value as an institution. Of course, a marriage serves love more fully when it serves the cause of existence and develops into family. This is how we should understand the statement that ‘procreation is the principal end of marriage’. But a marriage which cannot fulfill that purpose does not lose its significance as an institution of an interpersonal character. Moreover, realization of the principal purpose of marriage demands that its inter-personal character be realized to the full, so that the love of the spouses may be fully mature and creative. It should be added that if their love is already more or less ripe procreation will ripen it still further.” (Wojtyła 1981, p. 218).

Love, however, is fecund from its very essence. On this point E. Stein draws our attention. She devotes much space to this topic. Among other things she writes: „The fruitfulness or fecundity of animate beings, i.e., the power of generating out of their own selves other beings like unto themselves, must be regarded as part of their God-likeness, an image of the *bonum effusivum sui*, i.e., of the self-diffusive goodness of God. If humans rank above the lower creatures because as spirit they imitate God, their generative power too must be rooted in the spirit. We may regard it as being in conformity with the meaning of the original order of creation that bodily union was meant to be an expression and actualization of the union of souls and the consummation of a communal generative will in union with the divine creative will. An independent life of the instincts and urges, on the other hand, a life that has divorced and emancipated itself from its original context of meaning, appears as a consequence of the fall and of the necessarily ensuing abrogation of the original order. The child is the fruit of mutual self-giving and, more than that: it is the very embodiment of the ‘gift’. Each of the two spouses receives in the child an ‘image’ of his or her own being as well as the gift of the other spouse’s being. The gift, i.e., the

child is a third person, an independent creature, and, as a 'creature' in the full sense of the word, a gift of God." (Stein E., *Finite and Eternal Being: an Attempt at an Ascent to the Meaning of Being*, pp. 514-515).

The institution of marriage justifies (i.e., makes just) the fact of the sexual life of the wife and the husband in the entirety of the social life. It is very important because of the effects of sexual life, about which we spoke above, as well as with regard to persons, who take part in this life. It is also very important because of the moral qualification of love; love which demands its place in society. This fact points to man as „a social creature” (*animal sociale*). It points out that man, love, and marital sexual life require „the right of citizenship” in a community. This does not exclude the need of hiding the sexual life, which comes out of love; man wants to keep his marital sexual life secret or private, and, at the same time, he demands the acknowledgement of his love. Love is something that a married couple wants to display before society and include into society, because without this acknowledgement their love feels not entirely fulfilled. Yet, the institution of marriage is necessary not only considering society. The institution of marriage is needed also to give the spouses the opportunity to mutually manifest themselves to each other, to provide the opportunity for them to witness to the maturity of their love, which unites them *persistently*. Wojtyła writes that even were the spouses deserted by all other people they would need the institution of marriage, and perhaps they would apply a sort of a rite to initiate it. Although this institution would be created *ipso facto*, it would be totally different from the unity built on the reality of sexual life (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 216-217). Therefore, in no way can any form of adultery, or so called „free love,” be morally accepted. „There is more than a merely conventional difference of meaning between such words as ‘mistress’, ‘concubine’, and ‘kept woman’ on the one hand and ‘wife’, ‘fiancee’ on the other. (These are words referring to women, but whenever we use one of them we also say something about a man.” (Wojtyła 1981, p. 220). All these words refer to women yet this does not preclude the fact that man may also be an object for use to the women. According to the concept of „free love” the institution of marriage is unimportant and accidental. And, after all, without the institution of marriage the person living in a marital way becomes degraded to the position of an object of use for a second person, and such a standpoint opposes the requirement of the personalistic norm. The institution of marriage justifies (it makes just) the life of a man and a woman in a marital way both in regard to themselves and to the society, and above all – to God the Creator. Man is an existence, different from all

entities in the visible world, who is able to comprehend all this with his reason. His rationality is the basis of his personalistic dimension, because it indicates the spiritual element constituting the human being (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 220-224).² This threat was fully evident to Edith Stein, who wrote about it. In her book „Essay on Woman” she wrote: „Modern youth has proclaimed its sexual rights. If young people are still influenced by older traditions, or if they are aware through their own philosophical convictions that marriage is holy, then a purposeful striving for the establishment of families must follow. If these are abandoned, it results in the practice of free unions or absolutely promiscuous intercourse. The latter has increased in frightening proportion in all circles from year to year. This is partly a manifestation of the universally growing uninhibited drives; partly, it is an exact consequences of the negative theories aired in public discussion on marriage which a more traditional morality cannot withstand.” (Stein 1996, pp. 149-150). The previous analyses have brought us then to the threshold of understanding in the light of natural reason, i.e., the method that is proper to philosophy, the quest of the Sacrament of Matrimony. The Latin word *sacramentum* means „mystery”. The „mystery” in the broadest sense is something that is fully recognized. What is not fully visible does not lie in the field of sensual cognition. Beyond the horizon of sensual experience, only within the domain of understanding is there both the spirituality of man as well as his relationship with God. Thus, „it is not enough for a woman and a man to give themselves to each other in marriage. If each of these persons is simultaneously the property of the Creator, He also must give the man to the woman, and the woman to the man, or at any rate approve the reciprocal gift of self implicit in the institution of marriage.” (Wojtyła 1981, p. 224).³ Therefore the sexual life of a married couple is morally

² Such a point of view is also presented by e.g., Edith Stein. She writes: „And when we called the person a carrier of a *rational* nature, we evidently also claimed for it a spiritual nature, for *spirit* and *reason* seem to be inseparably linked”. (Stein 2002, p. 360).

³ One could say that it is not yet the domain of philosophy, it is rather theology. It would be, however, a very risky statement. Philosophy should talk about all entities including God and the Sacraments. If not, then most of the philosophical theories, including Plato, Aristotle, Hegel etc. should be excluded from philosophy and lectured on only at Theological Faculties. Such a philosophical attitude is also an opportunity for those who reject Revelation and the teaching of the Church. On this topic E. Stein writes: faith is darkness for human reason, and is a „going beyond all conceptually intelligible particularized knowledge unto the simple comprehension of the one truth. Faith therefore is to divine wisdom deeper than any philosophical or even theological knowledge and science. But because it is difficult to go forward in the dark, every ray of light that pierces our night gives us a glimpse of the future brightness and is therefore an invaluable aid in keeping us from going astray. And

correct and decent when it proceeds in accordance with God's principles. The point is that each marital sexual relation should be inwardly justified, because without justice one can not talk about the union of persons in love. Marital sexual relation cannot lead to the level of usefulness but must be adapted to the objective requirements of the personalistic norm. This issue discloses the huge aspect of responsibility for love.

V.

Man and woman united in marital sexual life are in the order of nature; yet „nature” not understood as „biological order”, but as the order of existence and procreation. The word „procreation” indicates that the order of nature aims at reproduction by way of the sexual life. Therefore, the unity of persons in the sexual relation by its very nature, from its essence, is unification in relation to procreation. In the marital life of spouses two orders converge: the order of nature and the personalistic order. The order of nature aims at reproduction, and the personal order finds its expression in the love of persons and aims at the fullest realization of this love. These two orders cannot be separated (Wojtyła 1981, p. 226). „In the animal world there is only reproduction, which is achieved by way of instinct. In that world there are no persons, hence there is no personalistic norm to proclaim the principle of love. In the world of persons on the other hand instinct alone decides nothing, and the sexual urge passes, so to speak, through the gates of the

thus even the feeble light of natural reason may render good service. A *Christian philosophy* will regard it as its noblest task to prepare the way for supernatural faith... [This is] the only way of finding some common ground with unbelieving thinkers... Unbelievers have no good reason to distrust the findings of Christian philosophy on the grounds that it uses as a standard of measurement not only the ultimate truths of reason but also the truths of faith. No one prevents them from applying the criterion of reason in full stringency and from rejecting everything that does not measure up to it. They may also freely decide whether they want to go further and take account of those findings which have been gained with the aid of revelation. In this case they will accept the truths of faith not as 'theses' (as do believers) but only as 'hypotheses'. But as to whether or not the conclusions at which both arrive are in accord with the truths of reason, there prevails again a standard of measurement which both sides have in common. Unbelieving thinkers may then calmly consider whether or not they find themselves able to make their own synthesis which results for Christian philosophers from the two sources of reason and revelation. And unbelievers must judge for themselves whether by accepting this additional knowledge they may perhaps gain a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of that which is. They will at any rate not shrink back from such an attempt if they are really as unbiased as, according to their own conviction, genuine philosophers ought to be". (Stein 2002, pp. 28-29).

consciousness and the will, thus furnishing not merely the conditions of fertility but also the raw material of love. At a truly human, truly personal level the problems of procreation and of love cannot be resolved separately. Both procreation and love are based on the conscious choice of a person. When a man and a woman consciously and of their own free will choose at the same time the possibility of sex, they *choose to participate in creation* (for that is the proper meaning of the world of procreation). And it is only when they do so that they put their sexual relationship within the framework of marriage on a truly personal level." (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 226-227).

In this way we reached the issue of parenthood; parenthood as the quintessence of both nature and love. Nature aims at reproduction. Etymologically the word „nature” is derived from the Latin term *nascor* = „to be born”, and *natus* = „born”. Reproduction joins with biological fertility. A human being, however, is a personalistic entity; hence, in this case the fact of becoming a father or a mother has not only a natural but also a personalistic meaning. Thus, in such an act are involved both consciousness and a free choice of the free will. Because love is realized in the marital life, i.e., an act on the personalistic level, so in love „a place” must be found for parenthood. Therefore the sexual life is completed only when it contains the acceptance of the possibility of parenthood. Without this their mutual relation can not be justified; it would be outright unjust. When rejecting the order of parenthood it is impossible to talk about a personalistic order within the domain of marital life. Instead of a true personalistic unity it would be no more than sexual union, without full personalistic value. It would be based only on the value of „sex”, not on the value of the person so instead of love we would say at the very most that it is a relation of mutual usefulness. In a marital relation, in which a wife and a husband entirely refuse to accept that „I can be a father” and „I can be a mother”, when they exclude parenthood, there appears the danger that their marital relationship is based only on utility without any affirmation of the value of the person.

We encounter here a question: by appealing to nature do we not oppose it? Do we not want to rule over it? An attempt at such reasoning can not be successful. For in speaking about the submission of nature to the person we mean only recognizing and adjusting to its internal dynamics. Other attitudes regarding nature are violations of nature. To take possession of nature can only be accomplished by recognizing its *rights* and its teleology; this is the only way to *use* its hidden possibilities.

Such a violation of nature can take place also in the domain of the sexual life of spouses. It happens when they do not follow the demands of the teleology of the nature of sexual relations; they do not observe the law of

nature that rules the sexual impulse. A human being when violating nature violates the person too because in such a case he or she makes of another an object of use instead an object of love (Wojtyła 1981, pp. 227-229). From such general rules we can easily derive particular moral qualifications referring to the concrete behaviors constituting the entirety of marital and family life, but on this issue there are many works. Yet, to conclude our essay with a clear suggestion let us repeat the instructions given by Husserl's student – Edith Stein. She writes, that a solid bulwark against pathology in marriage „can only be a clear and incontestable proven concept of marriage. We have such a clear and incontestable substantiation solely in Catholic dogma which views marriage as a sacrament and begetting and upbringing of progeny as its essential purpose (Stein 1996, p. 150). The foundation for all of these should be the true love of spouses.

References

- Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1994, Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
Wojtyła K., *Love and Responsibility*, 1981, trans., H. T. Willetts, London: Collins.
Stein E., *Finite and Eternal Being: an Attempt at an Ascent to the Meaning of Being*, 2002, trans. K. F. Reinhardt, Washington: D.C.: ICS Publications.
Stein E., *Essays on Woman*, 1996, trans. by Freda Mary Oben, Washington: D.C.: ICS Publications.

Copyright of Forum Philosophicum: International Journal for Philosophy is the property of Forum Philosophicum and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.