

## MARRIAGE ANNULMENTS

The annulments performed by the Church are never accepted as valid by the state. If you need a state annulment you have to get one even if you have had a church annulment. And the state and the Church will differ in their criteria of how a marriage can be deemed invalid. So the Church performs marriages following annulment that are not recognised as valid by the state. It is utter hypocrisy of the Church to say that marriage is important for protecting relationships and children when the marriage is not protected by the law.

The Church rewards you for forcing somebody to marry you, for marrying in a register office for not having full sex with the spouse and for not meaning the vows with a second chance to wed. The marriage is declared a fiction with only a Catholic marriage in a Catholic Church being considered real. Belief in divorce is an impediment to marriage.

### ANNULMENTS IN DEPTH

The Catholic Church forbids divorce and remarriage between two people who have been baptised. It permits divorce and remarriage when people are not baptised and if one person in a marriage is baptised and the other is not.

An annulment is a declaration that a marriage never really took place but only looked as if it did. It leaves at least one partner free to marry. Annulments are so common and they are granted with perturbing generosity to very wealthy people that many of them are really just divorces under another name.

Annulments in principle weaken all marriages. Though Church or state authorities evaluate if a marriage is really null and void or valid, ultimately only the "husband" and "wife" can decide that. They are interviewed during the investigation process. That only proves the point.

Annulments are a big source of scandal in the Roman Catholic Church. Annulments have become back-door divorce in a faith that claims to hold that marriage is indissoluble or cannot be ended except by death. The only difference is that annulments are worse than divorce. They deny that there was a real marriage and that the children were legitimate and require lots more mud slinging than a divorce would demand. It is easier to give grounds for divorce than it is for an annulment.

It is hormones and unrealism that do the talking when marriage vows are made. Marriages based on emotion can hardly be said to be valid. It is the emotion that is making the couple think they will adore one another for life. But the feeling of love can disappear easily and frequently turns into hate and misery. To marry because of how you feel about the person is not the same as marrying for the person.

The Church grants an annulment if it can be found that one partner didn't mean the marriage vows. If a partner was having a secret affair with the love of their life and marrying somebody else, the Church will accept that as evidence that the marriage was null and void and proceed with annulling the marriage.

Catholics teach that God is to be of supreme importance to you and not your wife or husband. God is only a theory. If you love a theory more than your wife or husband then obviously the marriage is real. No genuine Catholic marriage can be valid. Every Catholic marriage should be annulled by the state.

The Church says that you must have sex only within a valid marriage. The reason is that sex is supposed to be telling the person you sleep with that you want them entirely and give your whole self. The Church pretends to believe this. The Church says a spouse who is in a state of grave sin can't give themselves to anybody.

Also, if you really give yourself that much then how can you agree with the Church that marriage ends with death? Why not agree with the Mormons that marriage can last for all eternity?

If you tell somebody by having sex that you will spend all your life with them, and Pope John Paul II says you do, then it follows that you have to marry the first person you have sex with.

When somebody suffers, the Church says you have the right to believe in God and say that this is God's will. Naturally, truth has rights. You would have the right to hurt a person's feelings for the truth. But an atheist would never condone the ways of God. The atheist will simply say that the suffering is awful and they want to help it.

How could any marriage be real when it is easy to feel now that you want somebody for life? You are blinding yourself to

the fact that people change over time and that your feelings can change to hatred just like that. You simply can't promise to care for anybody as your husband or wife forever because your feelings are not perfectly under your control and never will be.

Rights are based on needs. Marriage is not really a need - it is not a right. Cohabitors prove that.

Today, marriages between Catholics are only considered valid if they take place before a priest or authorised representative of the Catholic Church and before two witnesses. This was brought in to stop the very common practice of clandestine marriages and couples were living together claiming they made their vows to one another without any witnesses. Such marriages were considered valid but it was decided to regulate things more carefully. It is only since the Council of Trent in the seventeenth century that the Church has had the present rules about validity. The Church claimed the power to change the requirements for a valid marriage. If the Church has no such power, then it follows that there are loads of marriages taking place in Churches when the couples are already married to other people. So the Church weddings are invalid. People still make clandestine vows and they are forgotten when the relationship breaks down. Most Catholics have little or no belief in the ability of the Church to validate or invalidate marriages. Thus they cannot trust the Church to annul. They could get invalid annulments.

Annulments are given on the assumption that marriage is nothing more than a couple of vows that only becoming binding with a single sex act even though all believe that marriage only starts with the vows. All believe that you do not say them once and for all but you live them and express them through your marriage. So the husband and wife are making the vows by sign-language all the days of their lives. The living together is actually then far more important and binding and deep than the vows. So logically even if the marriage vows were not meant the marriage could still become real without them for the vows are repeated anew every minute of marriage and are as valid as wedding vows made by a deaf-mute though nothing is said.

Annulments are granted if it was found the parties didn't mean the marriage vows in some way. But when you make a will nobody worries about your mental state when you made the will as long as you were known to be in your right mind after and didn't do anything about the will or fix it. Marriage is like making a will without thinking of death but of life. What you sign to get yourself recognised as a competent driver after your driving test is far more important than marriage. Bad driving kills but marriage doesn't. And nobody cares if you knew what you were doing when you signed it or not. You could have signed it in a haze of stress after the test.

The Church says that sex is one person giving the gift of themselves to another and so it expresses the giving of ones life to another forever. Vows then cannot express marriage or binding together as well as sex can. A last will and testament is no good to you until the person who left you everything dies. The Church should regard sex as causing a marriage not vows. The Church doesn't wish to do that because that would require it to hold that you are married to the person who first takes your virginity. That would mean that nearly every marriage ceremony in the world is a fake and also that if a man loses his virginity to a man they are married! If sex does what the Church says it does, then these conclusions are correct.

The rules of the Church about the vows not being binding if the bride was drugged or if she was on the rebound are based on the idea that marriage is caused by the vows. This contradicts the Church doctrine that the marriage didn't happen in reality if no sex took place after it - say for example the groom died of alcohol poisoning before making it to the marriage bed. In that case, it is the sex matters and the vows only create a potential marriage not a real one. The Church just invents silly rules for it seeks control over marriage. Witnesses to the sex are more important than witnesses to the wedding ceremony but the Church has never required anybody to stand and watch the bride and groom having sex. Yet the Church holds that a wedding is invalid if unsuitable witnesses are chosen for you need at least two proper witnesses. If the witnesses are no good then there is no need for them.

A marriage between two people who mean it more than anybody ever meant it is considered invalid if there are no witnesses! A marriage with a little love is valid as long as there are two witnesses! This is evidently more concerned about law than protecting love! Marriage is nonsense if the witnesses are that important. If they are needed, then why are marriages considered valid even if the witnesses were on drugs or were insane?

The Church doesn't check that the witnesses are under pressure, drunk, on drugs, insane etc. What hypocrisy and deception surrounds the Church teaching on marriage! Feminists suspect that marriage is about patriarchal control, men seeking control over women. No wonder with all the lies and hypocrisies that the Church endorses and embraces in regard to marriage.

If a country forbids a couple who got a Church annulment to remarry the Church tells them to get a divorce. So the Church while claiming to forbid divorce takes advantage of the state allowing it. So much for wanting marriage protected from divorce! The Church says that the priest does not give the sacrament of marriage but that the bride and groom give it to each other. It is impossible to see how they could really intend to give a sacrament when marriage as propounded by the Church is full of deceit and hypocrisy and it is actually an insult to ones partner to contract marriage under its laws. The

annulment laws of the Church make it impossible for you to know if you are really marrying anybody or not. If you don't know, then you are not really giving yourself in the wedding ceremony in marriage for life. You are giving yourself until annulment us do part.

A marriage that isn't consummated is said to be incomplete. So says the Church which should admit that it doesn't think there is a marriage until its consummated. Strange that you need witnesses for the ceremony but they are not required at the consummation which is when marriage actually takes place! It is like saying you should have an employee promise to do a good job in front of witnesses but that he doesn't have to be observed during the first day at work! That shows you are putting ceremony before commonsense and are not really concerned about his performance or dedication at all. The Church cares more about ceremonies than the people involved.

The Church pounces on non-consummation as an excuse for giving out annulments when the marriage act hasn't taken place. But what marriage is complete? No marriage is complete all the time. A marriage seems to cease being complete when the husband and wife stop having sex. A marriage seems incomplete when there are no children. A marriage seems incomplete if the wife goes insane days after the wedding and has to go the asylum for the rest of her life. The point is, why should the incompleteness signified by non-consummation be singled out as grounds for annulment?

What about a marriage that was consumed but in which the husband never ejaculated or didn't love his wife enough when it happened?

The Church says that sex should always end with the man ejaculating inside his wife's vagina. The Church allows different sexual positions. It lets the husband and wife decide how they will have sex as long as they do not use contraception and the sex ends with the penis ejaculating in the wife's vagina. It seems that if the husband does not have an orgasm inside his wife then the marriage is not consumed until he does. The Church sets up a criteria of morality that is based on biology and not love. The result is that the husband and wife consume marriage but they do not consummate their love! Marriage is about law and not love. In Catholicism, it is about clerical power.

Why stop with saying the husband must ejaculate in his wife's vagina to consummate the marriage? Why not say that the wife must have an orgasm with him just as he has his orgasm? Marriage proclaims that the Church should have the right to discriminate against men who can't have orgasms. No wonder the vast majority of marriages result in the male acting superior to the female and in the past wives were mere slaves of their husband.

The Church says that the language of sex is that you wish to be with the person you have sex with forever. It says that is the message sex communicates. If sex does that then ejaculation does that even more. The Church says it is a sin for the man to withdraw from the woman to ejaculate outside her. If the purpose of this is that the man prefers to do it and not to avoid conception then it is still a sin. The Church says the withdrawal turns the sex into a lie. The Church reasons that man declares by sex that he wants his woman completely and then he contradicts this by not giving her his seed. Teaching such as this imply that it is a sin for a man to have sex if he cannot ejaculate.

The Church does nothing to stop weddings when one partner is definitely a bit innocent or retarded and all ministers have performed such weddings. This is incredible for surely it is better to halt an invalid marriage than to let it happen and torment everyone and empty their pockets in the process of declaring the marriage null?

You can get an annulment for not intending to have children when you got married. This implies that it is not enough to consume a marriage. Conception must take place before the marriage can be considered valid.

The Church encourages a couple to seek an annulment if they split up. A holy religion would make them go through the procedure when their marriage was strong to make sure they were really married. The attitude she instils is, "I don't mind if my marriage is unreal and if it is fake I don't want to know unless we decide to part". This is no less than intending to commit fornication to make the "wife" an unmarried mother and a cohabiter rather than a wife. So, the Church suffocates real love between husband and wife.

The annulment doctrine is a great way for the Church to make money. It means that it is your duty to look for an annulment and spend a fortune trying to get it, if your marriage breaks down so that you can get a new partner and please God by identifying your marriage as a fake and not a true sacrament which is important for God wants us to be clear in such things for the sacraments are of supreme importance.

The Church keeps its reasons for annulling a marriage secret. What if an annulment needs to be appealed? There is no appeals procedure in place. At least with divorce you can judge if the persons should have been granted a divorce decree for all is laid bare. The secrecy allows the Church to do what it wants and we do have seen cases where the Church annulled marriages under dubious circumstances for the rich and famous. An annulment is a declaration that no marriage took place for the husband or wife didn't really intended properly to get married so what does this say about ordinations? Why not

allow some of them to be annulled as well? Its all exploitation and political manipulation. Annulments are mostly backdoor divorces and especially as the Church takes care to make sure the couple knows what they are doing and getting into before they get married (pre-marriage courses, meetings with the priest who will be officiating at the wedding etc.). They are dishonesty.

Dubious psychological grounds for granting an annulment are accepted despite the modern realisation that psychologists cannot be trusted except up to a point. For example, the Church accepts the bleat, "I wasn't a very mature person when I married", as justification for annulling a marriage if it seems to be the truth. People marry because of their feelings more than anything else. If their partner grew seventy years older overnight just before the wedding the wedding would soon be called off. Feelings change. They can disappear through time. A person can and will change and how you can feel about that person will also change. When marriage is so deeply based on how the pair feel now it is obvious that they are deceiving themselves by promising to love one another for life. No marriage could really be valid.

The Church has annulled lots of marriages and has won infamy for doing so for it is clear that it can annul nearly any marriage when it puts its mind to it. The disagreement about the grounds for annulment that exists in the world of lawyers and theologians is frightening. No marriage is safe. Can anybody be blamed for wondering if they are married at all? The married couple may know best if their marriage should be annulled so it seems there is nothing to stop them ending the marriage even without a church declaration of nullity.

The pope, Benedict XVI, has condemned annulment tribunals for being too generous in doling out annulments. Then why doesn't he set up a commission to examine their work and overturn some of these annulments?

If marriages can be annulled then annulments can be invalidated as well!

There is so much harmful and discriminatory nonsense taught by the Catholic Church in relation to marriage. People who teach absurd morals have no right to expect people to assume they are sincere. They should prove their sincerity by doing heroic good works. For example, if you are a priest or nun and encourage people to believe that it is better to catch killer sexually transmitted diseases than to protect with condoms, then if you are sincere you will be among the people who suffer the consequences of your doctrine helping them. The pope does nothing and lives in grandeur so we should do the decent thing and brand him as a bigoted despicable old hypocrite.

## APOSTASY

It is Catholic teaching that a Catholic who apostasises from the faith cannot contract a Catholic marriage. Apostasy is an impediment to marriage because the sacrament belongs to the people and a spouse who weds a secret apostate is being fooled by thinking she or he is marrying a real Catholic. [Decretals of Gregory IX, IV, title 19, vi; (Friedberg, II, p. 722).

## CONCLUSION

Annulments are backdoor divorce and those Catholics who approve of them and then wail about how marriage isn't sacred any more need to be shown their hypocrisy.