March 23, 1947

I greet you all, noble countrymen and countrywomen, with the words: Let Jesus Christ be praised

In the state of Kentucky, live people short on intelligence. They are so called Hill Billies. The greater number of these are unlearned people in a shabby state. They secretly maintain hidden stills of “moonshine” in the forests and are lawless whenever they can and protect their precious moonshine with guns. They have their strange original customs. In the last five months the American Press had some write ups. Here are three: First, a 15 year old boy married a twelve year old girl. Second, a 60 year old married a 13 year old. The third a 15 year old Don Juan married a 60 year old “madam:, who already had buried three husbands. What a comely and well-chosen couples these formed. On one side, girls; on the other, grandpas and grandmas. And so a girl marries at too young an age, and a suitor who marries too early, create for themselves disastrous outcomes and their progeny are given to suffering. Statistics confirm that men married before twenty years of age, die eight years earlier than those who married later. Married women who are between 15 and 20 die three and a half more than young women who marry later than that. We have no statistics and children born of such marriages. In all cases it is confirmed for young mothers to have stillborn. In current times other excesses occur. For reasons all too well-known, the couples decide not to have children until their financial status improves. What of the morality and this social situation in a further program? Today our title is:

ABUSE IN MARRIAGES

A change in the state of life brings about a change in external conditions which the spouses lived in up to this time and the change is difficult to adjust to. I can return to the topic of mixed marriages and warn young people who wish to undertake a mixed marriage. Mixed marriages can be mixed as to religion, or nationality. A mixed marriage in religion is one in which the husband is of one belief system or an atheist having no religion at all, and his spouse is Catholic. A mixed marriage can be one of difference in nationality when the husband or wife are Catholics but born of a different nationality. E.G.: A Pole and a German spouse which are a special case and within the Creator’s will. The Catholic Church is against mixed marriages as it is in danger of loss of faith. It is the obligation of the mother and father to strive not only in the physical but in the moral sense to educate the children in the faith. Will the non-Catholic above all agree to have the children to be educated in the Catholic Faith and Morals. In this case it is compulsory for the Non-Catholic to make an agreement. There is then a dispensation giving the ok to the marriage, but this mixed marriage at times has future troubles and so the party will not let the Catholic spouse to have that freedom of assurance so the promise must come in written terms. From experience, we know that the promissory notes are more often broken than kept. Often, the husband is the real fanatic holder of his opinions and convictions and tries to tell his wife how to bring up the children. Often he is lukewarm. The wife on the other and is more deeply believing and strenuously holds on to her convictions. Then the wife finds herself alone with her beliefs. Other religious beliefs entail also separate views on the morality of action in the world in general as well as in married life. In addition, each has some beguiling sense of superiority, which is almost always relative to each other, which, in his opinion, is mistaken in religious beliefs. You can foresee the unbroken chain of pain, professions, and humiliation in the sight of which, the husband acts badly, immorally, and leads the children leaving the wife behind. A Catholic wife married to a husband of a different religion should remember, should always remember that when she vows, she vows for the rest of her life but the husband has the opportunity to divorce or tries to find ways on how easily to get a divorce and get rid of the marriage bond. One can suppose or even expect that one day the husband with say good bye and without scruples, marry another but the wife not wishing to throw out her faith will remain alone since she does not at that time become a widow. Do national differences have positive influences or negative influences on marriage? We speak, of course, about marriages in which the partners are Catholics but from different nationalities. I gladly and sincerely admit, that such marriages are happy and the spouses live according the Christian principles. The spouses pay for this dearly with accusations, troubles, and hurts because of the differences in traditions etc. Will wives brought up in the atmosphere of Polish ways easily accept the traditions and accept Portuguese ways? She should go the way of her husband? She will miss her family with its family traditions, be surrounded with strange people on every side. And if the spouse live in the brides locale, then the husband will undergo the same emotions. Both will feel like intruders. A curious incident happened during the Second World War, when spouses of different nationalities; there were arguments, anger and even fights. All of this ended up in nervous episodes and ended up in court separations or civil divorces. And what about the lives of the children? The confusion about tradition will enter upon their scene. One notices often among young children who have the look of askance which says, “She does not understand us, because she is a stranger, not one of ours.” Little by little they will not like her and shy away from her. If she brings up the children the way she knows, the father will not be happy because he thinks he’s bringing up somebody else’s children. In these international marriages the children will be brought up without a nationality, cosmopolitan in nature who are emotionally torn and who live only to consume, without noble feelings; they are only intellectually fostered. Those who know the ways of people and how they respond to life cannot deny this.

 As I underscored more than once, marriage has three benefits and therefore three obligations. 1. Birthing children. 2. Rearing children. 3.Using the natural gifts in the unfolding of life. Furthermore against the manner in which the spouses go about living the family life is the might of erroneous outlooks, the truth, and in these days, there are more and more obstacles when learned minds write in the pagan ways of yore. They represent life on the cattle level, perhaps even lower. The present means which do not agree with the rational mind. The ideals of marriage are brought down low. Firstly, they do not favor procreation. Secondly, killing fetuses in the womb. Thirdly, motherhood and fatherhood are not favored. In the eyes of the Christian, these three theories are criminal. In the eyes of the new reformers they are virtue. But let’s look at them one after the other. First, progeny. Many call procreating progeny a burden and call for abstinence which is permissible or stifling the natural act. What are the reasons? There are many and of various put forth. Some are not able to abstain; they have a right to the marital act, on the reason for passing on material things to heirs. There is not right even the most important which can justify what is inherently contrary to nature. The marital act by its very nature tends to procreate offspring. Therefore it acts against nature and allows the infamous and dishonest act of awareness that this deed arbitrarily deprives it of its effect. Even in scripture we read how God, in great anger, condemned it and punished it with death. Pope Pius XII condemned it saying, “Whoever uses marriage in this way, by deliberately frustrating natural law, breaks the law of God and imparts guilt to the conscience. As regards the individual competition, having to justify these abuses, some are so shameless and immoral that they should not be named. Others are often imaginary or exaggerated. In regard to the health of the mother, current medical practices have made such advances that the death of the mother has statistically been brought to near zero. And with the pregnancy with the birth and early years mixed with difficulties and discomfort and suffering, that is natural thing, understood and reasonable. But, even here, the medical community is careful that something would not happen to the child to the mother. And I maintain on the strength of the church’s teaching and credibility of theologians that sometimes one sided, usually the wife hates rather than committing a sin, allowing for a good reason, against her own will, for breach of good order. The party is then not at fault also remembering about the obligation to not to be the occasion of sin to the other party.

 It may happen that the husband and wife amidst poverty decided that they should not have children at that time, there is no way on earth there would be such a difficulty which would change the obligation of the commandments of God, forbidding evil acts. Here often a husband and wife seeking personal comfort in which case they always find a way with money. For example, new furniture or more stylish clothing, or costly recreations. We had a good example not too long ago mentioned in the newspaper about a certain New York apartment building which housed fourteen children, only 89 cats, of various kinds. Besides, in every locality and under all kinds of living conditions husbands and wives can retain the virtues of married life because God does not expect us to do impossible things. The second abuse in marriage is an attack on the life of the unborn child. Some people want to make it conditional on the instructions of therapeutic, medical, social, or eugenic sources. All those clamoring to disassociate it from the will of the father or mother; others of the so-called "indication" or treatments, or to the external or government resources to carry out these deadly attacks.

 The Church extends its deep sympathy to such a mother who in the fulfillment of her natural duty, endangers her health and perhaps her very life. Never, however, can there be a reason so important as to justify the killing of an innocent child. When the life of the child is threatened even for saving the life of the mother poses a dilemma considering the commandment, “Thou shalt not kill.” All the reasons which are usually ascribed to the justification of this kind of killing, are apparent, deceptive and illusory. Thanks to conscientious and experienced physicians who strive to save the mother and the child; unworthy are others who would not serve the title of noble if they had intentions to abort the life of the mother or the child. In any case it is important to remember the saying: “the end does not justify the means,” or as the Apostle writes: “it is wrong to do bad things in order to achieve good. It follows that governments as well as other institutions should be careful to always and everywhere protect the life of the innocent, and more than this, it holds that the lives of those who are in bad health be aborted for this reason. And above all the children in the womb of the mother should not be aborted deliberately. God is the judge of our intentions and heaven cries out for the taking of a life. Third are abusive tendencies in regard to certain limitations to man in his right to natural law on marriage. Supporters of this science are demanding that the marriage was forbidden by law to all those who according to the rules and expectations of eugenics, will bear, by heredity, crippled or retarded offspring. And if the government permits such marriages, then such by law to be involuntarily deprived of their natural ability for childbearing, to go for a surgical procedure, which is called – sterilization. Firstly, I need to ask myself whether Eugenics should hold sway over the goals of marriage? Besides the family is more important than the governing institution and people are born not for the government or just for earthly concerns but for heaven and eternity. Then, people who are capable of marriage, but would bear children who have serious illnesses cannot marry? What are these occasions? For example, marriage between blood relatives; moreover such couples may give birth to stillborn children or weak of nature. Marriages by debilitated by sickness should be dissuaded because of the frequency of offspring susceptibility to certain diseases and sterilization in this case would not be the solution. And the government cannot harm the body or wound it without probable cause. Besides, common sense teaches that individual human body needs to use its members only for the purpose for which they are, by nature intended unless the whole body will benefit from, for example, cutting off a diseased limb.

 We also have some who are against marital fidelity. They even seek to ensure that existing criminal laws protecting marital fidelity, deprived nights and abolished the completely legal. As usual, Christian views on marital fidelity are nicknamed old-fashioned superstition and medieval cover up, and a low, vulgar jealousy. Following the shock of modern perceptions and views, permission to propagate false and not without danger and friendships with third persons. The idea is not to cramp the style in marital situation. The plain truth is that they take infidelity as something normal while this kind of personal relationship militates against nature. God’s commandment is clear: You shall not covet your neighbor’s wife. As the church is given as the body of Christ so the wife is in relationship with her husband. The command is clear, clear cut and without provisions. As far as I can see, to this time the command has not been abrogated. Besides, whoever wants to see with ease, will see that neither nature nor life considers the equality of women and men. I do not intend to go further with this. Equal rights and equal responsibilities can exist there where the dignity and goodness of human beings exists and there is a consciousness that comes from the institution of marriage. There is a certain inequality in good families for the good of the family, unity and permanency. And there needs to be a certain order for the family to operate smoothly. The basic system and the order of the family cannot be abused by anyone because it comes from God and not from people. But let me return for a moment to the concept of indissolubility of marriage. Let me add something more in the quest for clarity. There is a school of modern sociology that demands the greater good of the children when the marriage is dissolved. For example, when the children are not receiving proper care demanded or are not raised properly, or parental argument or bad example pave a pejorative road in their lives. In these cases is there no other solution but the dissolution of the marriage of the parents? Is the dissolution going to make it better or worse for the participants of the family? Instead of going to court and getting a divorce, might it not be better to put the parents in jail and put the children in a foster home. Divorce still widely open the way to new excesses, fresh abuses, and the children of such evil and uncaring parents will just push deeper into the morass of error and insincerity! Another school of Sociologists, maintains that for the nation in general, rather for the governmental benefit, it behooves to necessarily change the legislation concerning marriage and replace it with new stipulations according to the modern public opinion and modern usage. They base their arguments on life’s facts, namely, that often the spouses in their attempt to get a divorce, deliberately open themselves to immoral acts and even crimes; or lie in court without cause; often brazenly lie in court and boldly; often their false and false testimony is confirmed by paying them for statements of false and malicious nature which are harmful to the innocent’s side. The number of such divorces should be reduced instead of increased. Their proliferation rises to an alarming rate. Why not make more stringent the laws concerning false witness of the guilty instead of facilitating lies and false witnessing? Unless the laws more stringently reach the pockets and lessen their freedom, their wish to divorce will be stifled. There still is a third class of sociologists: those who claim that marriage is a private matter and religious, between the husband and wife and should not be subject to any laws or court issues. The result of this, divorce depends solely on those who take on the marriage. Therefore divorce depends only on the marital partners. As maintained before, I turn to the idea, that every valid marriage is subject to a contract, and an important contract as marriage is, it is not easily broken. Besides, even a natural marriage contains a religious character and is holy. The religious element is innate, implanted by nature. Marriage comes from God and the marital partners become stewards of God’s omnipotence. And what is there to say about the holy nature of Christian marriage, lifted to the Sacramental value? From this nature it stems the State and the Church have certain laws regarding it. There a civil laws which pertain to it’s civil contract. The Church however, as a religious institution has laws to marriage as a natural and Christian right to maintain certain restriction to marriage etc. Just 50 or so years ago, Pope Leo XIII proposed that unless laws permitting easy divorce are changed, the family and the entire population are in danger of dissolution and destruction. His prognostication has come to be true. We see that in our current times and in various countries, especially those where Communism was prevalent, the moral status of family life has disintegrated, bit by bit. There is a certain group of arch progressives who are found among lawyers, judges, teachers, and professors and even pastors who, for the resolution of various marital problems, thought up ways of living together, supposedly corresponding to modern requirements such as the mentality of modern day. This modern terminology of classifying marriages: terminal, trial, gay, student. They do not have to be defined to understand their meaning. The nomenclature tells what they are. They are bi-functional inventions of an overheated and sick brain. Although these inventions put forward under the pretext of newfangled culture, a healthy and God-fearing man easily senses unspeakable corruption in them knocking nations to the level of cultural seemingly barbaric primitive tribes that allowed himself criminal acts, contrary to nature. One more thing and I say this without apology, saying after St. Augustine against marital partners, who not wanting children, criminally get rid of them. He write thusly: “This debauched or rather cruel abomination, this debauchery often goes so far as to use poisons against fertilization, and when these measures fail, they destroy a fetus conceived in the womb and spends it. These people will that the children be lost before thy give birth willing to kill them before they see the light. And if that’s the way they were always, their living together was not marriage but fornication. And if both were not that way, I will say directly: I will say directly, she is somewhat concubine of her husband, or he commits adultery with his wife!” - Lastly, I repeat once more? No human power can change the structure of a marriage, because no human instituted marriage; only God and the wisdom of God. Otherwise the winds will blow and the house will fall and the fall will be great.