

CATHOLIC MARRIAGE LAW PROVES BAPTISMAL INITIATION IS A SHAM

Could the core Catholic doctrine that babies become members of the Church at baptism be in fact a lie?

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.

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 follow the quotes.

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.

Oddly enough, if you give informed consent to your marriage that consent is considered invalid if the partner has an illicit lover you don't know about. This is a case of where the consent is invalidated only if the truth comes out. The Church seems to believe though that if the faith proves false any consent you gave to be part of it is invalid. The idea is that man-made religion has authority but it is not valid or real authority.

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.

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. [We won't discuss the idea that if religion is nonsense then its marriage ceremonies are invalid in themselves.] 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!

FINALLY:

Church law in principle accidentally affirms that the membership is not real. The marriage laws make that obvious.

