

28. Marriage: Its Defense?

“Jesus was the troublemaker who demanded marital permanence, monogamy, and other strict rules; blame him.” Yet Christ’s teachings afforded society its greatest stability; so I’ll examine this classical viewpoint. The family unit, from which all of humanity arises, originates from God. Despite their differences, the major religions, along with many non-religious, agreed that the nuclear family is humanity’s centrifugal force.

Alternative Lifestyles

Some argue that opposition to non-traditional families rests solely upon arbitrary religious bigotry. They praise alternative lifestyles, namely: matriarchy (woman headed households), polygamy, same-sex marriage, mixed marriages between different major races and cultures, and couples forgoing marriage altogether. But can they prove that there has been a large, successful and harmonious society of humans who comprised one of the aforementioned alternative groups? If not, the idea of non-traditional families rests on air. **We must determine what works, then discipline ourselves to keep it working.**

Anthropologist J. D. Unwin studied numerous tribes and civilizations which existed through five thousand years of history and wrote a book on his findings. He found an exact correlation between monogamy and civilization; strict heterosexual monogamy within marriage is always required to create a civilization, and rampant homosexuality, promiscuity, pre-marital, and extra-marital relations always tears it apart. This was verified by Aldous Huxley, who reflected the same sentiment. Both men were non-religious, defeating any notion of religious bias.^{1,2}

Sexual intimacy tends to create psychological bonding. Marital fidelity’s opposite, casual sex, is universally antithetical to stable loving relationships. This dynamic is written into the very biomechanics of human physiology.

According to various historical religions, intimate physical relations sans marriage have always been deemed sinful because in marriage, two mystically become one flesh, a sanctified unit to God. Non-marital intimacy is considered connecting with an unsanctified and foreign party. It has been said countless times: “We don’t need a piece of paper.” Yet upon saying: “May I then have all your cash?” pieces of paper suddenly become imperative. Likewise being properly married is legal tender with God; any intimate relationship outside marriage is deemed counterfeit.

Historical Marriage Contrasted with Contemporary Marriage

Traditionalists created the Defense of Marriage Act, which opposed same-sex marriage and upheld the heterosexual status quo. Yet marriage had problems since earliest times. Throughout world history, polygamy was practiced.⁽³⁾ **Normally, about equal numbers of male and female children are born. If a minority of men corner a majority of women in plural marriages, many men are thereby forcibly unmarried.** The problem of unsatisfied needs leads to illicit sex and dangerously disgruntled men. Concerning “Old Testament” heroes with their multiple wives, every case of polygamy was a fiasco. Godly men repented of their plural marriages; those who didn’t forsook God and purportedly suffered spiritual death. Besides blatantly contradicting Christ’s credo of two becoming one, and Christ’s command for monogamy, this continued practice has stolen potential mates from millions.

After an army conquered a people they sometimes took their women for wives. Sometimes a marriage was forcefully terminated by a spouse’s parents, the wife given away to someone else. In rare instances this setup continues today. Other historical marriages were initiated merely to acquire political alliance or social status.

Within monogamous marriages of mutual consent, many men married women only for sexual gratification. Women were often considered mere sex objects or servants. As bad as that is, women’s sup-

erficial attitude towards men was even worse. Generally, there was no regard or consideration for a man's body. A man was what he wore; literally a suit, hat, and pair of shoes. Men throughout history have been used solely as a source of monetary income, denials notwithstanding. It's been said: "My wife divorced me over religious differences. She worshipped money, and I didn't have any." So don't defend historical marriage just because it's historical.

Christianity's original understanding was that divorce was permissible only in cases of adultery; second marriages were termed digamy. Even with adultery, spouses were encouraged to forgive and reconcile. Throwing away your spouse like yesterday's garbage is evil; I suffered that terrible experience. Yet worldwide divorce rates skyrocketed when "no fault" divorce was introduced. Because of this evil law, your marriage can be terminated immediately without cause, even if you don't agree to it, appear in court, sign anything, or comply whatsoever. Its stability is destroyed, leaving no defense.

As for marriages that hold together, many couples incessantly fight and argue for years. Spousal mental and physical abuse is widespread; domestic disputes are the most common service call of police. Child abuse by parents is also much more common than school or stranger violence. Most married people aren't abusers, but neglect is rampant. Television often dominates multiple rooms; each family member injects their thirty hour a week fix. Unwed pregnancy has skyrocketed because few parents teach their children the importance of abstinence. Yet being born out of wedlock dramatically increases the odds of future criminal activity.

Granted, raising children today is exhausting and enormously expensive. However, legalized abortion has been an unconscionable solution. See 26.Social Lunacy under The Very Young. Some couples choose to be childless, eliminating marriages' traditional and original purpose altogether. However, those with children often allow them to publicly run rampant, scream horrendously and disturb everyone around. In sharp contrast, both Judaism and Christianity required strict discipline of children, which required having a two-parent household and included spankings, so a child's unruly behavior didn't become unruly adult behavior. *Clement of Alexandria's The Instructor; Book I; Chapter IX* (AD 193): "He [the LORD] commands by Solomon: "Strike thy son with the rod, that thou mayest deliver his soul from death." As a child I was taught "Children should be seen and not heard," and I turned out beautifully. Contemporary laxity is indefensible.

Christian Marriage Requirements

Historically, there were nine Christian marriage requirements. Besides one man and one woman (1), couples needed: 2) an official to marry them (a legal triune), 3) parental approval, 4) a death do us part lifetime commitment, 5) the development of love towards one another, 6) lifetime monogamy, 7) procreation, 8) men were obligated to financially support their wife and children (without which men were deemed infidels) and head the household, while women had to be industrious homemakers who disciplined the children. 9) Parents were also expected to guide their children in the faith, men being the family's religious head. Besides neglecting to pass on their faith, couples today often attempt to amalgamate two divergent religions; either one person quits their faith or both religions suffer negation. Besides, raising a family is a full-time job; candidates for marriage must be willing to make great compromise, self-sacrifice, and permanent commitment.

Since straight society generally fails on eight points, most are discredited when criticizing homosexuals, who correctly state that Jesus never explicitly condemned same-sex marriage (though he implicitly excluded it) while explicitly condemning divorce and remarriage. Same-sex marriage was illegal longer than straight "no fault" divorce, because percentage-wise, "gays" are far fewer. Heterosexual "no fault" divorce was legitimized because percentagewise, heterosexuals predominate, not because of moral superiority.

Man/woman relations may be naturally productive, like seeds planted in gardens and plugs inserted into sockets, while same sex relations are "nonproductive." However, if all you've got is poison ivy,

or plug a 120 volt appliance into a 240 volt outlet, you have worse than nothing, you have a disaster. Before criticizing someone else, we must be exemplary.

Again, contemporary marriage is in ruins. And again, historical marriage was often faulty. Therefore marriages must be based on both historical and Christian or other strong religious principles. Instead, Christian believers chose to point at homosexuals; a red herring(4) to divert attention from their own problems. So if you plan on marrying, you should know everything about your potential mate before connecting in today's climate.

Supposed Solutions to Marriage Problems

Some say that living together before marriage solves the divorce problem "so they can know one another to understand what they're getting into" or "practice." Rubbish. When cohabitation was almost unheard of, divorce was very rare. People who saved themselves for marriage had lower divorce rates than those who had not. Today, **those living together before marriage have an 80% higher divorce rate than those who don't.**⁵

Young women should never acquiesce to premarital sex with their boyfriend. Sex is very serious, involving the likelihood of bringing new life into our world. If young men have sufficient love, maturity, and stability for such intimacy, they should also be ready for marriage.

Marriage counseling is available today, but the divorce rate remains high, while marriage counseling was unavailable in yesteryear, yet divorce was rare; so much for marriage counseling. Having children doesn't help prevent divorce either; it may cause increased stress, increasing the likelihood of divorce. **Putting away selfishness, not being a quitter, and respecting marriage's sanctity would solve the divorce problem and problems within marriage.**

Contraception

Marriage was profitable until the early twentieth century. Amidst agricultural and horticultural society, children worked on their parent's farm, helping run the family business. Today, farm jobs are scarce because sophisticated machinery does the work of a hundred farmhands, putting men out of work. And most well-paying jobs now require college degrees, and tuition is terribly expensive, along with other exorbitant costs. Having children has become a money pit.

Considering today's radically different circumstances, couples remaining childless or using contraception is understandable, although it is inconsistent with historical Christian practice. Many people can afford marriage but not children; insisting that all couples produce children unduly burdens poor men. And by denying marriage, people fornicate instead. (Fornication is sex outside of marriage, making it an unholy act). By foregoing contraception, some people have abortions instead. Others have children they cannot care for, while Scripture damns parents who don't care for their children. Then many of those children go on to make the world a worse place. And what if it eventually costs fifty million dollars just to teach your child to blow his nose? Then nobody should ever get married? That's unworkable. Then there is the insurmountable overpopulation problem.

Although the historic Church always condemned artificial contraception, surely they did not intend to encourage the breeding of vast numbers of non-Christian, violence-prone, and non-productive people who leech off the welfare system and prevent Christians themselves from affording children, which happens today. They likely opposed contraception to ensure that Christians would produce more productive Christians.

For those who oppose artificial contraception, know that women can only get pregnant on certain days of the month. Therefore, it's possible, though difficult, to track a wife's cycle and thereby enjoy relations while never using artificial contraception and never facing pregnancy. Furthermore, millions of women throughout today's world can never have children, often due to a hysterectomy. So in light of mod-

ern science, we now know that marriage is not just for producing children; childless marriages are a sensible option.

Teenage Sex and Marriage

Teen sex today is usually premarital and frequently promiscuous. Premarital sex harms future marital stability and puts youngsters at risk for sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancy. However, teen sex never abated. In every generation throughout history, most teenagers were sexually active; this rate has probably remained constant. Besides male sexual desires peaking in their teens, and most girls able to get pregnant at thirteen, desires for intimacy have always been natural for youth.

Society already pays the bill for single mothers on welfare, and youngsters from broken homes commit the majority of crimes. Then society pays for their incarceration through taxes. Though many advocate sexual activity with aggressive contraception methods, there are always youngsters who won't use contraception. Abstinence advocates avoid this problem, but generally don't teach contraception or deny its availability. Since not everyone abstains, more unwed pregnancy and related problems result. And both advocates of unwed teen sex and advocates of abstinence facilitate unwed pregnancy by supporting coeducational schools.

Since the other two options are failures, logically, there's only one correct option for many: teenage marriage. In centuries past, most people married as teenagers and remained monogamous, therefore contracting fewer sexually transmitted diseases, which diseases today's taxpayers fund.

In different cultures throughout history, thirteen year olds married each other, yet rarely divorced. Traditionally, Jewish boys were considered to have reached manhood and be ready for responsibility on their thirteenth birthday, celebrated with a Bar Mitzvah. An equivalent ceremony for girls was the Bas Mitzvah.⁽⁶⁾ Although Christianity has superseded Judaism in certain aspects, nothing superseded this particular idea. Besides, God as Creator could not have mistakenly given teenagers these powerful desires and procreative abilities. See 4.A Third Option (Origins).

Here are objections to teenage marriage and my responses: A) "Teenagers are incapable of maintaining healthy marriages": Society can be restructured to instill within teenagers quick maturity so they can financially support families. By eliminating television, chattering on cell-phones, texting, viewing rubbish on computers, and other inessentials, and fully concentrating on mental development and maturity, we would have a society of fully mature adult thirteen year olds. Claiming that young people's brains aren't fully developed is highly misleading. If that is so, then everyone's brain is undeveloped, since our brains develop throughout our lifetime, physically changing through the learning process (neuroplasticity).

Teenage brains lack nothing structurally or chemically. Many older people have played chess for decades and still are not experts, while some thirteen year olds with a chess coach are masters. Some teenagers acquired Ph Ds and became MDs. Mental maturity depends upon proper training and good genetics, not aging like wine fermentation.

B) "Perversion": Many people today say that older men who are attracted to thirteen year old girls are perverted. But since most of those accusers are the same ones who claim that gay sex is natural, their opinion is self-refuting. Rather, it would be abnormal for older males NOT to be attracted to young females. What is wrong is an older person enticing a youngster to have sex outside of marriage. Society is perverted in substituting age for marriage. God specified MARRIAGE as the operative qualification for sexual activity; age never was, as long as the age was past reproductive age. Besides, using man-made opinions for an age of sexual consent created major division between countries and regions.⁷

C) "People died young": Another blatant falsehood is that people felt pressured to marry young because they only lived to an average age of around forty. Reviewing historical birth and death records in evenhanded fashion refutes this. Psalm 90:10 (written 1,000 BC) states that the human lifespan is normally seventy years and by reason of strength, eighty. Even if you could bring the average life expectancy down

by factoring in a higher infant mortality rate, that's irrelevant. Infants and toddlers don't marry, and thus have no bearing on those of marriageable age.

D) "Natural means nothing": I asserted that God created humans to marry and procreate at thirteen, including us today. In response I got "What about nine year olds who can get pregnant? Surely you don't think they should marry." No they shouldn't but my position still stands. Rare exceptions to the reproductive rule are understood as genetic defects which serve no purpose, while whenever a characteristic is commonplace, that characteristic always serves a purpose. Full sexual development at thirteen is normal for humans worldwide. However, this doesn't justify mating with everybody you can, as stranger's cars don't belong in a garage designed for a car unless it's the garage owner's car. Likewise, garages are not built to sit empty for a decade before fulfilling their functional purpose.

People "know" that microwave ovens cook food from the inside out, and "know" that Thomas Edison invented the light bulb.(8) Although these "facts" are blatantly false, believing them is trivial. However, do not be mistaken on something so incredibly important. Again it's either teenage marriages or a world of fornicators. Another possibility is using selective breeding to eventually create a condition where people's bodies aren't sexually mature until age twenty-seven. Otherwise, opposing teen marriage (if sex should always be within marriage) is blatantly unnatural.

Successful Tradition VS Modernism

Contemporary values haven't facilitated purity. Our country has filled with pornography, "adult" emporiums, strip clubs, men parading half naked brandishing whips and handcuffs, and increased prostitution, mol-estation, abortion, sexually transmitted disease, and illegitimacy rates. Males without partners to provide proper sexual gratification masturbate constantly, and unmarried women are promiscuous because media propaganda says it's "liberating." Given marriage's difficulties, Jesus' disciples supposed that it was better not to marry. Jesus replied that only special select men could accept singleness without difficulty, and referred to eunuchs (Matthew 19:10-12).

Even before the stage of marriage and its brokenness, the brokenness has already started. Most single teenage boys have had premarital sex. But nice single guys always do without sex, always. That is because single teenage girls are disinclined to have sex, it's not in their biology. They're having sex because boyfriends pressure and manipulate them. Because of "progressive" society, its "sexual liberation" (ironic designation) and co-educational schools, mega-millions of young women are defiled by multiple bad boys before they're married. Many young women then marry them, whom they subsequently complain about, and assume represent all men, while nice guys finish last. Often, single mothers result, whom society supports through welfare. How long will we allow this insanity?

Throughout history, boys and girls were kept separate until they approached readiness for marriage. Men then obtained a wife from a young woman's parents, who used the wisdom and discernment of their years before giving her away in marriage, instead of dating. Though love usually wasn't the motivation, such marriages could be mitigated by developing mutual love. Christ and His disciples addressed marital problems, and spoke against a lack of love, lack of commitment and responsibility, divorce, and even marriage to non-Christians. Yet they mentioned the universal custom of young women being given in marriage like it was natural. See 32.Grrrl Power 2 under Women Given in Marriage.

Besides, arranged marriages have a very low divorce rate, while long-term dating-based marriages have very high rates.(9) Being in love, a mere fleeting feeling, is not a prerequisite to marriage. Children don't choose their parents, yet the loving bond between them is far stronger than temporary infatuation. Regardless, honoring one's father and mother always included their input as to the mate one has.

These facts horrify our feminist culture, especially since we "know" that young women are much more mature than young men, although they're not any more mature. Many also "know" that astronauts could clearly see the Great Wall of China while in outer space, although it's complete fiction. Though we may fail at trivia, we must not be mistaken on something that forms all of society. Women choosing

their mates may sound correct. But the feminist revolution could eventually result in all women choosing nobody.

Throughout my childhood, my mother was friends with the mother of a beautiful girl. Whenever our mothers got together, the girl and I saw each other. To this day, she remains the nicest person I ever met. However, when I was sixteen and she eighteen, she suddenly married a twenty-two year old man in a hasty wedding. This was supposedly precipitated by her parents' alleged abuse, although her sister mentioned no such abuse. Her marriage was bad and she divorced before long. For years she remained single and saved enough money to buy a small house. Then she remarried. This marriage was even worse; the man threw violent tantrums and destroyed the furniture among other things, so she divorced him. Then her house went into foreclosure, so she moved back with her parents. Later she entered a third dubious marriage. And the phenomenon of women idolizing serial killers is endemic.(10) So how long will the destructive social experiment of entrusting women to choose their mates continue, instead of building on the historical, rational foundation?

Eventually I married via an arranged marriage overseas. However, I paid a marriage agency a large sum. Then my fiancée's family had us pay an enormous amount of money for the wedding; then I paid all her other expenses. And while I gave my heart completely to this young woman, after six weeks of living with her, she said the United States was a bad country, "marriage didn't seem real," divorced me, and married someone else seven years later.(11) And after the marriage agency owner gave his wife control of the business, she divorced him and locked him out of his financial accounts. And many women marry men only for money. Many others marry men only to produce children. When they have the number of children they want, they promptly dump their husband. Many women repudiate men altogether.

Here's the essential problem: men were not made for women; women were made for men (Corinthians 11:9) they weren't mutually made for each other. This means that men will always desire women while many women feel that women need marriage like fish need bicycles.

The ratio of women gaining male privileges and making more money than their husbands is increasing, promoting unnatural role reversal. This shocking turnaround defies eons of marriage and family relations. Men having power over women will never repudiate women (it didn't for millions of years) because men are designed to desire women. That's the safety valve that protects women. But feminism causes repudiation of men. The original Christian construct must be restored so marriage, the foundation of society, isn't completely destroyed, thereby destroying society itself.

The Sexual Revolution

The Victorian Age was a unique period of repression.(12) An imbalanced focus continues among prudish "Christian" women, who give men who view nudie magazines dirty looks, yet do nothing else to uphold Christian values. Sometimes they misinterpret men's intentions, condemning them for nothing. Rightfully, men revolted against this distortion. However, the sexual revolution resulted in many women choosing to expose most of their bodies and be excessively made up, enticing men's lust just for attention. Yet they receive no disapproval from the aforementioned prudes. Hypocritical feminists are the chief cause of marital problems.

The sexual revolution stopped sex from being considered taboo and shameful but created another problem. The sexual revolution's chief pioneer Hugh Hefner became idolized by millions of men since he claimed to have freed the world sexually. Though he was only an entrepreneur trying to become rich, he claimed that men were sexually repressed and couldn't fully enjoy life so he created the playboy philosophy. He also claimed that women couldn't enjoy sex so he liberated them too. Actually, in previous ages married people were very sexually active and open about sexual practice. Hefner espoused the swinger's lifestyle, a fantasy which most men cannot fulfill, instead of monogamy.

Women want stability, not swinging. Since women are built differently, women will never enjoy sex as a recreational activity as Hefner tried promoting. Many women did feel liberated enough to use

sex and physical attraction to make money from and manipulate men, and many men were fooled into pursuing playboy lifestyles instead of monogamy. However, married people had sex more frequently than swinging singles who acquired many partners through the years. That's because it takes time to meet someone new and form another relationship to replace the previous broken one. So the playboy philosophy caused men to have less sex and fill the void with ogling pictures and fantasizing. Pied piper Hugh Hefner turned the world upside down like a maniacal clown, and opened the doors for subsequent opportunists. (Notably, feminist Gloria Steinem briefly worked for Hefner as a showgirl).

Maniacal clown and vulgarian Larry Flynt followed Hefner but upped the ante, removing all notions of innocence and wholesomeness. Subsequent pornographers pushed the boundaries even further, so within fifty years, it went from simple nudity to horrific images at pornography's worst. It is chiefly men who are exploited by pornography. Women become wealthy as porn stars (men get paid very little outside of gay porn), and some porn outlets are run by women. By logical induction men have less sex than they used to, their desires often addressed by masturbating to Internet pornography instead. Most young to middle aged men desire sex every day, and men decided on the frequency of sex instead of today's equal decision making. See the book *Libido Dominandi; Sexual Liberation and Political Control*.-13

Certainly love is good and lust is evil; the ongoing battle between good and evil rage within every sphere of humanity. But making this a false dilemma misrepresents sexuality. Biology is the biggest factor, as it is in eating, sleeping, using the washroom, and a hundred other things. Even if love and lust teamed up to fight biology, biology would always win. Therefore, insisting that men should always use sexuality to express love is a wrongheaded attempt to feminize them.

Corinthians 7:2-5 teaches that spouses have full authority over the other's body (provided that sex is gentle, natural, and hygienic). Yet shockingly, married people forty and under now have sex less than twice a week on average(14), the same society that gives nine year olds the ability to download sadistic pornography. Even if Paul's Christian injunction was replaced with a modern compromise, and even if wives preferred to never have sex, this would still average to three and a half times per week. If sex for an hour each night is considered excessive, consider how many hours per week women shop for unnecessary items and watch television. And consider how many hours per week men work hard to support their wife and children.

From 1965 on through the 2000s, the world increasingly succumbed to outlawing "spousal rape," an idea completely foreign to Judeo-Christian history.(15) "Marital rape" is often defined as physical pressure or non-consensual sex between spouses, instead of the brutality associated with rape by strangers. Previously, it was understood that husbands cannot rape their wives, since husband and wife become one in marriage; physical pressure was completely acceptable, while brutality was always unacceptable.

If a husband initiating non-consensual sex towards his wife was criminal, it would logically follow that if a husband neglects to financially support her, and his wife takes money from his wallet because of that, she should be arrested for theft. Rather, it was always a wife's responsibility to always provide sex. With wives deciding on sexual matters, husbands might never have sex again. Besides, husbands will never demand that wives constantly have sex; men's bodies aren't designed to do so. Some men only care about sex, but some women only care about money. We don't have the right to terminate our marriage; we are responsible for being the bigger person. See 32.Women's Rights 2 under Sex Drive; and Christian Wom-en's Rights verses Male Privileges.

Besides causing men's consternation, this idea of women having authority over their bodies also led to murdering tens of millions of unborn babies through abortion; the push for legalized abortion paralleled the push for the notion of "spousal rape." Often, the same feminists pandered both ideas. Furthermore, nobody's body is their own body; they are God's bodies which He lends out for their designated purposes.

Divorce and Remarriage

Because marriage is devalued, divorce is common, quick, and cheap, destroying family stability. Instead, here is Christianity's original understanding, spelled out explicitly:

Matthew 5:31-32: I (JESUS) say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

Matthew 19:9: I (JESUS) say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her that is put away doth commit adultery.

Mark 10:11-12: He (JESUS) saith, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

Luke 16:18: Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery, and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery.

Romans 7:2-3: The woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress. Yet tragically, Christendom now teaches many conflicting views.

Catholic/Eastern Orthodox Divorce

Priests claim to agree that marriages are indissoluble lifetime commitments, but sidestep this permanency with: Annulments! (costing each applying party hundreds of dollars, a sizable source of church revenue). Excuses for annulment follow in blue(16) with my critique:

“Lack of Form: If baptized Catholics marry outside the Catholic church, those marriages can sometimes be considered invalid.” But every group can consider marriages outside their organization invalid; then what? “Dispensations from the ‘correct’ form can be granted, but without it, marriages can be invalidated.” But why grant a dispensation from the correct form?????????????????????

“Contrary Intentions: The presence, on the wedding day, of an intention contrary to an essential marital quality; example: one spouse does not intend to be faithful, or believes in divorce.” But why wouldn't you talk over these issues before the wedding?

“Psychological Incapacity: Incapacity, at the time of marriage, to assume marital duties; for example, one party suffers serious mental illness preventing him/her from assuming parental or spousal duties. Consent requires freedom from mental illness, including latent undiagnosed illness.” But if your sweetheart was so bad, why did you marry him/her? “Mental illness” is subjective; if someone is likable, they're okay; if they're unlikable, an insurmountable problem can be diagnosed, disposing of a handicapped person, who has a greater need for a helpmeet than the average person.

“Psychological Immaturity: Immaturity impeding either party from understanding marriage's true nature. For example, a teenage couple hardly know each other but decide to marry (Hard to believe) because the girl is pregnant. They haven't thought about how they'll support each other in marriage, nor know one another well enough for a lifetime commitment.” But If it wasn't considered a true marriage, you would have to conclude they were living in sin. However, they remain a sanctified couple if they say so. Modernists bend the situation one way or the other to suit themselves.

“Conditional-ism: Presence of a future marital condition, such as one spouse demanding the other achieve a certain income level.” In other words, every time a couple fights over money, there are grounds for annulment.

“Pauline Privilege (the only reason of the six with any validity whatsoever): When two unbaptized people marry, that marriage is non-sacramental, and can be dissolved in favor of a new marriage after one party receives baptism.” Yet “Pauline Privilege” originated from Ambrosiaster (AD 370) No previous allowance was known. Afterward, most Church fathers rejected it. Not until the Reformation was the Church evenly divided. Today, most of Christendom accepts this premise, but demand for such divorces has equally multiplied; hmmm.

“Divorced and remarried couples not having received an annulment aren’t permitted to receive Communion unless they agree to live as brother and sister.” In other words, they can still cohabit and mislead others. “They’re still encouraged to attend Mass and raise their children in the Catholic faith.” Certainly they’re encouraged to remain Catholic; otherwise the Church could not get their donations. So the Catholic Church is quite heretical regarding Divine Holy Matrimony.

Along with many Protestants, some Orthodox leaders have used the NIV text, which perverts fornication (specific) in Matt.19:9 and elsewhere into “marital unfaithfulness” (very general). Quoting an Orthodox priest about Christ’s sole injunction of divorce for adultery only:

“I’ve never seen cases not involving adultery; whether cathexis in another person or thing, such as alcohol, drugs, work, et cetera or putting their spouse in a secondary position as a result of infatuation, obsession, and/or controlled by power, wealth, addictions, careers, mental illness, et cetera. In those cases, *economia* (second and third marriages performed by “economy”) is applied, in concern for people’s salvation.”(17) Rather, “people’s salvation” is code for making money, their church profiting on every subsequent marriage. Other Orthodox groups have a process called “Ecclesiastical Divorce”, which is an annulment.(18) Summarily, divorce for everything but perfect marriages. Another sophisticated dunghill made to hide behind and avoid the light of Christ’s simple teaching. Heresy indeed.

Defining Marriage and Annulment

Marriage is a legally recognized personal union entered into by a man and woman intent upon sharing their lives together, and which establishes rights and obligations between the spouses, their in-laws, and future children; a covenant between a man, woman, and God.

Specifically, marriages are put together by God through the State and the couple’s consummation. Before a legal marriage ceremony can be performed, one must obtain a marriage license from GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES. When legally married persons seek divorce they need A JUDGE to nullify the marriage. Religious leaders DO NOT issue legally binding marriage licenses and never had any legal authority to grant a divorce.

Furthermore, the institution of marriage predates recorded history. Marriage in some format existed in ALL societies and was practiced by ALL cultures. Since marriage was not originated by religious tradition, religious leaders have no right to alter it whatsoever.

An annulment is an official pronouncement which declares a marriage invalid. Here are examples of legitimate annulment and why: Annuling a gay marriage or one where a spouse discovered that they married someone of the same sex compares to buying a car, getting its title, and receiving a boat instead. You undo the invalid transaction. Annuling a marriage to someone who lied and said they were never married before is like buying a car, getting its title, receiving the car, and finding out that it’s stolen. You undo the invalid transaction.

A VALID transaction is a never-married and unrelated man and woman whom a judge recognizes as married and who consummate their marriage. Christians must obey the law unless it violates God’s law. The difference between getting legitimately married and buying property is that you cannot sell or trade your spouse and get another one; marriage is for life.

Most annulments are granted because one spouse wasn’t a Christian believer when they married the first time and is now, one spouse feels that the other is abusive, or the first marriage was not celebrated in the Church. But annulling such marriages is like saying that the deed to your house is invalid be-

cause you weren't a Christian believer when you bought it, you are unhappy with your house, or the house wasn't purchased from the Church.

Religious leaders who grant unscriptural annulments are heretics. And anyone who got married on the pretext of those unscriptural reasons must repent. After 1970, around two hundred annulments were issued for every annulment issued at previous rates.(19) Hence, the Church rapidly apostatized regarding marriage.

Protestant Divorce

Some Protestants claim that “the Church forgot other legitimate reasons for divorce.” (Why? see John 14: 26, Cor.4:17, II Pet.1:12-13, 15, 3:1, and 14.Revival!). Protestants sometimes appeal to the Old Testament although Christians are only under the New Testament.

Besides adultery: *emotional and physical neglect (in Ex.21:10-11, affirmed (supposedly) by Paul in Corinthians 7. *Abandonment and abuse (included in neglect, affirmed (supposedly) by Paul.” But what happened to Tim.5:11-12 and Cor.7:27? These reasons based on emotionality should be repudiated, since it's the Church's job to take care of needy people and their children.

“Jewish couples listed these grounds for divorce in their marriage vows and ancient Jewish documents shed light” (No, Christ shed the light: John 1:1-9) on divorce and remarriage. Don't scrap Christianity to feed your desires! Consider those chapters in Scripture which warn against judaizers. Christ specified that His ideas on marriage and divorce superseded ancient Jewish customs. Therefore, these ideas are quite heretical. Others proclaim “Whatever you did before obeying the Gospel doesn't count.” So if you stole somebody's car before obeying the Gospel, you can keep it; this brand of “Christianity” is apostate.

Paraphrasing from Origen's Commentary on Matthew Chapter 24 (AD 245);“Our Savior does not at all permit the dissolution of marriages for any other sin than adultery alone. Someone might ask if He allows a man to divorce a wife for other reasons. For example, what about poisoning her husband? Or what if she destroys an infant born to them? Such heinous sins seem worse than adultery and enduring them appears irrational. However, acting contrary to the Savior's teachings would be blasphemous.”

Besides, divorce harms the jilted spouse, who is sent into the world as an emotionally upset person who may consequently seek someone else's spouse or vent their anger on others. “What about the children?” Besides children of divorce having higher rates of divorce, children should see that adults can endure whatever problems arise without quitting. Moreover, spouses are disowned for only a microscopic fraction of the incompatibility that we sinners have with God. We can believe Christ, who said that husband and wife are no longer two, but one flesh, or listen to today's leaders who wilt before other's desires.

Christianity wasn't meant for earthly comfort or convenience; it's sacrificial. Jesus said “Deny yourself, take up your cross, and follow me.” “Take up your cross” did not mean wear a miniature cross around your neck every day; crosses were execution devices. We have no more right to desert our spouse than parents or children have the right to disown one another. We must nurture the relationship even if it kills us. ***Though men marrying divorced women, men divorcing their wives and marrying others, and divorced women marrying again are condemned by Scripture, some assume that men divorced by their wives are ineligible for remarriage. But actually, no scripture condemns that, since men are the marital head, unless they sever that through adultery. Women do not have authority over men.

Alternative Authorities for Marriage?

As the same-sex marriage debate rages, some show interest in separating marriage and state, ending government sanctioning of marriage, and states no longer issuing licenses or defining marriage. This would supposedly end all debate. There are basically two proposed alternatives.

One is each individual defining marriage as they please in a free association, which would be fornication, not marriage, according to Christianity. So would living together to form a common law marr-

riage. Although everyone can have their own definition of marriage, Jesus Christ already defined it long ago, and explained it to His disciples.

The other is leaving marriage to today's religious institutions to enforce their definition. However, each one might define it differently and only recognize marriages performed by their particular group as valid. This could be as chaotic as free association.

Besides, severing marriage from the government would separate parents and their children from government benefits. Instead, those with common viewpoints and goals could band together into one large organization to eventually succeed from their country. Forming one's own country to benefit like-minded people would be spectacular.

Supposedly, for eons of time, marriage was a private contract between two families. Some advocate "returning to the ancient tradition," which may have consisted of one tribe of cave-people giving away a young cavewoman to a young caveman from another tribe in return for mastodon meat. But with a third party initiating the union, having witnesses, exchanging arrowheads or seashells, and scratching on a rock to mark the occasion, you have a legally binding marriage with a contract. The cave-people collectively would be the State and its government. Although we might not recognize their State in view of our large complex bureaucracy, such scenarios would be state sponsored marriage, not free association.

Solution to Marital Problems

Summarily, the historical Judeo-Christian construct had five major responsibilities for each spouse, which held marriage together. Wives were responsible to provide meals, had the foremost responsibility of home maintenance, had to regularly provide sex, had the foremost responsibility of raising the children, and had to support their husband's decisions. Husbands were responsible for financially supporting their wife, children, and home, cherishing their wife and supporting her emotionally, being the family's physical protector, willing to die for his family if necessary, taking on all projects requiring strenuous physical labor, and decision-making leadership within families.

Although marriage was never a fairy tale experience, it worked. To maintain healthy marriages, preachers and social workers plead with people to respect and love each other. This is a stopgap solution, like the legendary Dutch boy who put his finger in a leaking dam to stop his village from being destroyed by flooding. It won't work for long because of humanity's fallen nature.

Changing the laws to eliminate "no fault" divorce and other social ills is required. Disallowing divorce except for cases of adultery, legally enforcing historical Christian conduct, and repudiating feminism is mandatory. For in depth analysis of feminism, see 31-32. Grrrl Power and the YouTube video: Why Marriages Fail Today.²⁰

