

Anton Fabian\*

Paul Joseph Safarik University in Košice,  
Catholic University – Faculty of Theology, Slovakia

## Different Interpretations of Marriage in Society and the Church

### 1. Introduction

Some statistics about marriage and the family in current Europe confront us with the Christian tradition and practice forcing us to ask: “Is the behaviour of young people a sign of progress or decline?” Two facts: (a) the number of births outside the marriage has exceeded thirty percent, or one third of babies are illegitimate children (b) the number of divorces is growing – about 40 out of 100 marriages are divorced. Two thirds of women request to divorce. One of the biggest reason of divorces, in the past, were differences in characters and alcohol. Nowadays, infidelity is number one cause for almost all divorces. Young people currently prefer to live with their partners even though they are not married to them. As they reason, young people say: “The most important thing is love, so we do not need a marriage certificate”. Other people prefer a “single” lifestyle, a lifestyle that is more and more on the increase. All this, as well as the fact that a growing number of European countries are legalising civil same-sex partnership with the adoption of children the question, puts the definition of marriage in a crisis. If this considering the enactment of a registered partnership with the adoption of

---

\* Msgr. Prof. ThDr. JCDr. Anton FABIAN, PhD teaches at Paul Joseph Safarik University in Košice in the Faculty of Art and at Catholic University of Slovakia in Faculty of Theology. His specialisations are pastoral theology, social work and theology.

children in various countries in Europe, the question of marriage crisis is indeed timely. These statistics are also reflected within social work casework, because of the consequences of failed marriages and dysfunctional families on both the individual and the family.

## 2. The definition of marriage

A dictionary of sociology defines marriage as “juristic relationship which binds man and woman living together”<sup>1</sup>. It’s a mere statement which says nothing about the relationship and what is essential. A more dynamic expression of what marriage is can be found in the Codex of Canon Law 1983 (can. 1055 § 1). The following are the main elements of the definition

- a) Conjugal contract,
- b) determines partnership between man and woman for the whole life,
- c) naturally keeps the good between wife and husband,
- d) procreation and upbringing of children,
- e) Lord Jesus promoted, among the baptized, to the dignity of a sacrament.

No one can deny that marriage is primarily a natural reality, based on the natural structure of man. Thus the structure of human beings are written, encoded God’s laws related to marriage. Therefore, it is fair to say that marriage is a natural institution. We also read in the document: Charter of Rights of the Family compiled and published by the Holy See on the 22nd October 1983, where right in the introduction is written “marriage is a natural by an establishment”<sup>2</sup>. From the Biblical perspective, God established marriage when He created male and female (comp. Gen. 1,27).

## 3. The essential facts and features

The essential aims of the marriage are (1) living in a community in love and (2) the willingness to accept and bring up children. The essential characteristics are (1) fidelity – unity, exclusiveness and (2) indissolubility. When these four pillars (love, children, fidelity, indissolubility) are understood correctly and applied in

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Jandourek, *Sociologický slovník*, Praha 2001: Portál 2001, p. 148.

<sup>2</sup> John Paul II, *Familiaris consortio*, 1981, p. 171, point C.

life they guarantee the stability of marriage. As table has four legs, if one is missing the table rocks, like wisem marriage is stable if it respects these essential elements and characteristics.

There are actually four possibilities of how we can consider marriage:

- a) psychological aspect – this includes issues such as: communion in love, relationship, falling in love, attraction, ability to establish and develop home, support of each other, complementarity, sacrifice, service, solution to loneliness.
- b) pedagogical aspect – this includes topics related to parenting: the willingness to accept and raise children, the problem of communication in the family. Special attention here should be paid to the moral issues of responsible parenthood, contraception and abortion.
- c) sociological aspect – we can talk about only one partnership and exclusiveness when we talk about monogamy in a Christian marriage (as opposed to polygamy in African or Arabic countries). This also deals with the topic of fidelity which is relative to the environment, and the occupational and social conditions which we live in.
- d) juristic aspect –this is the issues the civil courts deal with in divorce. Christian marriage is indissoluble. The Church does not use the word “divorce” but uses the term “nullity” because, under certain circumstances and in certain cases, it declares a marriage as invalid and never incurred (even if the ceremony and wedding reception took place and are evidenced in a video production).

In addition, in canon law another expression is used: conjugal rights and obligations. The above-mentioned four pillars (two essential elements and two characteristics) are a set of the rights and obligations that supposed to be mutually given and received in marriage.

The following table clarify the issues relating to the Christian sacramental marriage:

Essential elements	Love	Community in love, sympathy, attraction, relationship, self-sacrifice, service, ability to establish and develop home, support each other, complementarity, solution loneliness.
	Children	willingness to accept and raise children, problem of communication in the family, responsible parenthood, contraception, abortion.
Essential characteristics	Fidelity	Only one partner, exclusiveness, monogamy, Fidelity
	Indissolubility	divorce rate, nullitas (invalid marriage)

#### 4. The first pillar: Communion in love

In the Constitution of the Second Vatican Council we read: “Confidential community of conjugal life and love established by the Creator and his own laws, which is actually the conjugal contract that is irrevocable personal consent. So this human act is considered for conjugal union with giving and taking between married. That was made by God for people and it is seen in society. The sacred relationship is independent of human volition and in the interests of the spouses, offspring and society. Because God is the creator of marriage which is characterized by different aims and good”<sup>3</sup>. The intimate partnership of married life and love has been established by the Creator and qualified by His laws, and is rooted in the conjugal covenant of irrevocable personal consent. Hence by that human act whereby spouses mutually bestow and accept each other a relationship arises which by divine will and in the eyes of society too is a lasting one. For the good of the spouses and their off-springs as well as of society, the existence of the sacred bond no longer depends on human decisions alone. For, God Himself is the author of matrimony, endowed as it is with various benefits and purposes.

Let’s compare what we can learn about love in community in the church and what we read in publications of revolutionaries in the past two hundred years. In particular, the philosophical and psychological ideas published by Jean Jacques Rousseau, August Comte, Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Friedrich Nietzsche,

<sup>3</sup> Second Vatican Council, *Gaudium et Spes* (The Church in the Modern World) 1965, Article 48.

Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, Wilhelm Reich, Alfred Kinsey, John Watson, Jack Kerouac and others whose common opinion is the rejection of the Church.

Friedrich Engels (1820–1895), in his work *The origin of the family, private property and the State* in 1846 wrote: “The first class in history which has been opposed is identical with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in marriage and first class oppression was ramming the female sex by the male one”<sup>4</sup>. According to him there was class oppression in marriage and not an expression of love and respect. Divorce was considered to be the granted right of men and women.

The first woman of the revolutionary Petrograd Soviet, Alexandra Kollontainov was a commissioner in Lenin’s times for national economy. After the revolution of 1917, she legalized divorce and abortion, founded communal houses and spread “free love” to relieve woman from “the choice between marriage and prostitution”. The Bolsheviki had to control the upbringing of children to communism. Women had to work in factories and did not stay at home with their spouses and children. According to Kollontainov: “The fire of the family fireplace is going to be extinguished in all classes and social levels and we will not use any of the artificial resources to keep fire alive”<sup>5</sup>. The revolutionary message was simple: free yourself from repressive Christian sexual morality, revel in your instincts and so help to create paradise in society without domination<sup>6</sup>.

Sigmund Freud (1856–1939), in connection with psychology, taught that human consciousness is only the visible top of the iceberg. Under that is the hidden unconsciousness which manages the human being. This unconscious, supposedly circled around the repressed sexual requests such as the “Oedipus complex”, “penis envy” and “castration anxiety”, which Freud claimed he detected in cases of his patients. Religion, morality, and parental authority are said to be enshrined in the superego (education developed normative control in the personality) and carry out repressive power over man, particularly with regard to his sexual demands. Using the emancipated ego deprived of its authority and without sexual guilt satisfy requirements<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> F. Engels, *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats*, in: K. Marx, F. Engels, *Werke*, Berlin 1962: Dietz Verlag, zv. XXI, 1962, p. 68.

<sup>5</sup> M. Jones, *Libido Dominandi. Sexual Liberation and Political Control*, South Bend (Indiana) 2000, p. 159.

<sup>6</sup> G. Kuby, *Globálna sexuálna revolúcia*, Bratislava 2013: Lúč, p. 13.

<sup>7</sup> G. Kuby, *Globálna sexuálna revolúcia*. Bratislava 2013: Lúč, p 51.

One of the most influential revolutionaries of sex was Wilhelm Reich (1897–1957) of which Freud's theory about libido developed the theory of orgasm: which simply says that a person needs to have an orgasm three times a week to be healthy and to be able to build a revolutionary body and a classless society. How we reach the climax is up to the individual, whether it is done alone or through swapping partners of both sexes. Therefore, "forced marriage" and "forced families as machine for upbringing" need to be eliminated. Family is the main means of sexualisation, especially children. Reich argued: "Patriarchal family is the structural and ideological point of rendering all social orders which are based on the principle of authority. So do not talk about presence or absence of God; what we need to do is to eliminate sexual repression and let the infantile bond go to the parents<sup>8</sup> – the rest of the subversive objectives are then made as if automatically using dynamics which are in place".

Authority rests on the principle of the relationship to God, the Church, tradition, law, parents, the father and teachers. Reich knew very well that sexualisation is driving the destruction of all these relationships and thus the order of society. Like Marxism, which acted as an infallible, objective science, Reich, under the guise of science and psychoanalysis asserted his "objective truth". According to him, war, exploitation of the proletariat, religious mysticism and fascism have just one cause: six thousand years of "enslaved sexual instinct", which made humanity, all over the world, ill. Reich once said: All these whips to human life will no longer exist when men will feed their sexual needs without any restriction<sup>9</sup>.

Reich pioneered masturbating as a "starting point of damage caused by abstinence" and sex from puberty, because the duration of "forced marriage and the family, as well as the formation of servile structures require such suppression of youthful sexuality"<sup>10</sup>.

Reich was subjected to "forced marriage" three times when he divorced with his third wife with whom he married and had his third child in exile in the United States. At the end of life he was jailed for fraud because along with Dr. Silverton they produced an "orgone machine" a machine for the production of "vital energy". He died in prison in Lewisburg in 1957. His collaborator was released a year later and shortly afterwards committed suicide.

---

<sup>8</sup> W. Reich, *Die sexuelle Revolution*, Kopenhagen 1936: Sexpol-Verlag.

<sup>9</sup> W. Reich, *Die Massenpsychologie des Faschismus*, Frankfurt am Main 1974: Fischer Taschenbuch (orig. 1933).

<sup>10</sup> W. Reich, *Die sexuelle Revolution*, Kopenhagen 1936: Sexpol-Verlag.

Instead of marriage as a community of love for life that needs a sacrifice, self-denial, and the ability to “carry each other’s burdens”, the authors mentioned above offer sexual frolic, under the guise of freedom, and they wanted to liberate man from the classical Christian marriage, which they called class struggle, from the coexistence of coercion and oppression.

## 5. The marriage as sacrament

Let’s compare the previous opinions on family, marriage and sexuality with the theological doctrine of the sacramental value of marriage. Every adult Christian who is looking at the woman whom he is going to marry as his wife can see her figure, her personality, her smile and accepts her as a gift given from God to himself. It is completely the same for an adult Christian woman. After all, how could God show man that He loves him? Well, He created woman for him with all his needs: biological, psychological, sociological and spiritual. How God could show the woman that He loves her? In the same way, He created man for her with all her needs. Getting this gift from God is, at the same time, an invitation: to be respectful to your partner, not to take your partner for granted and wanting to live and sacrifice oneself for the other.

This is the difference between getting married in Church as a sacrament and getting married civilly. Even civil marriage involves a contract: an agreement between two people who love and give themselves to each other. With God, however, this does not count. Without God’s help and protection we may cancel, or terminate the marriage. The partner is not accepted as a gift from God but taken for granted – if God does not exist, where would that gift come from? He or she is considered to be an object, something which you can dispose of anytime. On the other hand, Christianity proclaims the indissolubility, and the duty to look at each other with respect, love and sanctity.

Thus the sacrament of marriage is contact with God, receiving God’s character in men and women. The person of the man is “conjugal enjoyment” for a woman – she receives a sign and a gift of God’s presence in him. The person of the woman is “conjugal enjoyment” for the man. The kissing is receiving. God intended these two people to bless and develop their lives to serve each other<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> A. Fabian, *Vydarený život. Zamyslenia inšpirované evanjeliom*, Prešov 2011: VMV, p. 21.

This view of marriage is based on mutual trust, respect, love, and contrasts sharply with the views of sexual revolutionaries and the “arsonists” of the last century. We are now reaping the fruit of what they had sown. The difference in the interpretation of the first pillar of the marriage is therefore, apparent.

## 6. The second pillar: openness in accepting and upbringing of children

Christian tradition considers as its second pillar, the openness in accepting and upbringing of the children. It is due to the fact that life is a gift from God and should be protected from conception until natural death. Parents “participate” in the creation of their children. The arrival of children in the family increases the love between man and woman as the sign of giving themselves to each other. This kind of love must be, and remain, the love of giving.

Then, this love will be given to the children unconditionally, without any loss to the conjugal love. More so, their love will grow as they themselves love their children. This love brings people true happiness, freedom and real dignity of the human being<sup>12</sup>.

Christian beliefs are comprehensively summarized in the social documents of the popes, especially *Humanae Vitae* by Paul VI. in 1968 and the *Evangelium Vitae* written in 1995 by John Paul II., which deal with these topics.

The opposing views on marriage and adoption of children were published by the Simone de Beauvoir (1908–1986), in her bestseller-book “The other sex”. The book was published in 1949 in French, then 1951 in German. In the late sixties, she sold thousands of copies of the book and in 1967 the book published in Slovakian language as well. Beauvoir was raised in Christian environment, but in her student days she started to be drawn to bohemian life. “I am convinced that there is a place of vice in ourselves, predestined for God. At same time I feel like I am falling down on my knees, as when I was child, right from the bar stool”<sup>13</sup>. She did a “pact” with Jean Paul Sartre and so she became a prototype of free love. In her novels, *L'invitée* (The Invited), *The love in Trinity* and *La femme Rompue* (Broken woman) describes what a high psychological price she had to pay.

---

<sup>12</sup> M. Rusnakova, *Rodina v slovenskej spoločnosti v kontexte sociálnej práce*, Ružomberok 2007: PF KU, p. 34.

<sup>13</sup> A. Schwarzerova, *Simone de Beauvoir. Ein Lesebuch mit Bildern*, Reinbek 2008, p. 38.

“We were not born as women but they make us women” – this was the loud cry of the opposite sex which was understandable since men oppressed women. Women had to deny their feminine identity so that they can have the same privileges as men did. The other sex was claiming it is time to break all shackles of patriarchal oppression and time to escape from the slavery of maternity. They claimed it was the time to have real careers and have a sex with anybody. Thus they needed unconditional contraception and abortion. Pregnancy was considered to be a “deformation” for Beauvoir and the fetus is just a “parasite” or “peace of the meat”. She flaunted her two abortions, and founded a station for aborting children at a time when it was prohibited. Her views attracted Alice Schwarzer to come to Germany as her student. Both achieved what they wanted: the immunity from prosecution of a mother who killed an unborn child in the womb. Since then in Germany more than eight million children were killed<sup>14</sup>.

The manifesto of radical feminism has been formulated as: the rejection of moral standards, the rejection of marriage, motherhood and family, abortion as “women’s right”, self-employed woman as the only one ideal, power to fight against the man.

The second pillar of Christian marriage – the willingness to accept and raise children – also has opponents within the Christian field. In the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, Anglican pastor, Thomas Robert Malthus (1766–1834), a lecturer in political economy wrote “political law” through an *Essay on the Principle of Population*, in 1798. He says that since the population is growing and aging and we do not produce enough food, he prefers the starvation of people and the decrease in birth rate. His theory still has an impact on development in the world. Malthus wanted to remove useless eaters on the “great feast of the nature”. He wrote: “A person who is born into an already occupied world, and his/her family has not enough means for living, or society does not need her/his work, have no right to ask for a meal because they are surplus for society. There is no place for them on the great feast of nature at all. Nature masters itself by killing useless people or: “By disease, misery, death” or making global effort by population controllers, in cases where decimation is not sufficient<sup>15</sup>. One day, when we will really have the lack of the food as is actually happening in some countries worldwide, there will be two options: increase the production of food and fairly divide it between people, or reduce the quantity of the people. The United Nations expects the population in the world to increase to 8.9 billion by 2050, and then to decline. For the first time, the United Nations is

---

<sup>14</sup> G. Kuby, *Globálna sexuálna revolúcia*, Bratislava 2013: Lúč, p. 60.

<sup>15</sup> T. R. Malthus, *Esej o principu populace*, transl. Ivo Šebestík, Brno 2002.

basing on the fact that fertility will decrease in most developing countries in the course of the 21st century. The number of children will go down to 2.1 children per woman. It is assumed that three of four developing countries will drop below the level of substitutability by the year 2050. These estimates got United Nations resort for population during official revision of population in 2002<sup>16</sup>.

The Rockefeller Foundation, with its billions tries to manage social development in accordance with their own interests and takes care of birth rates. In the 20<sup>th</sup> Century it helped in the dissemination of the use of the contraceptive pill and the gradual legalization of abortion since 1960.

Another important movement against the birth rate is referred to as eugenics. Margret Sanger (1883–1966), played a crucial role by having the mission to promote and achieve the legalization of contraception, sterilization and abortion. This “racial hygiene” was asserted also by Theodore Roosevelt (1901–1909), the 26th president of the United States of America: “One day we will find out that our the highest duty of all good citizens is to leave their blood to next generation and we cannot allow begetting of children to an inappropriate people. The big problem of civilization is to allow a relative increment of valuable and not inferior, or even harmful elements in the population... We will be able to handle this problem only when we respect the serious influence of hereditary dispositions... I wish we could prevent giving a birth of unsuitable people mainly with a bad character ... Criminals should be sterilized and the less talented people would be prohibited to leave posterity... We should take care of begetting children by suitable men”<sup>17</sup>.

From the beginning, communist-oriented feminist, Margret Sanger could help out only these powerful and influential one. She lived alone and promote free sex and had affairs with her supporters. She left her husband and their three children and she got married to the oil tycoon James Noah H. Slee who financed her eugenic activity. However, she was affected by the premature death of her disabled daughter throughout her life. Many times she tried to keep in touch with her through the occult seances she participated in<sup>18</sup>.

In 1921, Margret Sanger established the *American Birth Control League* which openly supported eugenic and racist goals. In the same year, in London, Marie Stopes opened her Clinic for birth control. Nowadays, *Marie Stopes International*

---

<sup>16</sup> www.un.org.esa.population.

<sup>17</sup> J. Rifkin, *Was macht euch so ängstlich? Eine Anfrage an die Deutschen*, “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” 18. 11. 2000, č. 269, p. 41.

<sup>18</sup> G. Kuby, *Globálna sexuálna revolúcia*, Bratislava 2013: Lúč, p. 41.

is the largest organisation performing abortions. In the late thirties, the Rockefeller family began to support Margret Sanger in order to solve the problem of massive poverty at the times of economic crisis. In congress, she advocated idea: *more children from the fit, less from the unfit*. Unfortunately for her, there was a powerful opponent of those times, Catholic moral theologian Msgr. John Ryan who said: "... Their main objective is to increase the practice of birth-prevention among the poor... It is said that the present birth-prevention movement is to some extent financed by wealthy, albeit philanthropic persons. As far as I am aware, none of these is conspicuous in the movement for economic justice. None of them is crying out for a scale of wages which would enable workers to take care of a normal number of children".

This article clearly demonstrates the difference between Christian and anticlerical attitudes towards the question of acceptance and upbringing of children. So, current opinions of young women about parenthood, are not voiced by chance, but a result of real people and institutions who promoted free sex, contraception and abortion in the last century.

## 7. The third pillar: fidelity and monogamy

Among the essential features of the Christian sacramental marriage is monogamy and the related loyalty. A problem of our time is that man spends more time with a colleague at work rather than at home with his wife. Similarly, a woman spends more time with her colleagues at work than with her husband in the family. Other seriously threatened families include those where one of the partners has to travel abroad for work for one or more months. Whilst abroad, homesickness and loneliness might easily lead to get to know more people possibly leading to extramarital relationships. Although we therefore cannot expect faithfulness of spouses readily, this value must be purposely fostered among both men and women<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>19</sup> Ruth Stafford Peal in her book "The Adventure of being a Wife" writes a dialogue with her nineteen yearold daughter who is planning to leave her parents' house and move into her new apartment with her boyfriend. But she does not know if she will stay with him. She needs a change and it seems to her to be pretty boring being just with one person for one's entire life. That is the reason why she does not want to marry.

Her Mum said: "I have never felt so powerless, as I am feeling now. What can I reply to your opinion? How can I explain to you what love really is? What I have felt and still been feeling for your

Revolutionaries preferred ideas like: Destroy everything that destroys you! Fight middle-class families! Who has a sex with the same woman twice belongs to middle-class people!

Instructions on how to devastate conjugal fidelity and break up the family were written by Herbert Marcuse (1898–1979) in his book ‘Eros and Civilization.’ According to him the suppression of Eros is supporting socio-pathological dynamics which cause domination among people the, war and mass slaughter. Marcuse was inclined to “libidinal morality” based on Eros. He criticized the “repressive tolerance” and calls for intolerance against anything that might obstruct revolutionary overturning of values. Live here and now, according to the principle of joy and pleasure, was celebrated as a revolutionary act. Whoever was not convinced of this idea was insulted, as a reactionary, revanchist, counterrevolutionary and indecisive<sup>20</sup>. These

---

father? Well, my daughter, what limits people and ruins their happiness is definitely not the bond between two people but opinions such as the ones you present. It is all about your attitude: I care about myself first and foremost. If you care about your happiness first, you will probably need to change men every year. As soon as you start thinking about the other’s happiness and not yours, you will find out that any kind of bond is not an obstacle anymore. Then, you will never need to change men ever. Maturity means to accept responsibility of making the other person happy. Marriage begins right there when we reach this level of the maturity. In this way, it also bridges the chasm of loneliness, which is the worst evil for humans”.

The mother says to her daughter again: “Do you remember? We were on holiday a year ago and you used to go for a walk on the beach every morning. You were not bored by that even though you were there every day. In September, when we went home, you said: ‘I just realized how beautiful sea is! Whether it was rather sunny, windy or rainy weather I could always come out on the beach and admire the sea and everything was on the shore’.

I lived through something similar with your father. It does not matter whether it is sunny or windy, or whether he is in a good mood, whether he is smiling, whether he is sad, if he is sick or healthy there is always something to admire him for, if I love him. A person needs a lot of time to see what treasures are hidden deeply under the sea. In the same way, I needed a lot of time to see what treasures lie deep in his heart. Depending on whether a woman loves her husband, she will need a lot of time to discover his treasures hidden inside. So when she changes partner every year she will not have time to discover anything. Similarly, when a man loves his wife he needs a lot of time to discover treasures hidden inside her heart. However, he will not find anything when he changes women every year”. S. R. Peal, *Ist Ihre Ehe mottensicher?*, “Das Beste aus Reader’s Digest”, júl 1973, p. 110.

<sup>20</sup> H. Marcuse, *Eros and civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*, Boston 1955: Beacon.

views contrast sharply with a hundred-year-old efforts of humankind to control our instincts and so form relationships and families as culturally advanced beings. At the time when Thomas Kempensky (1380–1471) preached: “You are as advanced as many times you deny yourself” – revolutionaries of welfare proclaimed boundless enjoyment of sexual instinct which will allegedly cause a good society without domination, war and genocide.

The Berlin Commune in 1967 (1967) began to promote public sex for all with all. Their opinion was that if youth “want” to have a sex why should we deprive them from it? They practised sexuality being free from “forced marriage”, taboo of incest and forbiddance of paedophilia and propagandized it all in mass media. At the end of eighties and nineties, all these arguments supported Grüne (political party of the Greens) and Humanistische Union (human union).

By removing the Production Code (rules of a film production) in Hollywood and the abolition of the prohibition of pornography in Germany (1973), sex became a bestseller in all forms of media and commercials. In 1951, Beate Uhse opened her Sexshops. In 1956 Bravo was release encouraging the sexualisation of children and adolescents. In 1959 The Playboy magazine followed suit. In 1963 Ingmar Bergmann broke the limits for public expression of sex by his movie *Tystnaden* (The Silence). Since 1967, Oswald Kolle recorded films where people could see many sexual positions. A subculture of hippies, through the powerful medium of pop music, became a mainstream culture of young people. Hashish and psychedelic drugs become socially acceptable. The catchword of those times was: Make love not war.

At the Esalen Institute in California, humanistic psychology and group dynamics methods promised expanding states of consciousness as a prerequisite for the New Age. They penetrated secular and religious educational institutions and schools, and attracted people, promising the possibility to achieve the divine state of consciousness and the fulfilment of all earthly desires without the Christian “morality for slaves”.

Constant media stimulate the sexual instinct with more and more crude images of sexual acts have changed our attitudes and behaviour at the most basic moral level of the human – in sexuality.

All the facts mentioned could give rise to matrimonial infidelity, which from the perspective of the Christian marriage is an important and indispensable pillar of the stability of the family.

## 8. The fourth pillar: indissolubility and divorce

The most significant difference in understanding between civil and ecclesiastical (sacramental) marriage is in the question of dissolubility. Whereas a valid sacramental marriage can be terminated by no power (authority) or any outside or inside influence, civil marriage may be terminated by a verdict of the Court. Both spouses can agree with a common statement for termination of the marriage. The practice of many diocesan tribunals around the world shows an increased number of annulled marriages in the last decades caused because of immaturity of the spouses, as well as the inability to take over the essential obligations of marriage – can. 1095, b. 2 CIC 1983. There are also cases of annulments for defects presented in the mental health of the bride and groom such as gambling, alcoholism, narcissism, homosexuality, and internet addiction, which make it impossible to create healthy interpersonal relationships.

The vast percentages of divorces experienced in our time, are not by chance but they are the result of the social engineering of the past century. Social engineering is the manipulation of society in the service of hidden aims and it is based on behaviorism. The founder was John Watson (1878–1958), whose book *Behaviorism* was released in 1914. He saw in people a mouldable object which can be adapted to positive and negative incentives. It was considered to be a new, strictly scientific knowledge about man and the method for his change. The message of Darwinism: man is nothing more than an evolved monkey, was the first step. Humans could and had to be newly formed so that they would not be connected with religion, tradition and morality.

In 1928, Watson published his book *Psychological Care of Infant and Child* in which parental love and traditional educational standards are replaced by “scientific” ways of behaviour since there is a continuous process of interfering educational competence of the mothers and the fathers. Behaviorism promised to solve social problems by transformation from psychologists to social engineers.

Eddie Bernays (1891–1995), a nephew of Sigmund Freud, was one of the first and most effective social engineers. The magazine *Life* ranks him among the top hundred most influential personalities of the twentieth century. His passion was the manipulation of the masses: “If we understand the mechanism and motives of group thought we will be able to control and manage the masses according to our wish without their being aware of it”. This technique of the formulation of the masses he described as: “engineering of consent”.

Ethologist Bernard Berelson (1912–1979) from Columbia and Stanford Universities further developed the techniques of handling the masses using new

technical possibilities and socio-scientific improvements such as radio, television and public opinion. He worked for the *Ford Foundation* and *Rockefeller Foundation*. In the introduction to his pioneering work, in the 1950s, *Public Opinion and Communication*, he clearly set out the assumptions behind the manipulation of the masses: “The aim of secularization has been to reduce all imperatives of life to an opinion, so that all these imperatives would not be an expression of absolute morality or the law of God. When secularization has succeeded, those who will spread the opinion will rule as well”<sup>21</sup>.

Man who is rooted in religion and in family can be hardly manipulated. People need to first release the moral anchor of faith in God and social anchor of the family so that they can be seduced by the vision of the absolute freedom and sexual satisfaction. Decades of growing prosperity has enabled entertainment to be sold as the meaning of life, promoting all the products that are able to lengthen life, especially through sexual messages, mainly sex. Since the attitudes and behaviours of the masses has changed, a global cultural revolution goes ahead in public debates without any resistance. Sexualisation, even if it is “only” the occasional infidelity or a bit of pornography, make one blind and incapable to resist situations such as the legalization of abortion and “homosexual marriages”. 750 years ago Thomas Akvinsky formulated it as follows: “Blindness of spirit is the first-born daughter of lust”<sup>22</sup>.

Thus different interpretations of the Christian and civil marriage is noticeable in the fourth pillar too, which discuss the dissolubility of marriage. The result of a few decades influence by mass media, institutions and individuals who proclaim if is something possible then it is good has caused so many divorces. Christianity does not hold this principle. Not everything that can be done is also allowed and correct.

## 9. Conclusion

This paper tried to present *four pillars* which the Christian sacramental marriage is based on in contrast with the attitudes of people who do not agree with them and decided to fight against them. The following summary introduced by Gabriele Kuby is a timeline of all these changes and resistances in Germany:

1961 contraceptive pill permitted

---

<sup>21</sup> M. Jones, *Libido Dominandi. Sexual Liberation and Political Control*, SouthBend 2000 (Indiana), p. 415.

<sup>22</sup> G. Kuby, *Globálna sexuálna revolúcia*, Bratislava 2013: Lúč, p. 67.

- 1969 sentence for blasphemy cancelled
- 1969 the partial decriminalization of homosexuality
- 1969 cancellation of marital infidelity
- 1969 introduced sex education as a compulsory subject in elementary schools
- 1973 released pornography
- 1976 the liberalisation of abortion
- 1977 abolition of principle of the guilt in the course of divorces
- 1994 full decriminalization of homosexuality
- 1995 abortion is still “unlawful” but there is no punishment because of law §218a; if “doctor indicates” it is possible to undergo an abortion until a child is not born
- 1999 After red-green government’s decision during Schröder’s times, gender mainstreaming became the main principle and task of politics
- 2001 cohabitation between partners of same sex allowed
- 2001 prostitution approved as a service and employment with social insurance; the struggle for same-sex partnerships, with family and admission of total rights to adopt the child; struggle for acceptance of “sexual identity” to constitution art. 3,3<sup>23</sup>.

Many things which have happened in the last century have had massive impact on current society. Systematic sexualisation of society through mass media has seriously changed the attitudes to sexuality and so, the four pillars of Christian marriage were attacked. The Christian community has to make a great effort to defend the natural, and God’s intention with the people and His project for their happiness.

## Bibliography

Druhy Vat. Koncil, 1965, *Gaudiumetspes*, Rím: SUSCM 1968.

Engels F., *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats*, in: K. Marx, F. Engels (Eds.), *Werke*, Berlin 1962: Dietz Verlag, zv. XXI, s. 68.

Fabian A., *Vydarenýživot. Zamysleniainšpirovanéevanjeliom*, Prešov 2011: VMV.

Jandourek J., *Sociologickýslovník*, Praha 2001: Portál.

JánPavol II, *Familiariconsortio. Apoštolskáexhortácia* (1981).

*Charta právrodiny*, Trnava 1993.

---

<sup>23</sup> G. Kuby, *Globálna sexuálna revolúcia*, Bratislava 2013: Lúč, p. 68.

- Jones M., *Libido Dominandi. Sexual Liberation and Political Control*, South Bend 2000 (Indiana).
- Kuby G., *Globálnasexuálnarevolúcia*, Bratislava 2013: Lúč.
- Malthus T. R., *Esej o principu populace*, přel. Ivo Šebestík, Brno 2002.
- Marcuse H., *Eros and civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*, Boston 1955: Beacon.
- Paleová S. R., *IstIhreEhemottensicher?*, "Das Besteaus Reader's Digest", júl 1973, s. 110.
- Rifkin J., *Was machteuch so ängstlich? EineAnfrage an die Deutschen*, "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" 18.11.2000, č. 269, s. 41.
- Reich W., *Die sexuelle Revolution*, Kopenhagen 1936: Sexpol-Verlag.
- Reich W., *Die Massenpsychologie des Faschismus*, Frankfurt am Main 1974: Fischer Taschenbuch (orig. 1933).
- Reismanová J., McAlister M. E., *Sexual Anarchy: The Kinsey Legacy* (2011), Available online: <http://www.LifeSiteNews.com>.
- Reismanová J., *The Scientist as a Contributing Agent to Child Sexual Abuse: A Preliminary Study*, Haifa 1981.
- Röhl K. R., *LinkeLebenslügen. EineüberfälligeAbrechnung*, Frankfurt am Main 1994.
- Rusnáková M., *Rodina v slovenskejspoločnosti v kontextesociálnejpráce*, Ružomberok 2007: PF KU.
- Schwarzerová A., *Simone de Beauvoir. EinLesebuchmitBildern*, Reinbek 2008.