

Fr Glen Tattersall replies to 'Gay Marriage must be accepted'

The alleged separation between the private life of a Catholic, and his public duty, does not exist. It has been condemned by the Church many times. Its most famous proponent in modern times was probably John F Kennedy. May I draw attention to the following pronouncements of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, that are most relevant in this matter:

CDF, Doctrinal Note on some questions regarding the participation of Catholics in Political Life, 21st November, 2002.

[http://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\\_con\\_cfaith\\_doc\\_20021124\\_politica\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20021124_politica_en.html)

“A well-formed Christian conscience does not permit one to vote for a political program or an individual law which contradicts the fundamental contents of faith and morals.

“It is a question of the lay Catholic’s duty to be morally coherent, found within one’s conscience, which is one and indivisible. «There cannot be two parallel lives in their existence: on the one hand, the so-called ‘spiritual life’, with its values and demands; and on the other, the so-called ‘secular’ life, that is, life in a family, at work, in social responsibilities, in the responsibilities of public life and in culture.”

CDF, Considerations regarding proposals to give legal recognition to unions between homosexual persons, 3rd June, 2003.

[http://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\\_con\\_cfaith\\_doc\\_20030731\\_homosexual-unions\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20030731_homosexual-unions_en.html)

“10. If it is true that all Catholics are obliged to oppose the legal recognition of homosexual unions, Catholic politicians are obliged to do so in a particular way, in keeping with their responsibility as politicians. Faced with legislative proposals in favour of homosexual unions, Catholic politicians are to take account of the following ethical indications.

“When legislation in favour of the recognition of homosexual unions is proposed for the first time in a legislative assembly, the Catholic law-maker has a moral duty to express his opposition clearly and publicly and to vote against it. To vote in favour of a law so harmful to the common good is gravely immoral.

“When legislation in favour of the recognition of homosexual unions is already in force, the Catholic politician must oppose it in the ways that are possible for him and make his opposition known; it is his duty to witness to the truth. If it is not possible to repeal such a law completely, the Catholic politician, recalling the indications contained in the Encyclical Letter *Evangelium vitae*, “could licitly support proposals aimed at limiting the harm done by such a law and at lessening its negative consequences at the level of

general opinion and public morality”, on condition that his “absolute personal opposition” to such laws was clear and well known and that the danger of scandal was avoided.(18) This does not mean that a more restrictive law in this area could be considered just or even acceptable; rather, it is a question of the legitimate and dutiful attempt to obtain at least the partial repeal of an unjust law when its total abrogation is not possible at the moment.”

While conservatives may have reason to be grateful to Tony Abbott for various policies, we cannot afford to be uncritical. Some of us have noted with concern Abbott's continued very public support for the infamous self-mutilator Malcolm (now styled "Cate") McGregor. I fail to see how the Edmund Burke's Club's goals or members are served by a slavish defence of Tony Abbott at every turn.

Fr Glen Tattersall, 6 Oct 2016