

## MARRIAGE IMPLIES SEX OUTSIDE MARRIAGE BAD

Marriage is defined by the Christian faith and the state as the lifelong union of one man and one woman for life to the exclusion of any other sexual partners.

Marriage is a man or a woman giving a member of the opposite sex the right to have sex with her or him. As such it casts aspersions on those who live together happily without marriage and to gay relationships for it implies that they have no right to have sex. It picks on them though they are not doing anything wrong. Marriage is pro-discrimination.

The Church says that to have sex outside marriage means you are telling the person you are having sex with, "I am giving you my whole self now. This means I am giving you myself for life." They argue that sex is only suitable for marriage, where a man takes a woman for life as his sexual partner, for outside of marriage it is simply a lie. Sex in marriage then means that the husband is telling his wife that he belongs to nobody but her for life and vice versa.

This is simply utter rubbish.

If sex means you give your whole self then why say that it means you give yourself to your partner for life? Why not eternity? Why should it just be for this life? If you really give your whole self then you give yourself forever.

If sex is giving your whole self to another person then how can it be right to look for a new partner or wife or husband if that person dies? To say I give myself to you until divorce if it happens is putting a condition on it as much as saying I give myself to you until you die is. It is not giving your whole self. If you give your whole self to a person you will be like the person who having lost their beloved wife or husband refuses to even think about a new partner for they loved the old partner so much.

Sex isn't the only way you give yourself to another person. You give yourself to your child when you get pregnant. That doesn't mean you shouldn't have any more babies or that the child should stay with you instead of getting married and going away. When you tell your sweetheart that you love her or him and nobody else and swear undying love are you not giving yourself in a deeper way that sex could ever signify? Because sex is such fun and love is scary and challenging there can be no doubt about that. The closeness of that moment could be closer than sex. Don't you see then the absurdity of the Christian doctrine that sex means you are giving yourself not just now but for life?

When you work you are giving your precious time to your employer and yourself. You could be dead next week and better off having a party instead of working and yet you work. You put the job before the thought that you could be dead and should be living it up in the meantime. Does this giving yourself mean you should work to this person until death?

You could intend a great commitment to a person through sex outside marriage and then when you get married you may feel less committed. Marriage can change relationships. To say that unenthusiastic and unloving sex in marriage is good for it promises and signifies lifelong commitment and that sex between two unmarried people who are really into each other and are soul mates should but does not just because they are not married and so is a lie, is just bigoted cruel insulting nonsense. It is really just saying that there is no honest commitment without a simple ceremony. Did you know that you are insincere when you take out a loan wearing white shoes?

If sex outside marriage is lying to the sexual partner that he or she is the one for life as the Church says then sex within marriage when one of you believe in divorce is also lying. Why? For the marriage could end in divorce and the sex is not saying, "I take you for life no matter how bad things get", but, "I take you for life but if things get too bad we will get divorced".

If marriage is so holy, it follows that the married couple who have sex but who hope to get out the union some day are committing a graver sin than those who have sex outside of marriage.

How far must a man and woman go before their sex is saying, "I take you for life"? Does oral sex say that? Anal sex? Heavy petting? Foreplay? Masturbation? Is ejaculation necessary? Can you see how saying sex says that confines people to a silly biological morality in which it is physics that count more than feelings and intentions?

Nobody ever gives their whole selves to anybody. You might give your body and your time in sex but that is all. Are husbands who don't feel much for their wives giving their whole selves? They are holding back and yet the Church permits their sex. As long as separation or divorce is allowed by having sex you are saying that you are giving yourself only as long as the other person doesn't do something that entitles you to look for a separation or divorce! That is not giving your whole

self.

Marriage by its nature is not worth undertaking unless the couple intend to have sex with nobody else. What is the point of getting marriage while intending to have an open marriage? The question is, is a relationship that endeavours to stop a partner from having sex outside the relationship a relationship of trust? I don't see how it could be. Your partner could have sex that is just about erotic fun and nothing more and it is impossible to see how that could be a betrayal of what you and he or she have when you both agree to you having this sex. It is clear then that jealousy of such casual sex is rooted in your own selfish insecurity and it is a disorder.

Marriage implies that pre-marital sex and homosexuality are immoral. If they were not there would be no need for marriage. Something like a civil partnership without the concept of adultery and without the requirement that the relationship be consummated by sex would perhaps suffice if anything like marriage were needed at all. Thus marriage is offensive. It implies that those who do not marry but have sex and are committed should be discriminated against. Even to suggest that the behaviour of those who have sex outside marriage is not the ideal is insulting and it is discrimination. Marriage ought to be recognised as more politically incorrect than it is. In reply it is said by the Church that marriage is only for those who want to create a stable environment for each other and for having children and that it does not imply that these things are wrong. But is a commitment made more real by force? Marriage is politically incorrect.

Should gays be allowed to marry? They should if old people can get married for that shows that procreation and making a family is not a necessary condition for marriage. But then the question is should old people and barren people be allowed to wed? All agree that marriage is for procreation and to control sex and reproduction so gays should not be allowed to marry.

Marriage goes with the concept that adultery is bad. Adultery is having sex with somebody and betraying your promise of sexual fidelity to your husband or wife. Some say the sex isn't what is bad but the promise-breaking. Marriage vows contain no specific promise not to have sex with anybody else. And if the sex isn't the sin but the promise-breaking is, it follows that the sex is good but just a good thing being misused. If promise-breaking can be a sin why can't sex be a sin? How bad is adultery? Is it middling bad if the wife approves or doesn't care? Or if the man is under great pressure in the marriage. Is it only very bad because women have a stronger feeling and need for monogamy than men do? If that is so then it is very bad only because of how people feel so appalled by it. But Christianity says that human nature is applied by the gospel and God has to help it to accept it. If it is so bad because it is the breaking of a big promise why can promises be undone? Even in the Bible you read of blood sacrifices being performed by divine authority so that somebody can be released from a vow. The only honest reason Christians can give for severely condemning adultery is that it involves sex. Besides a man having meaningless sex behind his wife back is far better than the man who has a sexless affair behind his wife back. The latter is a worse betrayal. Yet the sex is categorised as adultery!

## CONCLUSION

Marriage makes a laughing stock of morality and demeans the standing and value of women.

## WORKS CONSULTED

A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Catholic Truth Society, Westminster, 1985

Believing in God, PJ McGrath, Wolfhound Press, Dublin, 1995

Biblical Dictionary and Concordance of the New American Bible, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington DC, 1971

Divorce, John R Rice, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, 1946

Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven, Uta Ranke Heinmann, Penguin, London, 1991

Moral Questions, Bishops Conference, Catholic Truth Society, London, 1971

New Catholic Encyclopedia, The Catholic University of America and the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., Washington, District of Columbia, 1967

Preparing for a Mixed Marriage, Irish Episcopal Conference, Veritas, Dublin, 1984

Rome has Spoken, A Guide to Forgotten Papal Statements and How They Have Changed Through the Centuries, Maureen Fiedler and Linda Rabben (Editors), Crossroad Publishing, New York, 1998

Shattered Vows, Exodus From the Priesthood, David Rice, Blackstaff Press, Belfast, 1990

Sex & Marriage A Catholic Perspective, John M Hamrogue C SS R, Liguori, Illinois, 1987

The Emancipation of a Freethinker, Herbert Ellsworth Cory, The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1947

"The Lord Hateth Putting Away!" and Reflections on Marriage and Divorce The Committee of the Christadelphian, Birmingham, 1985

The WWW

How to Fight the Religious Right, Brian Elroy McKinley

