

Study for the Month of December 2018

Christ's Sacred Office as High Priest Corrupted by the Roman Church

INTRODUCTION:

The love-and-law-based everlasting gospel, none other than the excelling “good news of salvation” (also called the plan of redemption), was “divinely brooded upon” and perfected by the Council of Heaven before the foundations of the earth were laid prior to its creation in six literal days. It was merely awaited activation at the very moment the crisis for which it was prepared for, happened. And it did, in the fall in Eden. The rest is fallen mankind’s history, serving as the main vehicle and stage for manifesting “to man, angels, and to the world” the unspeakable love, mercy, wisdom, honor, glory, power, and authority of a righteous God, from the first to the final generation.

The Council of heaven is comprised exclusively and limited to the three Persons of the Godhead, namely, the *invisible* Father, the *visible* Son, who is “the express image of His Person” (Heb. 1: 2), and the *invisible* Holy Spirit. Each possess life original, unborrowed, and underived as three divine Co-Equals, the heavenly Trio (“trinity”), each occupying different offices, functions, and corresponding authority attached to each Person. This most wonderful, profound, incomprehensible mystery of union of the Three is described and addressed in the Bible as “the one and only true God.”

As creatures, not and never the Creator, our human mind in our human body are finite, cannot and never will come to the end of searching God or fully fathoming certain aspects and things of *divinity and eternity*, even though the eternally-saved will be continually studying the theme of redemption and the God who created and redeemed them, throughout the endless years of eternity! They will continue growing *ad infinitum* both in the knowledge of God and in His likeness. Just a couple of scriptures make this truth quite plain: “For My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways My ways, says the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts.” Isa. 55: 8, 9, N.K.J.V. “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out.” Rom. 11: 33.

“In the school of Christ [both on earth and in heaven] students are *never graduated*. Among the pupils are both old and young. Those who give heed to the instructions of the divine Teacher *constantly advance* in wisdom, refinement, and nobility of soul, and thus they are prepared to enter that higher school where *advancement will continue to throughout eternity*.” - E.G. White, *My Life Today*, p. 106.

All these, and infinitely more are what Satan and a third of the angels who joined him in his rebellion and war against Jehovah Creator in heaven, have forever forfeited when they were cast out of heaven, completely defeated. And once these heavenly angels, created as a “ministering spirits,” fell, they automatically became a fiend, or devil, or evil spirit. This eternal damnation in “the second death,” will also be what all incorrigibly-rebellious sinners, who persistently reject heaven’s invitation and merciful warning to repent and be saved within a given generational probation time, will inherit. Then they will be as though they never existed, exactly contrary to the devilish doctrine that “unsaved souls are eternally burning in hell.”

Being the *crowning act* of God’s creative power, expressed either through *fiat* or in physical action as in *made*, Adam, followed by Eve were both created “in the image and likeness” of God. The first holy pair, the father and mother of mankind were perfect and without blemish in every conceivable internal and external detail, physically and spiritually. There were no creative defects or inherent weaknesses nor a scintilla of propensity for disobedience in any form or fashion.

They possessed sinless human nature which, by divine design, was endowed with a **will** or the power of choice, rendering them as free moral agents, then and forever as the underlying foundation of true freedom and liberty. The will is the governing power in the nature of man. In their original sinless state—with their moral characters uncorrupted and their conscience undefiled—these were yet undeveloped though their *physical nature* was perfect. The unlimited capacity for love, faith, trust, loyalty and obedience to their Creator and His law, as *free moral agents*, were yet undeveloped, untested. And untested character is unreliable.

The Omniscient and loving Creator knew exactly where to begin with the creatures made in His image and likeness. Therefore the first test of *love for God Creator*—that fundamental principle and power that brings in its train the virtues of genuine faith, trust, loyalty, fidelity, obedience, honesty, purity of thought and actions resulting in righteousness, was, according to plan, facilitated through the simple, comprehensive the Hebrews, p. 92. test of *appetite* or desire—the central driving force in the human nature and the will that governs it.

The very first command ever give to man in his yet sinless, unfallen state was a restriction (as in ‘thou *shalt not*’), inextricably accompanied by warnings of the dire consequence of disobedience, which would be the incontrovertible evidence of the lack of trust and loyalty. The restriction was “not to partake or taste of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and *evil*.”

There was absolutely nothing within them, above, beneath or surrounding them in their perfect Eden home that would enhance in any degree the strength of this first test. On the contrary, every rational reason and physical provisions were present to influence them to obey, pass that first test designed to set them on the endless course of growing more and more in the image and likeness of their Maker so that they could fulfill their original purpose--to represent God in character---to both angels and all the sinless beings of the unfallen worlds in the universe, throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity! Yes, that was the original glorious purpose in the creation of Adam—to become the *human* alter-ego or vicegerent of God on earth and subsequently, throughout the universe.

It was for this exclusive reason that of all the numberless beings He created who occupy both heaven and the unfallen worlds, only Adam and Eve were created in the image and likeness” of the Creator. In hindsight, we are tempted to say in self-justification: “If only Adam and Eve realized their high and holy privilege above all creation and created beings, how differently they would have thought, acted, and decided in response to the first temptation of Satan!” But are we any less worse for not taking the grand plan of salvation to heart, studying what it comprehends, and appropriating its benefits, provisions, promises, and divine power contained in God’s grace to overcome the world, the flesh, and the devil? The condemnation of this final generation upon whom the greatest light of truth has ever been given to mankind will be proportional to its ignorance and rejection. One word describes their condition: “Woe.”

In the plan of salvation Christ was to occupy three successive offices of authority: First, Prophet, then Priest (High), and finally, King (King of kings and Lord of Lords).

Office, in its fullest and complete sense invariably includes three distinct things: power, authority, and the seat. The seat or throne from which the exclusive power and authority resident in it are exercised and dispensed, which its title expressed and defines, includes corresponding prerogatives, privileges, responsibilities, and accountability exclusively invested and expected from the said office and title.

OFFICE OF THE PRIESTHOOD

HIGH PRIEST--Mediator between sinner and an offended God; represents man to God, and God to man. Merciful High Priest and Advocate. Presentor of Sacrifices.

A. The Priesthood of Christ

For this month’s issue, extending to the following issues, if needed, we will consider *in general* Christ’s superior office as Priest and High Priest, followed by the inferior yet essential priesthood of the Christian believers of the New Testament dispensation—as

this is the office and the services connected with it that have been corrupted by the abominable doctrinal errors originated by the Church of Rome and perpetrated down through the centuries till now. It still exercises a strange, mystical, vise-like grip on the minds, traditions, and culture of her adherents, and mainstream Christianity, including the allegedly apolitical, irreligious world-at-large in this supposedly advanced modern age.

The fact that the media in its news reporting, editorials and opinions (as well secular governments and other official institutions) constantly refer to the Pope as “the universal head of Church” and accord him distinctions and prerogatives that exclusively belong to the eternal, immortal God, never to any fallen, sinful mortal man clearly reveals the depths of fearful ignorance that the world-at-large has sunk into regarding the Biblical teachings of the nature of the great controversy, thus, misunderstand the meaning of the gospel and what is for.

Christ’s Qualifications as High Priest

The following are extracts from *The Book of Hebrews* by M.K. Andreasen, *Synopsis of Chapter 5* of the Paulinian epistle:

“To the Jews, a gentle and compassionate high priest was a novelty. [Why?] In Christ’s time the sacred office had fallen to low levels. Arrogancy, pride, and an overwhelming attitude were common traits among the leaders. The remark of the Pharisees, ‘This people who knoweth not the law are cursed,’ well describes their estimate of the lower classes. John 7: 49.

“When Paul, therefore, put compassion for the weak and erring as one of the qualifications of the high priestly office, it must have made a deep impression on the people; for they needed compassion and understanding, and the fact that Christ had these qualifications would predispose them in favor of a change of priesthood.

“In the fifth chapter the author stresses Christ as the ideal priest. In Him, Israel would have their heart’s desire, and would be assured of a compassionate and changeless high priest, who would not in time be superseded by one less worthy.

Hebrews 5: 1-10. For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also compassed with infirmity. And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins. And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but that *he is called of God, as was Aaron*. So also Christ glorifieth not himself to be made an high priest; but he said unto him, Thou art My Son, *today* have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place, *Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedec*. Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things

which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him; called of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec [not that Aaronic or Levitical].”

Verse 1. High priests are taken from among men and ordained for men. (Exo. 28: 1). ‘Things pertaining to God,’ has reference to all things wherein men’s relation touches God, such as sin, forgiveness, mediation, prayer, thanksgiving.

‘Gifts and sacrifices.’ *Gifts* are thought to refer to *unbloody* offerings, *sacrifices* to *bloody* [offerings]. Priests are not to lord it over men but to serve them. They are not only to *accept* gifts and sacrifices but to *offer* them.

Verse 2. “Compassion’ means to feel gently toward, to suffer with. The word denotes an even temper, ‘the mean difference between passionateness and indifference.’ This disposition the priest is to maintain in view of the fact that he himself is *not perfect*, and needs compassion.

‘The ignorant.’ Men often show contempt for the ignorant when they need pity. *The high priest must be no respecter of persons.* He must treat all alike. ‘The ignorant, and . . . them that are out of the way,’ the erring, are primarily such as sinned ignorantly and erred in minor matters.

Verse 3. ‘He ought,’ he must, he is bound to, offer for himself. This should tend to make him compassionate. He must have no feeling of superiority, knowing that he is a sinner as are others. He is one with the people, and must offer for his own sins, as well as for the people’s.

Verse 4. “One important consideration in the office of high priest is the *call*. *This must come from God.* If a man thus receives a call from God, he is divinely fitted to exercise the prerogatives to his call, and men must give him due honor.

Verse 5. “In the century before Christ the selection of candidates for the high priesthood became *irregular*, and was no longer confined to the house [lineage] of Aaron. *Wicked men sought the honor and then obtained the office by the most dishonest means.* Originally the office was for life, and descended from father to son, but now each high priest served only a few years, when he was displaced to make room for another who perhaps had obtained the office by *bribery or even assassination*. **In the 125 years before Christ there were a total of 29 high priests.** The wise high priest would hold his office only long enough to fill his coffers [or bank account]. To continue to serve would expose him to removal by violent means.

“*This explains why there were several high priests living contemporaneously at the time of Christ* [reminds us of the so-called “great Western Schism”-- a 40-year period when three men coming from three different lines claimed to be the legitimate

pope and accused one another as ‘*antipope*’—not antichrist! There was much fighting and even bloodshed!). They had resigned or been forcibly removed to make room for others. *Conditions such as these make more pertinent the statement that Christ did not glorify Himself to become high priest.* ‘It is My Father that honoreth me.’ John 8: 54. Christ did not appoint Himself. *The Father appointed Him.* This refutes the concept some have that the Father is a hard, cruel master, unwilling to forgive, and who will exact the last farthing. On the contrary God appointed Christ mediator [merciful high priest and advocate].

p. 198: “This fact refutes the concept some have that the Father is a hard, cruel master, unwilling to forgive, and who will exact the last farthing. On the contrary God appointed Christ mediator, thus indicating His interest in the salvation of man. [Einstein, his ilk and their supporters totally miss out on this wonderful truth!]. ‘God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.’ 2 Cor. 5: 10.

The following quotations emphasize the fact that Christ did not appoint Himself high priest, and that ‘the exercise of it waited for the ascension,’ which was the coronation.

“When Jesus rose ‘the first-begotten’ from the dead, He was fully constituted the high priestly administrator of the ‘everlasting covenant.’ When He ascended to God’s right hand [ultimate authority, not direction], He clothed Himself with ‘honor and majesty’ and entered upon His administration.’ –*Bishop’s Commentary*, note on Heb. 5: 6. “The resurrection was the virtual investiture of Christ with the priesthood. The exercise of it waited for the ascension, which was to the resurrection as the coronation is to the accession of a sovereign [to the throne or any seat of authority and power].’ – C. J. Vaughan, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 92.

Christ could not be High Priest while on earth for two facts: (1) though fully corrupted already the earthly priesthood was still existing in the Jewish church of Judaism. (2) Until He was crucified and died as the Lamb of God and ascended victorious over temptation, Satan, death, and the grave, He was still the promised Messiah. F.C. Gilbert explains this to the point:

“[Exo. 30: 26-33; 40: 9; Lev. 8: 10-12 Num. 7: 1; Exo. 29: 35; Lev. 8: 33-36 quoted.] These facts of Scriptures are not only interesting, but they are also important to a right understanding of the *work of Christ for man in the heavenly temple.* The anointing of Christ on earth was *not* the anointing for His priesthood. He was anointed on earth as the *Messiah*. After His anointing on earth at His baptism, He became a *Teacher*. He was a *Leader*. He was a *Shepherd*. He was not and could not be a priest, until after the offering was slain. It should be remembered that it was Moses who was performing all these preparatory work of the Aaronic priesthood [cited in the scriptures above of the

anointing of the earthly sanctuary and its vessels, and Aaron as first high priest]. Aaron was not a priest *until after* Moses had anointed him, and had offered the offering of consecration.” – *Practical Lessons for the Church Today*, pp, 472, 473.

“After Jesus spent three and a half years of teaching, healing, and ministering [in His work and capacity as the Messiah], He gave up His life, and died on the cross, as the offering for the human race. *His work then on earth corresponded to the work of Moses, not to the work of Aaron.* Heb. 3: 1-5. *We should bear in mind that the work of Christ includes the work of Moses and of Aaron.* See Deut. 18: 15-18; Acts 3: 22; 7: 37. *The anointing of Christ on earth was the anointing of the Holy Spirit* at the time He began His labors of ministry. *The holy oil was significant of the Holy Spirit.* This anointing with oil [on the earthly high priest and the vessels of the tabernacle] was always a symbol of the anointing of the Holy Spirit.”- F. C. Gilbert, *Ibid*, pp. 473.

Verse 6. “The two quotations in which God declares Christ to be Son and also High Priest, are from Psalms 2: 7 and 110: 4. The first states the fact that Christ is the Son of God, the second appoints Him to the high priesthood. Christ, as the Son of God, had the right of approach to the Father. Even as the Son of *man*, being perfect, He could not be denied access. But He awaited the appointment of the Father, and did not glorify Himself is assuming the office, which He might have claimed as His right. It is significant that it was *Christ*, the anointed One, who had a right to the office [of high priest], who did not glorify Himself. (Heb. 5: 5.) On the other hand the Father ‘glorified His Son *Jesus*,’ thus exalting humanity, and establishing Jesus, the Son of man, as mediator. (Acts 3: 13.)” – M. L. Andreasen, *The Book of Hebrews*, pp.195-199.

Source for following extracts: *Practical Lesson for the Church Today* by F. C. Gilbert: Chapter XIV, The Priesthood and the Offerings, p. 450-451, 452, ___:

“[Heb. 7: 26, 27 quoted]. ‘*The Priests to Represent Christ.*’-- Of all the offices connected with the Jews, that of the priesthood was the most solemn and sacred. The climax of truth and beauty concerning the work and ministration of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the most graphic representation of the Messiah as He was to be, *were met in the high priest* and those associated with him. Consequently, special laws and ordinances were given for the priesthood, which *could not under any circumstances* be applied to any other class of people. The Lord sought to keep them pure, holy, spotless,-- living examples to all of the purity and spotlessness of their great Antitype, the Lord Jesus. *They were to be the models for the people; and to them the people were to look for instruction, for blessing [Num. 6: 22-26], for truth, for light, for judgment.*

“2. Though the Lord had done all in His power to preserve them pure, it was but a *short time* after the priesthood was instituted, before some of them became corrupt [Lev. 10: 1, 2; 1 Sam. 2: 12, 17, 27-29]. Corruption continued to increase among them, till

the days just prior to the Babylonian exile; then all became so wicked and vile [2 Chron. 36: 14; Ezra 10: 18, 19] *that the Lord was obliged to send them into captivity for seventy years*. After the return from Babylon, Ezra, Nehemiah and a few others sought to reform the priesthood, and for a while met with good success [Ezra 10: 18, 19]; but soon after the men of God passed away, corruption again was rife among them [Mal. 1: 6-8; 2: 1, 2, 7, 8], and so wicked were they, that when the Lord came to earth every bit of sacredness and solemnity connected with that office was entirely lost; and *the priests in general were among the worst of the people* [Matt. 21: 15; 26: 3, 4; Luke 10: 31].

“This was especially true of the high priest. His position being the greatest, his influence the most extensive, using it for personal advantage only, naturally made him most wicked and corrupt [Matt. 26: 65-67; Acts 23: 2]. To see the force of this statement, we need to consider such men as **Annas and Caiaphas**, from the accounts given them in the New Testament. And the **Talmud** tells us that a *learned* person, though he be an illegitimate child, is to be preferred before a high priest who is an ignorant man. Thus we can see how this most holy office had become vile, especially among the rabbis and priests themselves.” – *Ibid*, p. 452 . (see explanatory note below):

Chap. XVI *Explanatory Notes* on Paragraph 2: “a. Of the priesthood just before and at the time of the Messiah’s first advent, the following is to the point (quoting Josephus):

“Hereupon they sent for one of the *pontifical* tribes, which is called Eniachim, and cast lots which of it should be the high priest. By fortune the lot so fell as to demonstrate their iniquity after the plainest manner; for it fell upon one whose name was Phannias, the son of Samuel, of the village of Apatha. He was a man not only unworthy of the high priesthood, but that did not well know what the high priesthood was, such a mere rustic was he; yet did they hale this man, without his consent, out of the country, as if they were acting a play upon the stage, and adorned him with a counterfeit face: they also put upon him the sacred garments, and upon every occasion instructed him what he was to do [robotic; marionette-like!] This horrid piece of wickedness was *sport and pastime* with them , but occasioned the other priests to shed tears, and sorely to lament the dissolution of such a sacred dignity.” – *Josephus, The Jewish Wars, book 4, chapter 3, par. 8*.

Origin of the Priests

“Much might be said concerning the priests and their work, but space will forbid an extended dissertation. In the **patriarchal days** [the patriarchal dispensation], the head of the family was also its local priest, who did the ministering for the family, before the Lord. The father of the family was supposed to represent the Great High Priest before his household. In the days of the Israelites, after they had become a people [inaugurated

by the first Passover held on the eve of their departure from the land of Egypt] and were a type of the gospel and salvation through the Messiah, the priesthood was confined to a special tribe. The tribe chosen was that of Levi (Num. 3: 11, 12, 41, 44, 45) [the **Levitical dispensation**]; the gift was placed upon Aaron and his posterity (Exo. 28: 1). All male children of Aaron (Num. 3: 10) were to be priests. This priesthood was to be confined only to the family of Aaron, and was not to be transmitted to any other portion of this tribe [Levi]. (Lev. 21: 10; 2 Chron. 24: 11).

4. “The priesthood was divided into *two sections*, the **high priest** (Lev. 21: 10; 2 Chron. 24: 11) and the **regular priests** (Num. 3: 2, 3; Luke 1: 8). The high priest was especially to be God’s personal representative on the earth [this is where the papal claim to be vicegerent of God comes from], *a special type of Christ*, to communicate His messages to the people. This is forcibly illustrated when Moses and Aaron were commanded to appear before Pharaoh. The Lord said thus to Moses: ‘*Is not Aaron, the Levite thy brother? I know that he can speak well. . . . And thou shalt speak unto him, and put words in his mouth And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God.*’ Exo. 4: 14-16, K.J.V.” – *Ibid*, pp. 453, 454.

The Papal Teaching and Practices of the Priesthood

Louis F. Were says: “The papal teaching of the dignity and power of the Roman Catholic priesthood is another, of many examples, illustrating that Satan deceives by *limiting* to earthly persons or places truths which apply in a universal sense to the body of the church. The members of that church are educated to believe that the ‘keys’ of heaven and hell are in the hands of the *priest*. By wrong interpretations of hell Matt. 16: 18, 19; John 20: 22, 23, the people [members of the Catholic communion and the world in general] are taught to believe that the *priest* can bind and loose, and remit *sins*. The New Testament teaches that *every believer* [in the fullest sense of the word] *is a priest* (see Rev. 1: 6; 5: 10; 20: 4; 1 Pet. 2: 5, 8, etc.) offering up ‘*spiritual* sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.’ ‘Let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually.’ Heb. 13: 15. ‘*Present your bodies a living sacrifice*, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.’ Rom. 12: 1.

“To the [true] *church as a whole*—with *each* individual sharing *alike* in privilege and power—has been committed the solemn charge of handling the *keys* of heaven and hell [1] by bringing the knowledge of salvation from sin, [2] by bringing the sinner into contact with the Savior, and [3] *by* prayer leading the sinner to lay hold on eternal life. As the [true] church* joins with the Savior in the work salvation, she becomes a channel of blessing to all who accept her message; but those who reject will be destroyed in the day of the Lord’s wrath. Thus the power of life and death is not in the hand of a *few*

literal priests, but belong to the *whole church, every* member of which is a *spiritual priest* offering up spiritual sacrifices.’ The error lies in the *limitation* [devised by the papacy] placed upon that which God intends should be applicable to His children in *all the world*. The same error---of limiting to time and place truths that are world-wide---appears throughout Satan’s counterfeit system of interpretation.”- L. F. Were, *Certainty of the Third Angel’s Message*, p. 299.

Below are fundamental yet comprehensive Biblical definitions of what the church is, its purpose and mission from its founding by the twelve apostles after Pentecost with Jesus Christ as its Rock and Cornerstone and onward through its seven stages from Pentecost down to the close of time. See the seven churches of Revelation chapters 2 and 3. E. G. White in her *Acts of the Apostles* says, and we quote pp. 9, 10, 11 (emphasis mine):

“The church is God’s appointed agency for the salvation of men. It was organized for service, and its mission is to carry the gospel to the world. From the beginning it has been God’s plan that *through* His church shall be reflected to the world His *fullness* and His *sufficiency*. The members of the church—*those whom He has called out of darkness into His marvelous light* [of the gospel truth], are to show forth His glory.

“The church is *the repository of the riches of the grace of Christ*; and through the church will eventually be made manifest, even to ‘principalities and powers in heavenly places’ (Eph. 3: 10) the *final and full display* of the love of God.”

“The church is God’s fortress, His city of refuge, which He holds in a revolted world. Any betrayal of the church is *treachery* to Him who has bought mankind with the blood of His only begotten Son.

“From the beginning, *faithful* souls have constituted the church on earth. In every age the Lord has had His *watchmen*, who have borne a faithful testimony to the generation in which they lived. These *sentinels* gave the message of *warning*; and when they were called to lay off their armor, others took up the work. God brought these *witnesses* into covenant relation with Himself, uniting the church on earth with the church in heaven. He has sent forth His angels to minister to His church, and the gates of hell have not been able to prevail against it.” –*Acts of the Apostles*, p. 11.

Q. How have the “gates of hell” not been able to prevail against the true church?

“Through centuries of persecution, conflict, and darkness, God has sustained His church. Not one cloud has fallen upon it that He has not prepared for; not one opposing force has risen to counterwork His work, that He has not foreseen. *All has taken place as He has predicted* [by way of prophecy]. He has not left the church forsaken, but has traced in prophetic declarations what would occur, and that which His Spirit inspired the prophets to foretell has been brought about. *All His purposes will be fulfilled*. His law is linked to His throne, and *no power of evil* [‘gates of hell’] can destroy it. Truth is inspired and guarded by God; and it will triumph over all opposition.” - *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 11, 12.

(Continued next month)

“It is true that there are real Christians in the Roman Catholic communion. Thousands in the church are serving God according to the best light they have. They are not allowed access to His word, and therefore they do not discern the truth. They have never seen the contrast between a living heart-service and a round of mere forms and ceremonies. God looks with pitying tenderness upon these souls, educated as they are in a faith that is delusive and unsatisfying. He will cause rays of light to penetrate the dense darkness that surrounds them. He will reveal to them *the truth as it is in Jesus*, and many will yet take their position with His [commandment-keeping] people.” –*Great Controversy* (1911 edition), pp. 563-581.

Allegiance to, when Sunday observance is sign of, GC 449 (Ev 233-4)

America will unite with the Papacy in forcing conscience and compelling men to honor the false sabbath, 6T 18

Papacy, as form of antichrist 7BC 910

Papacy as ‘man of sin.’

Source of the information following below: *American Freedom and Catholic Power* by Paul Blanshard, The Beacon Press, 1949: *Sex, Birth Control and Eugenics*, Chapter 7, pp. 132-154:

Firstly, **eugenics** is defined as “the science that deals with influences that improve inborn or hereditary qualities of a race or breed, especially of the human race.”

Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, Fifth Edition, Merriam-Webster 1942.

Rhythm Method Marriage Destroyer

Blanshard writes:

“Faced with increasing skepticism and revolt among their own people, the priests have turned to a *Catholic birth-control formula* of their own that is technically permissible under one interpretation of the general phrases of Pius XI’s encyclical, *Casti Connubii*. Originally the formula was sponsored in this country by the very prelate, Cardinal Hayes, who had been responsible for directing New York Catholic police to break up a birth-control meeting arranged by Margaret Sanger.* The new ‘discovery,’ published in official pamphlets {20}, is called the *rhythm method*. It is based upon the finding that conception takes place midway between menstrual cycles, about fourteen days before the next period. Catholics, according to this formula, **may avoid pregnancy without sin** by refraining from intercourse during a part of each month so long as they are submissively receptive to the arrival of an unwanted soul in case

there is a miscalculation. **The theologians call this rhythm method ‘natural’ because it involves no medicine or contraceptive device.**”- *Ibid*, pp. 141,142.

“Whether this rhythm method is ‘natural’ or not, it is certainly a difficult and inferior method of birth control, as Dr. Robert L. Dickinson has pointed out in his authoritative work, *Techniques of Conception Control*. Any fright, slight illness or journey may disturb the menstrual cycle enough to destroy a calculation. Four-fifths of all women vary five days or more in their cycles, and very precise handling of a calendar is required to make the rhythm method successful. Some specialists believe that the rhythm method allows only six or seven safe’ days a month for sexual relations without danger of conception, and they agree that *abstinence during the balance of each month is one of the surest methods of destroying a marriage.*’ {21}.

p. 143: “The advocacy of the rhythm method puts Catholic theologians in a paradoxical position. *For years the priests who discussed birth control attacked the conventional arguments for child-spacing as morally mistaken.* Now they are using many of those same arguments for **the systematic regulation of planned intercourse in the Catholic pattern.** The Catholic physician, Dr. Leo Latz, in his officially approved plea for the rhythm method, says:

‘Burdens that test human endurance to the utmost limit, and to which all too many succumb, will be lightened. I speak of economic burdens, the burdens of poverty, of inadequate income, of unemployment, which make it impossible for parents to give their children and themselves the food, the clothing, the housing, the education and recreation they are entitled to as children of God. I speak of physiological burdens, the burdens of depleted energies and exhausted vitality resulting from a previous birth or miscarriage, the burden of chronically or temporarily adverse conditions of the heart, the kidneys, or other organs, or of conditions that threaten the life of the mother in case of pregnancy. I refer to psychic burdens, not infrequently more difficult to bear than any I have so far mentioned, burdens of uncontrollable fear, anxiety, irritability, or rebellion against God and His Church for seeming to make demands beyond human nature, beyond human power to endure.’ {22}.

“The rhythm method, with all its uncertainty, has gained such popularity among American Catholics that priests are apprehensive about the ‘vicious rhythm mentailit’---

“Nobody knows exactly where the elaborate sexual code of the Catholic Church has come from. It has been developed by accretion over a period of nineteen centuries, until, today [1949], it is one of the most conspicuous parts of Catholic moral philosophy. Perhaps it ought to be called an anti-sexual code (even though the Church teaches that ‘a wife may not without sufficient reason deny herself to her husbands’) because the primary emphasis has always been upon the negative than upon the wholesome aspects.

p. 147: “The [Roman Catholic Church] hierarchy’ s claim to control the entire ethical code surrounding propagation and child-birth includes the fields of sterilization,

artificial insemination, population control, and the so-called Rh blood factor. Behind the Catholic formula in regard to all these 'quality' problems in human beings is the philosophy that creating Catholics is a good thing in itself, and that even if they are diseased, feebleminded and a menace to normal community life, no *medical act* should be permitted to prevent conception, their survival, or their freedom to produce other human beings. Unless such a theory of reproduction, eugenics is on the defensive. 'Medicus,' whose priestly textbook I have already mentioned, opens his section on eugenics for priests with the statement: 'In our time there has risen a most dangerous movement called Eugenics . . . Human nature is more than an animal. Therefore it must not be made subject to the laws of stock breeding.'

Why countries where Roman Catholicism is the national or majority religion have very large families

"With this outlook upon eugenics, it is natural that the RCC should oppose all types of population control except 'self-control' within marriage. The hierarchy freely admits that self-control has obvious limits. Hence the production of large families regardless of quality or poverty is an inevitable and recognized result of Catholic population policy.

"Catholic sociologists refuse to concede that there can be any such thing as overpopulation. The trouble with the world, they declare, is not too many people but a poor organization of human resources. 'With supplies increasing in proportion to population,' says the *Catholic Encyclopedia Supplement*, 'there is no such thing as overpopulation.'

"Such a statement meets with general ridicule in the world of non-Catholic social science, and in self-defense many Catholic economists *pretend* that advocates of population control have not given due thought to economic reform. Actually, of course, advocates of **planned parenthood** and population control are usually advocates of economic improvement also, and only in segregated culture of the Catholic universities is there any divorce between movements for economic and biological experiment.

"Virtually all the population experts of the world today believe that some form of population control, with child-spacing, is necessary to preserve minimum standards of social decency. The plain facts seem to make their position incontrovertible. The world has more than doubled [as of 1949] in population in the last century from 1, 000, 000, 000 to 2,200, 000,000 and with modern improvements in medical science the world's population may reach 4 or 5 billion within the life-span of those now living. [NOTE: see above the latest world population] . Such overpopulation, if unchecked, will mean **unspeakable horrors**, especially in Asia, even if the world's productive capacity is rapidly increased. It will mean also the kind of overcrowding that leads inevitably to **war**.

“William Vogt has recently emphasized these dangers in his *Road to Survival*, and has indicated that many experts consider the United States already overpopulated. Professor Earnest A. Hooton, head of the department of Anthropology at Harvard, expressed the conviction of most experts in this field when he said in 1941: ‘The *hypocrisy of certain organized religions* and governments in endorsing deliberate killings in warfare, for whatever motives, and at the same time opposing the restricting of that fatal overproduction of low-grade human life which leads to warfare, should not be tolerated by the leaders of human biological science.’{30}

“The American Catholic scholars cannot admit the truth of such statements. *They are under Papal orders to stress quantity rather than quality in population* and to resist every medical and political reform that might sacrifice one for other. Vogt’s *Road to Survival*, when it appeared in 1948, was denounced in the Catholic press as part of a ‘war against the child.’ {31} Catholic sociologists are trying to stimulate the movement of Catholic families from the city to the country—without success—because the Catholic birth rate in rural areas is much larger than in crowded cities. They are alarmed by the fact that 80 percent of American Catholics live in cities and that the Catholic birth rate in such cities is declining. [32].

p. 149: “Various spokesmen for the Church deny that the Church officially teaches Catholic women to have as many children as possible, *but the denial will not bear analysis*. At one and the same time the priests teach that ‘a wife may not without sufficient reason deny herself to her husband, [33], and that *all contraception is a grave sin*. The fear of extreme poverty is not accepted by the priests as ‘sufficient reason’ for avoiding surplus children. **So the Catholic doctrine leads inevitably either to the overproduction of children or to the violation of the ‘divine’ law.**

Note: The inspired writer cites pure Biblical principles in warning about “big families.” _____. Moreover, the Bible says the following are *grave sins* in the sight of a holy God:_____.

“When the Catholic organizations choose ‘the Catholic Mother of the Year,’ they usually avoid this dilemma by choosing a mother of the upper classes whose husband earns enough money to support and oversized family. *The ‘Catholic Mother’ of 1848 had fourteen children*, a husband with a very substantial income as a prominent Philadelphia attorney, and a mother who lived with her for twenty-five years and ‘took over the housekeeping.’ [34].

“The tensions and strains imposed upon the Catholic family by priestly rules for sex relations ultimately destroy many families. Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist Church brought this out clearly in an address in 1947 before the *Planned Parenthood Association of Chicago*:

'Roman Catholic insistence on continence as the virtuous method of spacing children is based on ignorance of the place of conjugal love in the maintenance of the home and as vicious conception of one of the most sacred of human relationships. If we may assume that the normal family should be composed of from three to six children and we face the fact that the child-bearing years of the woman are about twenty-five, the Roman Catholic Church is recommending continence for approximately twenty of the twenty-five years. Psychologically, the inevitable frustration of such a practice means the destruction of the home, and it is therefore sinful. If continence is not practiced, then it means a woman may be called upon to bear twenty children, which in present society, if we think in terms of the support and education of the child, as well as the life of the mother, is sinful.' {35}

"In reply to such realism the hierarchy can offer only the Papal defense that quantity production of Catholic souls outweighs [see infant baptism to swell church membership!] outweighs all the personal suffering and frustration involved. Dr. Raoul de Guchteneere in his *Judgment on Birth Control* said bluntly: 'The value of progeny is not to be measured by physical qualities but lies entirely in that supernatural destiny which is common to all. Even the marriage of the feebleminded is forbidden only on the ground of their inability to make a valid contract and not on account of the possible quality of the offspring.' {36}

"American priests console themselves with the thought that their own **celibacy** [one of the doctrines of devils ____] provides a 'solution' for the problem of overpopulation [and is, in fact, the fertile ground for sexual perversion, homosexuality, and pedophilia, as is being exposed today—since it goes against God's design for man and woman, the marriage institution and sanctified procreation between man and wife!] Father Daniel A. Lord said in a thinly disguised fiction of his *Speaking of Birth Control*:

'But the Catholic Church long ago, perhaps without realizing it, solved whatever problem of overpopulation there might be. It stressed the fact that there is a state of celibacy [absolutely no Biblical basis]. It encouraged men and women to marry and bring into the world large families; but out of those families it asked for a generous supply of priests, monks and nuns who would vow themselves to *continuous chastity*. Their example inspired people of the world with the realization of the possibility of purity [a poorly-disguised accusation that married people married people cannot be morally pure!]. And at the same time the fact of their professional chastity kept them from increasing the world's population. So without any preaching about crimes against nature [celibacy is in fact, a crime against nature!] and by example of pure lives lived by men and women, the Church removed any possible danger of overpopulation.' {37}

"In view of such determined complacency concerning *overpopulation*, it is not surprising that the hierarchy opposes all kinds of eugenic sterilization, even when surrounded with the most careful safeguards against abuse. *The theologians do not oppose sterilization as a penalty for crime because such opposition would bring the priests into direct conflict with the enforcement of criminal law.* The Church even condones and accepts capital punishment. [see **latest public stance of pope Francis on this**]. But eugenic sterilization is another matter. Such sterilization,

designed to protect society against the production of feeble-minded citizens, is branded as ‘interference’ with divine law. It cannot be countenanced even when applied only to those inmates of mental institutions who could thereby gain release.

“This attitude has been imposed upon all American Catholic doctors and nurses by the same Pope Pius XI who ruled against contraception in 1930, and in the same encyclical. Before 1930 many competent Catholic authorities argued that the state has the same right to sterilize the feeble-minded that it has to *vaccinate* children, for its own protection. Then Pope Pius XI, in his *Casti Connubii*, not only condemned sterilization of the feeble-minded, but said that the government, in sterilizing the insane and feeble-minded, *is arrogating to itself ‘power over a faculty which it never had and can never legitimately possess.’* [Who does prophecy expose as the antichrist who blasphemously arrogates to himself the name, title, and authority over the conscience that exclusively belongs to the Godhead only?]. This defiance of modern governments was justified by Pius XI who said that ‘the family is more sacred than the State and that men are begotten not for the earth and for time, but for Heaven and eternity.’ {38}.

“I have already quoted Father Francis J. Connell who gave the doctrine *American application* by saying, after he had declared that *no Catholic judge* [the U.S. Supreme Court is now stacked with judges who are Roman Catholic] *could ever approve euthanasia::* ‘Similarly, in those states which now prescribe or permit eugenic sterilization for certain types of defectives and criminals, no circumstances can justify a judge giving a decision that the law should be put into operation.’ It would be interesting to bring a test case in some American court to determine whether a Catholic judge, sworn to enforce the law [and the Constitution] of his state without reservation, could obey this ecclesiastical edict and still observe his judicial oath. If, in order to obey the Church, a Catholic judge violates his judicial oath after getting a *Papal dispensation* for the violation, *he is considered blameless by Catholic theologians.* He is obeying a ‘higher law,’ and the Pope is empowered under Canon 1320 to dispense with *any* oath.’ {39}.

NOTE: The Pope, it is claimed, is empowered under *Roman Catholic* Canon law 1320 to dispense *with any oath!* The Bible, however, solemnly warns all not to make any oath or promises or enter into any covenant with the intent of not honoring such. Unless they repent and do restitution, they are self-condemned in the “judgment seat of Christ” as false witnesses, liars, and law-breakers.

“Fortunately, neither the people nor the courts of the U.S. agree that there is anything necessarily wrong in depriving an insane or feeble-minded person of the capacity to reproduce by a simple and relatively painless operation [vasectomy] which does not even deprive him of the satisfaction of sex. The Supreme Court of the U.S. approved sterilization of the unfit in an historic opinion written by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1927, with only one dissenting vote, that of *Catholic Pierce Butler.* Justice Holmes

said: 'It is better for all the world if, instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime or let them starve for the imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit for continuing their kind. The principle that sustains compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the Fallopian tubes.' In commenting on the test case he added: 'Three generations of imbeciles are enough.' {40}

"But the opposition of the hierarchy continues to hamper enforcement of the sterilization laws in the twenty-seven states that now have such laws [as of this publication date], and to prevent the passage of adequate sterilization laws in other states.' {41}. Birthright, Inc., the national organization which is working for sterilization laws in all states, reports the same kind of threats against legislators in this field that the Planned Parenthood Federation reports in the field of birth control. Meanwhile, the feeble-minded who are at large in our population produce future Americans at a much faster rate than our normal citizens.

"Eugenic sterilization for normal persons is also forbidden by the priests even when it seems to be absolutely necessary for the health of the mother and the happiness of a marriage. The following question and answer for the use of priests in confessionals appeared in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* for July, 1948. It is a striking revelation of priestly *casuistry* ["sophistical, equivocal, or specious reasoning, esp. in regard to law and morals." *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, Fifth edition, 1942].

Question: A woman has had two children, both of whom were brought into the world by a Caesarian operation. On the second occasion the attending obstetrician declared that the woman would never be able to give birth to a child normally, and that another pregnancy would very probably prove fatal. Accordingly he recommended that the fallopian tubes be tied up as a protection against such an occurrence. Would such a procedure be permissible? In other words, would ligature of the tubes in such circumstances be regarded as a lawful therapeutic sterilization?

Answer: The tying up of the fallopian tubes in the circumstances described would be a grave sin against the law of God [what law in the Decalogue specifically defines this?], an unlawful act of sterilization. The fact that another pregnancy would probably (or even certainly) cause the woman's death does not justify the procedure by rendering it a lawful therapeutic sterilization. A lawful therapeutic sterilization takes place only when an operation or treatment is given which, though it produces sterility, also *by its very nature* confers a physical benefit sufficiently great to compensate for the evil effect, sterility. Thus the excision of the reproductive organs when they are seriously diseased is permissible, since such an operation *by its very nature* has a notable beneficial effect on the health of the patient, in addition to its sterilizing effect.

"In such as case we legitimately apply the principle of the double effect, so frequently used in moral theology. But in the case presented the ligature of the tubes in itself contributes nothing toward the well-being of the woman; it merely produces sterility. It is true, this is directed to a good effect inasmuch as it prevents the physical harm which would (probably or certainly) be consequent on another pregnancy. But this good effect is produced *by means* of the bad effect, hence, one who would hold that such as operation is lawful would have to admit that *a good end can justify a bad means*. If the woman in question

