



We Must Vote No

As of writing this newsletter, the general survey is currently being sent out to all Australian citizens eligible to vote. Many have returned their survey forms with their answers. To all those who have not yet received or replied here is why you must vote no.

The majority of our supporters are Christians while a good number of them are Catholic. Firstly to remain a Catholic in good standing one must vote no. No life or bans. It is a simple black and white issue. The Church holds that marriage is between a man and a woman, it is a part of it's explicit teaching. The Church recognizes that marriage is a natural institution, meaning that all different cultures all throughout the ages have recognized the importance of marriage as an institution that upholds society at large. Christ raised up marriage to be a divinely instituted sacrament but it has always been a natural institution. Hence why when people argue that the Church should just stay out of the rest of the debate, as it does not affect the sacramental marriages, our reply is well yes it does.

Our argument that has not really had much airtime amongst all the debate, is political arguments about the definition of marriage. All the talk has been about the consequences which will follow. This is of course is extremely important as these will affect many freedoms that we currently enjoy. At the same time they show just how far marriage has been broken down. One cannot blame people for going down this line of thinking without addressing the real problem. This shows the insurmountable weakness of society as a whole. Society at large has already abandoned the principles that set held so sacred and its definition of marriage has already changed.

Some point to two-fold divorce as the real agent of this change, but I have always thought that it is really contraception; with the acceptance of contraception, any argument against same-sex marriage from conjugality becomes useless. However, upon reading Pope St's 1930 encyclical *Castii Connubii* I was recently struck by the realization that there is a more fundamental reason than contraception as to why society's definition of marriage has already changed. In fact, the onset and acceptance of contraception was simply subservient to this reason.

Some time, about a hundred years ago, there began a steady push for professionalism in marriage. I speak of the church that men and women are the same - a church that endorses behind the veil of contraception. The "sexual equality" between the spouses of which Pope XI spoke in *Castii Connubii*. This was to make marriage essentially not a union between man and woman, who are different at the level of being in their maleness and femaleness, but between two people who are the same. In order to achieve this, the main, undeniable biological difference between men and women had to be overcome: from sexual union, women bore children. Contraception came about as the technological solution to this problem.

The agenda was to make marriage not a union between man and wife, so it always was, but effectively between two men - albeit effective men. Over the last century, this was achieved. 'Marriage' became a union of two equal people, having exactly the same societal role, engaging in mutual sexual gratification without the procreation of children. This may as well be a description of same-sex marriage.