

MARRIAGE VOWS CANNOT BE MEANT THE HYPOCRISY OF MARRIAGE

An arrangement where people pledge selfless love to each other is insincere. Marriage is the worst form of that where two people promise selfless love to each other forever. Selfless love is loving without seeking or consenting to get anything back. But in marriage you use selfless love as a bribe to get something back. Selfless love that you want paid for with selfless love is not selfless love at all. The truly selfless person will choose to give their fortune entirely to the poor rather than to receive anything from anybody else. If they accept anything it is resultant acceptance: "I only accept it for they have to be allowed to be selfless too." But joyfully agreeing to let another be selfless to you as in marriage in return to you being selfless to them is self-deception. That is getting something back and arranging it. The reward for you pretending you are selfless is that you get somebody to treat you as if they were selfless.

Marriage is the core unit of the Catholic Church. Thus if it is deceptive it is right to say the whole Church is.

Legally a contract is not binding unless you understand what you are doing and the contract clearly states what is involved. Those who get married are not really married at all. There is no mention in the ceremony or the contract about their duty to have sex penis-vagina at least once. Or that they must jointly own all they have. Or what husband and wife means.

The Church says that sex should only take place between a husband and wife who are validly married. If a couple trust one another completely then why can't they have sex whether married or not? Marriage does not mean that the partners will have a complete trust in one another. Also, even if a couple is united by trust that trust might be small one day and huge the next. It is ridiculous to say that people should only have sex if they are married. That is saying that this law is what matters most and not the level of trust that they have for one another. It is anti-personal. It is anti-respect.

Marriage is supposedly the husband and wife giving themselves to each other in a covenant of loving sacrifice. The vows state as much but the vows, "I N. do take thee N. as my lawful wedded husband/wife to have and to hold from this day forward, in sickness and in heath, for richer or for poorer, to love and to cherish till death us do part."

The Bible teaches that all people are sinners and none of them are good and that good works are impossible except for the saved. All other good is just a pretence. In this scenario, what use can marriage vows be? If people are too selfish to really be genuine about others then why believe their profession of vows?

The Christian Church and most of society in general get by on telling lies. One of the main lies is that you can love the wrongdoer or sinner but hate or condemn the wrong or the sin. To say that you condemn the sin but not the sinner is so ridiculous that everybody knows it's a contradiction. Evil is that which should not exist. If I say John did evil I am saying John is evil and it would be better for him to be annihilated and replaced by a clone who freely commits no evil. Humanists often deny free will and are happy to because they see that to say we have free will is exactly the same thing as saying that hatred as long as you don't admit to hating is commendable. The marriage vows could not be taken unless you hold that you will and should love your partner until life ends. So that means you are resolving to love your wife and not her sins but that is impossible so you cannot really have the required intention to create a valid marriage. There is no marriage in this world that can be called valid. And relationships cannot be built on lies and marriage is built on lies so the relationship is more false and fake than people realise.

You don't feel about a lightning strike the same way as you feel when a person hurts you. The anger and hatred if they happen feel personal. Marriage is a declaration that a man and woman will love each other but hate one another's sins for life. But this is impossible. You cannot hate a person's sins like they were things. You feel personal when a person hurts you but you don't feel that way if a robot hurts you. You hate the person even if you love them at the one time. Marriage is based on a lie. It is paying homage to Christian hypocrisy. Marriage is a lie. The Church says you must give your whole heart to a person in sex in marriage. Yet its hypocritical doctrine makes this impossible - hating the sin is hating the sinner. The husband hates his wife in so far as he hates her sins and vice versa.

The love sinner hate sin idea commands that you must always hate sin in others. It won't be easy keeping a marriage going with that kind of attitude. The idea demands that you hate sin or you don't love the person in reality. If hating the sin is hating the sinner then this love is pretend. Even Hitler could say that he loved the Jews for he didn't want them to be Jews and that it was Jewishness not Jews he intended to hurt. As with love sinner and hate sin it is a distinction without a difference. Hatred is a form of warped love. That is why indifference, not giving a toss about a person if they live or die or are happy or not, is the real opposite of love. The person who hates you hates you because of something you support or are a part of or do. They do not hate you because you are a person. They attack you and are angry at you because of something else. There is no difference between this and loving the sinner and hating the sin.

If you cannot like the sinner and dislike their sin then how can you love the sinner and hate the sin? If you dislike the sin and you still like the sinner as much as ever then it follows that you don't dislike the fact that they committed the sin but that the sin had unpleasant results. So it is not the sin at all you dislike. The sin is not an action or the results of sin but something that a person becomes. To dislike or hate the sin is to dislike or hate the sinner.

Marriage is legalised prostitution because both partners lie to one another about all this sacrificial love and self-giving that marriage is said to be about. How can your sacrifice be a sacrifice when done just for benefits and how can you give yourself when it is only the fulfilment of desire that you are after? Your desires always mean more to you than the thing desired so we are egoistic animals. Prostitution is less wrong but only in that it is more open and honest. In married love, it is only the way the person looks and the good treatment they give and not the person that counts.

Marriage is legalised prostitution because both partners get benefits for having sex. Marriage is entered into for these benefits which include material benefits. It is not right to punish a woman for selling herself to one man outside of marriage when she can do this legally by marrying him. And Christianity likes to pretend to care about prostitutes when Jesus was so nice to them!

You do not love any person but your judgement of that person. It is all in your head. Therefore marriage is an illusion. The vows cannot work. It is totally false to say: "I take you as my wife and I give myself to you as your husband". It is your perception of her that you are after, not her. Marriage is about persons but you cannot marry a perception so marriage IS just a piece of paper.

The Catholic Church admitted in a book of apologetics (page 165, *The Emancipation of a Freethinker*) that a survey done under the auspices of a psychological laboratory of Pharsalia, Oregon found that very few people, only 5% practice altruism or unconditional love when they do good works. Everybody else was after pride of workmanship, feeling self-important, loving the interfering end, looking for gratitude and so on. This survey took place in a time when people were more religious and less materialistic than they are now. So it's a lot less than 5% today! Altruists if they exist would surely tend to be unmarried so that they can be free to engage in philanthropy.

How could many marriages be valid when people are failing to be truly loving?

How could a marriage be real when the man and woman are egoists or just care about their own desires? They might consummate but the reason for the consummation is to fulfil desire and not to consummate properly and have mutual self-giving. We know philosophically and 100 % that there are no such things as altruists or non-egoists so marriage as understood by the Church which has extended its unhealthy influence into the state is an empty ritual.

If I am only interested in good because of how it makes me feel I am marrying my perception of the other person and what they can bring into my life not the other person. It follows that even if religion is right that we are not like that people that want to marry must prove it right first. Why? Because there is no real marriage unless I establish that people are not egoistic. I cannot make my vows validly without clarifying that. Brighter minds than mine say that man and woman is egoistic.

There is nobody to witness or prove that the married couple properly consummated their marriage. You can't have witnesses to verify a wedding that is only a potential marriage until consummation and none to prove that the marriage has been sealed and fulfilled and has become legally binding. It is prostitution all right for it is not a marriage at all at least in the eyes of the consistent and perceptive souls among us until children come who can be proved to be fathered by the husband. The wife and husband give their property to one another for sex. This makes the way religion and society treat prostitutes to be scandalous for it is hypocritical. In brief, I am saying that nobody knows if the marriage is real until the children start coming and yet they approve of the couple having various kinds of sex until that happens. So it is possible sex outside real and valid marriage that they are approving of. The husband and wife are encouraged to sell themselves to each other in order to have children.

A partner should compliment your life and not be the pivot of it but marriage demands that the husband love his wife like his own body (I got that from the Bible in Ephesians 5 and it is an accurate description of the requirements of marriage). It is impossible to love anybody that much. It is also unnecessary and therefore destructive for love hurts. Every person should be independent and be able to move on without too much difficulty if the relationship fails. Marriage requires that the couple depend on each other for everything for there is something unreal about a couple who say they love one another as themselves but who do not depend on each other for life and health and happiness for then there is no reason to believe it is anything more to it than words. Marriage would forbid the wife to go out and earn her own money. The husband makes the money while the wife looks after the home and the children in return. There is no other way to make a marriage real. Couples who believe in equality and independence for each other definitely cannot contract a valid marriage though the Church and state still have them going through the ceremony. Marriage should be seen as bad as slavery is.

Marriage is insulting for a couple that are really committed don't need a ceremony. Marriage only works if the commitment is there. It is not marriage that works but the commitment because marriage is not going to work without the commitment. The romantic trappings of marriage are deceitful and intended to blind you to the fact that marriage is a sham and is just asking the permission of other people to have sex. They may have said nothing when you lived in so-called sin but that was sex without their permission nevertheless.

Catholicism says marriage requires that you be open to life in all the sex in your marriage. You don't use artificial contraception but you use natural birth control which allows God to create a life should he wish. It says that artificial contraception treats the child as an accident and natural contraception doesn't. This is utter nonsense for God can let you use condoms and still be open to life. If you avoid conception using the natural or artificial method you may still be regarding any child that results as a calamity and as an accident. The Catholic Church treats marriage as an implicit agreement not to use artificial contraception. Is marriage valid if the man and woman intend to use and/or believe in such contraception? The Church would have to answer no for it says when a man and woman give each other their bodies in the marriage bed they are giving their fertility and their whole selves. Artificial contraception then is a grave defilement of marriage. It must be worse to use it in marriage for marriage is so sacred to God than for unmarried couples to use it.

If a couple are committed then they have no need for marriage. There are better ways than marriage to make a person work at a relationship, like financial agreements or children.

Catholicism teaches that marriage is a sacrament. A sacrament is a sign that actually gives the power from God and the supernatural help of God that it pictures. For example, baptism pictures God washing sins away and so when a person is baptised God really takes their sins away when the rite takes place. Suppose marriage is a sacrament. It is grace given to help the man and woman live together and be good to one another and be good parents. Above all it is meant to make them holier and to help them prepare each other for Heaven. Few will tell you they felt more attraction to God and religion after getting married. And what happens if they break up in a month? Is the sacrament reversed or what? It can't work any more. Perhaps the man and woman should try all their lives to fix the marriage and get back together so that the sacrament can re-activate. The worst sin when a marriage breaks up is resistance to the power of the sacrament not the heartbreak caused. God comes first. The suggestion that marriage is a sacrament certainly implies that it is a grave sin to fail to keep trying. If the husband starts a new relationship, his wife should do all she can to break it up. There is miracle power ready to give them a chance even after all that. They have no excuse. Unless you agree with all the thinking in this paragraph, and you will if you are consistent, you cannot mean the marriage vows if marriage is a sacrament.

The commandment of God and Jesus that you must love your neighbour as yourself contradicts the idea of marriage. Marriage implies you love one person as yourself and everybody else in second place. Catholic marriage isn't impressive in the love stakes! The vows really say, "I take you as my spouse until death us do part. If we part you will still have to be faithful to me for the marriage still exists though it doesn't. A marriage where people live separate lives is not a marriage at all." That sounds more geared towards control than love! It is more about law than love!

To get married you have to vow to stay with your partner for life no matter what. You do not know what will happen. The fact that a bride loves her man and finds him sexy and charming only means she feels that way now. If he aged forty years overnight her love would soon evaporate which shows that marriage is always shallow though society and the Church do a good job of dressing it up as something terrifically noble.

There is always some way to keep even the worst marriage together. Believers in separation or divorce and especially divorce cannot contract a true marriage because they intend to divorce and remarry if all turns sour. They are not giving everything to the other person so their vows are just words that do not unite in matrimony. When you are supposed to give your body to the other partner you are symbolically giving your life. Marriage implies that divorce is wrong therefore marriage is evil. It is trying to put a ball and chain around the necks of two people. Marriage is a threat to human progress though it encourages progress that only looks like progress provided you don't get behind the veneer. Divorce only recognises that a marriage is no longer a marriage for the couple can't stand each other. It is only the recognition of a fact and is the only way to happiness and freedom for many.

You cannot mean it when you tell your wife or husband at a wedding ceremony that you take them for better or for worse forever for that is really promising that you will not change for change makes it harder for the partner to accept you and remain loving you. You are giving up your very important right to change which goes with the for worse part. You are abnegating your right to revamp your identity. When you hate yourself enough to try and make yourself a stick-in-the-mud how could marriage be a union of lovers? How could it be a union at all for love is union? Love is communion.

If you are committed, you are committed. A ceremony is not going to make any difference.

Marriage is only a pile of superstition and illusion dressed up to make it appealing. Its purpose is often to facilitate the

manipulations of the people by the clergy and religion.

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