

## CATHOLIC MARRIAGE LAW PROVES BAPTISMAL INITIATION IS A SHAM

As an entity that is about social prestige and influence, it is not surprising that the Catholic Church does not really care if parents don't take baptismal commitments seriously and come along with a child for baptism. This is a rite of initiation into the Church. It confers rules on the child. It supposedly makes the baby a member of the Church.

It takes little thought to see that baptism confers pretend membership of the Church on a baby. You cannot make a baby a member of a sports club so why would you think a baby can be made a member of the Church?

And if the baby is inclined to rebel against God from conception as the Church says and needs baptism to heal this trait, surely you are forcing your will on the baby by baptising it or having it baptised? If the baby had a choice it would most probably choose what is called evil by the Church - namely a normal life that doesn't worry much about God or popes or what the Bible says. In other words, it doesn't want baptism for it doesn't want to be healed.

Baptism religiously speaking is a more important step than marriage. Yet if a child weds the wedding will be considered to be invalid because the child didn't fully understand what she or he was doing. So how can we recognise a baptism if the child chooses to be baptised without fully understanding it? Religious people will feel uncomfortable at the thought of a child validly choosing baptism so why do they feel okay about a baby being baptised? Christian teaching regards the enforced baptism of a child from seven upwards as invalid. "If an adult lack the intention of receiving the sacrament, he must be rebaptized. But if there be doubt about this, the form to be used should be: "If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee." See Summa, Question 68, Article 7. Whether the intention of receiving the sacrament of Baptism is required on the part of the one baptized?

The claim that the baby is not forced into God's kingdom for it cannot care one way or the other is strange in the light of the Christian doctrine of original sin that we all have an innate opposition to God that we must fight all our lives.

It is hideous to say that God's grace is needed to get you into Heaven and this grace corrects the moral and spiritual defects in you and that receptivity to grace is administered to babies in baptism. This is clearly forced conversion where the child is anti-God by default and then forced to be receptive by baptism. The implication is that the force is justifiable for the baby is so bad.

Religionists often say they get their babies baptised but will not force the religion on the child though they will try and influence the child to live up to the baptism and believe what baptism obligates the child to believe. If they are really concerned about treating the child fairly, if they really believe the child should decide when old enough, then it must be wrong to impose a religion on that child to give that child the bother of perhaps renouncing the religion later on! They claim that baptism confers an obligation on the child to believe and obey the faith that baptises it. They are making out that if a child rejects the baptism or church membership that the child is letting them down and breaking loyalty and has no sense of duty to the faith. They are urging the child to live up to the baptism on pain of sin and everlasting torment in Hell. In other words, they are acting like spiritual bullies. They are bigoted.

The law in many countries allows transgender people to legally change the gender stated on their birth certificate to the gender they believe themselves to be. Clearly there is a right to have your baptism to be declared to be a farce. One must be allowed to have it declared invalid and not a true baptism. Transgender people have the right to change birth certificates so we have the right to have baptismal certificates declared useless. We have a right to declare that we were never validly baptised and were never made true Catholics.

You can be validly initiated into a political group against your will - but only in a legal sense. This initiation is only a social or legal construct. It is not a true initiation unless your heart is in it. It is just like we have to legally pretend that a marriage still exists when the husband and wife hate each other. When they get a divorce we can stop pretending. We need the pretending to make life smoother. We can't declare a marriage over or at least temporarily non-existent every time the husband and wife fall out - though it is true! Our social and legal constructions involve pretending. It would be mad to say that God needs to pretend that a baby is a Catholic just because we have to pretend that a man and woman are married though they hate each other. It would be insulting him!

You might receive a provisional or assumed initiation at baptism as a baby but it doesn't become real until you grow up and accept it. And naturally if you can accept it, you can reverse this acceptance as well. You can undo the initiation.

Roman Catholic Canon law enshrines some important principles of justice in relation to marriage. These principles show that despite itself, Church law can be used to declare infant baptism invalid. My comments are in italics.

Canon 1095.1 The following are incapable of contracting marriage:

Canon 1095.1.1 those who lack sufficient use of reason;

Canon 1095.1.2 those who suffer from a grave lack of discretionary judgement concerning the essential matrimonial rights and obligations to be mutually given and accepted;

Canon 1095.1.3 those who, because of causes of a psychological nature, are unable to assume the essential obligations of marriage.

COMMENT: If a person cannot understand the duties of marriage, then the marriage is invalid. Why? Because consent was not given properly. Baptism then is invalid and does not initiate babies into the faith. The baby is unable to assume the essential obligations of church membership. The baby cannot pray for example.

Canon 1096.1 For matrimonial consent to exist, it is necessary that the contracting parties be at least not ignorant of the fact that marriage is a permanent partnership between a man and a woman, ordered to the procreation of children through some form of sexual cooperation.

Canon 1097.2 Error about a quality of the person, even though it be the reason for the contract, does not render a marriage invalid unless this quality is directly and principally intended.

Canon 1098 A person contracts invalidly who enters marriage inveigled by deceit, perpetrated in order to secure consent, concerning some quality of the other party, which of its very nature can seriously disrupt the partnership of conjugal life.

COMMENT: Baptism is marrying God and Jesus Christ. It is marrying them not just until death like in marriage but marrying them for all time and all eternity. The Church however seeks to wed people to its perception of God and Jesus regardless of whether this is the real God or Jesus or not. Under this canon then, even adult baptism cannot be valid - so how could infant baptism be valid? It would be more invalid if that were possible!

Also, we can see that God should wipe all babies of original sin instead of restricting this favour only to babies that are baptised. Nobody can honestly say they want to be married to a God like that. Their consent is really pretence.

Christians continually chant how we must love the sinner and hate the sin. Without that doctrine there is no point in having religion. And it would follow that God does not love all people. This is really saying you must hate the sinner while not admitting it. If they separate the sin from the sinner they are pretending that the sinner is not responsible for the sin. They don't really believe this for they say that when a good person does wrong that they have seen another side to that person! In other words, they admit that there is no such thing as sin really but only sinful persons. Sin describes what a person has become, it describes their character. The hypocrisy that is intrinsic to Christianity and the pretending they do that God loves sinners and hates sins shows that any consent to accept that faith is invalid.

Canon 1099 Provided it does not determine the will, error concerning the unity or the indissolubility or the sacramental dignity of marriage does not vitiate matrimonial consent.

COMMENT: This is saying that you can be validly married if you believe in divorce or that marriage is not a sacrament as long as you intend your marriage to be for life. If you marry intending to divorce after a few years then the marriage is invalid. If a sin a child never committed, original sin, can keep that child away from God, imagine what a deliberate and serious sin would do? It practically speaking is a declaration of independence from God and making the baptism useless as long as you persist in sin. If you consent to be baptised intending to defile that baptism and undo its power later, surely the baptism must be invalid. If it is valid, then the canon is wrong and marriage is valid if a person intends to stay married only for a while.

Canon 1102.1 Marriage cannot be validly contracted subject to a condition concerning the future.

COMMENT: If you marry saying that you will only stay married if the partner stays healthy and if she or he gets sick you will divorce them then the marriage is invalid. If you take on membership of the Church, the only way to do this properly is by holding that you want to be a member of the true faith and the best religion. So your taking it on has to be conditional on whether or not the Church is the true Church. Baptism, especially when given to a baby who can't know what to expect from the faith, is invalid for it has to be a conditional commitment. It needs to be about marrying God for all time and all eternity and it is not! The most important doctrine of the faith is that we are to love sinners as ourselves for the sake of God and to hate sins for God does so. Nobody really wants to do this for it means you will have to suffer as much as your neighbour when you see him or her hurt and will additionally have to endure the agony of seeing your God so disrespected. This would make life a misery. The consent to become part of the faith is invalid. Nobody genuinely accepts their baptism.

Baptism is useless for in relation to babies, it is an attempt at forced conversion.

Canon 1103 A marriage is invalid which was entered into by reason of force or of grave fear imposed from outside, even if not purposely, from which the person has no escape other than by choosing marriage.

COMMENT: Christians fear that bad things will happen their baby if it is not baptised and the unbaptised baby will be cut off from God forever if it dies. This is the strongest threat possible. Baptism cannot be valid for its purpose is to redeem the child from the consequences of sin and the sure and certain eternal exclusion from the presence of God. Thus it is based on fear.

Canon 1105.4 If the mandator revokes the mandate, or becomes insane, before the proxy contracts in his or her name, the marriage is invalid, even though the proxy or the other contracting party is unaware of the fact.

COMMENT: The mandator is the person who can't be at the wedding and who has to be married by proxy. If he or she becomes insane at the time of the wedding, the wedding is null and void even if the proxy and the bride or groom think there are no problems and the mandator is deemed sane by them. An insane person has more powers of consent than a baby! So we are to believe that baby baptism is valid despite the absence of consent.

If insanity invalidates a marriage when the vows are taken the marriage does not happen in reality though it may look as if it has. A baptism ceremony can take place but it is possible that the person may not be really validly baptised.

The law of the state says that you need to be able to consummate the marriage to contract a valid marriage. A marriage contract then is valid when the man and woman can consummate but what if the man has an accident on the way home with his bride to the marital bed and his penis is severed? The state will annul the marriage but if a contract has been made we can see that this is not the annulment it is pretended to be but actually a divorce! The Church will annul the marriage as well. So if that is okay then there should be baptismal annulments as well!

Canon 1107 Even if a marriage has been entered into invalidly by reason of an impediment or defect of form, the consent given is presumed to persist until its withdrawal has been established.

COMMENT: If you are to assume that a doubtful marriage is real, then you are to assume that a doubtful baptism may be real too. But at least it is admitted that the baptism may not be valid.

Canon 1086.1 A marriage is invalid when one of the two persons was baptised in the Catholic Church or received into it and has not by a formal act defected from it, and the other was not baptised.

COMMENT: A religion that claims the right to deny that somebody's marriage was real and which denies it just for the sake of it cannot complain if atheists or critics dismiss its baptisms as invalid. Indeed the Church would have to encourage them to do this - you are to encourage people to obey their own consciences. You can't claim to love the sinner and hate the sins when you come up with unnecessary sins!

If you get confirmation when you are asleep, the rite has to be repeated for you were asleep. You can't get communion, you can't get confession, you can't get ordained, you can't get any sacrament barring baptism unless you are awake. With extreme unction, if you pass into a coma before you are anointed, the sacrament will not work if you went into the coma set against the idea of being anointed. So it depends on what your state of mind was before you passed into the coma. So consent is still necessary for it. So you need to give consent to get a sacrament and so its a violation of your rights if you can't give it and are granted the sacrament. If it is a violation to give you a sacrament without your conscious consent at the moment of the rite imagine how big a violation baptism of a baby is.

Extreme unction is an exception for it is a sacrament for the sick or dying and so one might not be conscious. But it still requires your consent though, just that your conscious consent is unnecessary if you can't give it. Baptism violates the rights of the baby. It cares not a whit for consent. It cares even less when it can be given when the baby is asleep. At least if the child was awake it would be closer to the power to make consent.

FINALLY: No canon decrees that baptism binds Catholics to Church Law. Canon Law merely assumes it. No canon says that Protestants are exempt from Canon Law though their baptism engrafts them into Jesus' Church. But it is taken for granted that they are exempt until they formally enter the Catholic Church. You could say Protestants think they are Protestants and don't realise they are Roman Catholics and bound to Roman Catholic law. The Church doesn't say that which amounts to a denial that baptism really confers membership in Catholicism. It is not fair to class a baby as Catholic for being baptised in the Church of Rome and Protestant if baptised in say a Presbyterian Church. An unfair law is to be opposed and disobeyed. Thus Catholics are not made Roman Catholics in reality or legally.

Also, suppose Canon Law did decree that baptism makes you a subject of the Pope in Roman Catholicism. This is based on the assumption that Roman Catholicism is the only Church that the sacrament of baptism really belongs to and the Church it is really meant for. If Roman Catholicism is not the only Church authorised by Christ then the Canon is invalidated.

## CANON LAW SHOWS INFANT BAPTISM TO MAKE A CHILD A CHRISTIAN CANNOT DO IT

Baptism confers pretend membership of the Church on a baby. You cannot treat a baby as an assumed member never mind a member. You cannot make a baby a member of a sports club so why would you think a baby can be made a member of the Church? And if the baby is inclined to rebel against God from conception as the Church says and needs baptism to heal this trait, surely you are forcing your will on the baby by baptising it or having it baptised? If the baby had a choice it would most probably choose what is called evil by the Church - namely a normal life that doesn't worry much about God or popes or what the Bible says. In other words, it doesn't want baptism for it doesn't want to be healed.

If enrolling your baby in the gym cannot make it a true member of the gym but only a nominal or pretend one, surely trying to enrol him or her in the Church is far sillier if it is true that our nature is to live without God? It is really down to a refusal to accept anybody as a person, they have to be accepted as a Catholic.

Church law in principle accidentally affirms that the membership is not real.

Roman Catholic Canon law enshrines some important principles of justice in relation to marriage. These principles show that despite itself, Church law can be used to declare infant baptism invalid. My comments are in italics.

Canon 1095.1 The following are incapable of contracting marriage:

Canon 1095.1.1 those who lack sufficient use of reason;

Canon 1095.1.2 those who suffer from a grave lack of discretionary judgement concerning the essential matrimonial rights and obligations to be mutually given and accepted;

Canon 1095.1.3 those who, because of causes of a psychological nature, are unable to assume the essential obligations of marriage.

COMMENT: If a person cannot understand the duties of marriage, then the marriage is invalid. Why? Because consent was not given properly. Baptism then is invalid and does not initiate babies into the faith. The baby is unable to assume the essential obligations of church membership. The baby cannot pray for example.

Canon 1096.1 For matrimonial consent to exist, it is necessary that the contracting parties be at least not ignorant of the fact that marriage is a permanent partnership between a man and a woman, ordered to the procreation of children through some form of sexual cooperation.

Canon 1097.2 Error about a quality of the person, even though it be the reason for the contract, does not render a marriage invalid unless this quality is directly and principally intended.

Canon 1098 A person contracts invalidly who enters marriage inveigled by deceit, perpetrated in order to secure consent, concerning some quality of the other party, which of its very nature can seriously disrupt the partnership of conjugal life.

COMMENT: Baptism is marrying God and Jesus Christ. It is marrying them not just until death like in marriage but marrying them for all time and all eternity. The Church however seeks to wed people to its perception of God and Jesus regardless of whether this is the real God or Jesus or not. Under this canon then, even adult baptism cannot be valid - so how could infant baptism be valid? It would be more invalid if that were possible!

Also, we can see that God should wipe all babies of original sin instead of restricting this favour only to babies that are baptised. Nobody can honestly say they want to be married to a God like that. Their consent is really pretence.

Christians continually chant how we must love the sinner and hate the sin. Without that doctrine there is no point in having religion. And it would follow that God does not love all people. This is really saying you must hate the sinner while not admitting it. If they separate the sin from the sinner they are pretending that the sinner is not responsible for the sin. They don't really believe this for they say that when a good person does wrong that they have seen another side to that person! In other words, they admit that there is no such thing as sin really but only sinful persons. Sin describes what a person has become, it describes their character. The hypocrisy that is intrinsic to Christianity and the pretending they do that God loves sinners and hates sins shows that any consent to accept that faith is invalid.

Canon 1099 Provided it does not determine the will, error concerning the unity or the indissolubility or the sacramental dignity of marriage does not vitiate matrimonial consent.

COMMENT: This is saying that you can be validly married if you believe in divorce or that marriage is not a sacrament as long as you intend your marriage to be for life. If you marry intending to divorce after a few years then the marriage is invalid. If a sin a child never committed, original sin, can keep that child away from God, imagine what a deliberate and serious sin would do? It practically speaking is a declaration of independence from God and making the baptism useless as long as you persist in sin. If you consent to be baptised intending to defile that baptism and undo its power later, surely the baptism must be invalid. If it is valid, then the canon is wrong and marriage is valid if a person intends to stay married only for a while.

Canon 1102.1 Marriage cannot be validly contracted subject to a condition concerning the future.

COMMENT: If you marry saying that you will only stay married if the partner stays healthy and if she or he gets sick you will divorce them then the marriage is invalid. If you take on membership of the Church, the only way to do this properly is by holding that you want to be a member of the true faith and the best religion. So your taking it on has to be conditional on whether or not the Church is the true Church. Baptism, especially when given to a baby who can't know what to expect from the faith, is invalid for it has to be a conditional commitment. It needs to be about marrying God for all time and all eternity and it is not! The most important doctrine of the faith is that we are to love sinners as ourselves for the sake of God and to hate sins for God does so. Nobody really wants to do this for it means you will have to suffer as much as your neighbour when you see him or her hurt and will additionally have to endure the agony of seeing your God so disrespected. This would make life a misery. The consent to become part of the faith is invalid. Nobody genuinely accepts their baptism. Baptism is useless for in relation to babies, it is an attempt at forced conversion.

Canon 1103 A marriage is invalid which was entered into by reason of force or of grave fear imposed from outside, even if not purposely, from which the person has no escape other than by choosing marriage.

COMMENT: Christians fear that bad things will happen their baby if it is not baptised and the unbaptised baby will be cut off from God forever if it dies. This is the strongest threat possible. Baptism cannot be valid for its purpose is to redeem the child from the consequences of sin and the sure and certain eternal exclusion from the presence of God. Thus it is based on fear.

Canon 1105.4 If the mandator revokes the mandate, or becomes insane, before the proxy contracts in his or her name, the marriage is invalid, even though the proxy or the other contracting party is unaware of the fact.

COMMENT: The mandator is the person who can't be at the wedding and who has to be married by proxy. If he or she becomes insane at the time of the wedding, the wedding is null and void even if the proxy and the bride or groom think there are no problems and the mandator is deemed sane by them. An insane person has more powers of consent than a baby! So we are to believe that baby baptism is valid despite the absence of consent.

If insanity invalidates a marriage when the vows are taken the marriage does not happen in reality though it may look as if it has. A baptism ceremony can take place but it is possible that the person may not be really validly baptised.

The law of the state says that you need to be able to consume the marriage to contract a valid marriage. A marriage contract then is valid when the man and woman can consummate but what if the man has an accident on the way home with his bride to the marital bed and his penis is severed? The state will annul the marriage but if a contract has been made we can see that this is not the annulment it is pretended to be but actually a divorce! The Church will annul the marriage as well. So if that is okay then there should be baptismal annulments as well!

Canon 1107 Even if a marriage has been entered into invalidly by reason of an impediment or defect of form, the consent given is presumed to persist until its withdrawal has been established.

COMMENT: If you are to assume that a doubtful marriage is real, then you are to assume that a doubtful baptism may be real too. But at least it is admitted that the baptism may not be valid.

Canon 1086.1 A marriage is invalid when one of the two persons was baptised in the Catholic Church or received into it and has not by a formal act defected from it, and the other was not baptised.

COMMENT: A religion that claims the right to deny that somebody's marriage was real and which denies it just for the sake of it cannot complain if atheists or critics dismiss its baptisms as invalid. Indeed the Church would have to encourage them to do this - you are to encourage people to obey their own consciences. You can't claim to love the sinner and hate the sins when you come up with unnecessary sins!

If you get confirmation when you are asleep, the rite has to be repeated for you were asleep. You can't get communion, you

can't get confession, you can't get ordained, you can't get any sacrament barring baptism unless you are awake. With extreme unction, if you pass into a coma before you are anointed, the sacrament will not work if you went into the coma set against the idea of being anointed. So it depends on what your state of mind was before you passed into the coma. So consent is still necessary for it. So you need to give consent to get a sacrament and so its a violation of your rights if you can't give it and are granted the sacrament. If it is a violation to give you a sacrament without your conscious consent at the moment of the rite imagine how big a violation baptism of a baby is.

Extreme unction is an exception for it is a sacrament for the sick or dying and so one might not be conscious. But it still requires your consent though, just that your conscious consent is unnecessary if you can't give it. Baptism violates the rights of the baby. It cares not a whit for consent. It cares even less when it can be given when the baby is asleep. At least if the child was awake it would be closer to the power to make consent.

FINALLY: No canon decrees that baptism binds Catholics to Church Law. Canon Law merely assumes it. No canon says that Protestants are exempt from Canon Law though their baptism engrafts them into Jesus' Church. But it is taken for granted that they are exempt until they formally enter the Catholic Church. You could say Protestants think they are Protestants and don't realise they are Roman Catholics and bound to Roman Catholic law. The Church doesn't say that which amounts to a denial that baptism really confers membership in Catholicism. It is not fair to class a baby as Catholic for being baptised in the Church of Rome and Protestant if baptised in say a Presbyterian Church. An unfair law is to be opposed and disobeyed. Thus Catholics are not made Roman Catholics in reality or legally.

Also, suppose Canon Law did decree that baptism makes you a subject of the Pope in Roman Catholicism. This is based on the assumption that Roman Catholicism is the only Church that the sacrament of baptism really belongs to and the Church it is really meant for. If Roman Catholicism is not the only Church authorised by Christ then the Canon is invalidated. The Church takes away the right to Catholic marriage if you are baptised and become Catholic and commit apostasy or have not repented of apostasy. It is a block to real marriage and gives the spouse the right to separate. Apostasy is reasonable for Catholicism is a false religion.