

Study for the Month of June 2014

## ***The Papacy Series-Part XVI***

By Nathaniel Fajardo

Whole Gospel Ministries

PO Box 1764 Loma Linda, CA 92354

Tel (951) 685-1956 (leave a message) email: [HYPERLINK "mailto:natfajardo777@yahoo.com"](mailto:HYPERLINK \)

[natfajardo777@yahoo.com](mailto:natfajardo777@yahoo.com)

Web: [www.wholegospelministries.org](http://www.wholegospelministries.org)

### ***Papal Principles Diametrically Opposed to Democratic Institutions, Pluralistic Society, Religious Liberty, Freedom of Speech and Press***

Official Roman Catholic doctrine denies, in fact decries religious freedom and liberty *for all* which is mankind's most fundamental inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience---not by any church or any civil powers' definition and edicts, particularly so when both separate powers combine to enact and enforce such as the rule of the land. This was what precisely brought on the Dark Ages, 538-1798 A.D. The universal church opposes the divine principle of the separation of church and state which is the very foundation of Americanism. The Papacy detests it.

But it's what the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution guarantees, as the founding fathers wrote it. Every American citizen and Bible-reading Christian knows it by heart. But sadly, few realize it has been undergoing steady erosion which will end in the permanent loss of this God-given right, according to Bible prophecy.

Christian Edwardson, in *Facts of Faith* documents and cites official Catholic literature and authorities on this vital topic. He succinctly states the true Christlike attitude that every true Christian is to exercise towards this issue and the institution we have been serializing. In the opening statements of the chapter *Americanism Versus Romanism*, he states his position, which has been the attitude and spirit of this ministry from the very outset. This background is essential in analyzing Patricia Miller's blog (see below after quotes from Facts of Faith and other sources mentioned) entitled: "Why the Catholic Church's Suppression of Abortion Dissent Should Concern Us All."

Thus we quote Edwardson again, since we quoted him in the past issues (all emphasis mine):

**"Some say: What of it! Are not Roman Catholics as good as *Protestants*?**

[That is, if there are still Protestants today in the fullest sense of the word, aside from Seventh-day Adventists]. **Yes, certainly they are. As individuals there is no distinction from the law, and as neighbors they are loved and respected. We, however, are not speaking of individuals, but of a church organization that claims certain rights of jurisdiction in civil affairs, and whose avowed principles are diametrically opposed to liberty of speech, liberty of press, and religious liberty in general, as understood by the founders of this republic and incorporated into its fundamental laws.** This we shall now prove (1) from official Catholic documents, (2) from actual application of their principles to civil governments.

"OFFICIAL CATHOLIC DOCUMENTS. Pope Leo XIII, in an encyclical letter,

Immortale Dei, November 1, 1885, outlines 'the Christian constitution of states,' by saying that 'the state' should profess the Catholic religion, that the Roman pontiffs should have 'the power of making laws.' 'And assuredly all ought to hold that it was not without a singular disposition of God's providence that this power of *the Church was provided with a civil sovereignty as the surest safeguard of her independence.*' [This is nowhere taught in the Bible but was particularly warned of by Christ himself].

"He says of the Middle Ages [actually, the Dark Ages]: '[then] the church and state were happily united.' – *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII,* pp. 113, 114, 119. *Bensiger Bros., 1903.*

"Sad it is to call to mind how the harmful and lamentable rage for innovations which rose to a climax *in the sixteenth century*,\* . . . spread among all classes of society. From this source, as from a fountain-head, burst forth all those later tenets of unbridled license . . . .

'Among these principles the main one lays down that as all men are alike by race and nature. . . . that each is free to think on every subject just as he may choose . . . . In a society grounded on such maxims, all government is nothing more nor less than *the will of the people* [isn't this the pluralistic principle of a democracy?].

'And it is part of this theory . . . .that everyone is to be free to follow whatever religion he prefers, nor none at all if he disapproves of all. . . .

'Now when the state rests on foundations like those just named---and for the time being they are greatly in favor---it readily appears into what and how unrightful the a position the [Roman Catholic] Church is driven . . . . They who administer the civil power . . . defiantly put aside the most sacred decrees of the Church [not the Bible]. . . .

'The sovereignty of the people. . . . is doubtless a doctrine. . . .which lacks all reasonable proof.' –*Id., pp. 120-123.*

"In his next encyclical letter, of June 20, 1888, he calls it 'the fatal theory of the need of separation between Church and state,' 'the greatest perversion of liberty,' and 'that fatal principle of the separation of Church and state.' – *Id., pp. 148, 159.*

"In his letter of January 6, 1895, he says ; 'It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that **in America** is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the [Roman Catholic] Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for state and church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced . . . . She would bring forth more abundant fruits *if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.*' – *Id., pp. 323, 324.* [Would the RCC say this also for other churches and denominations? Certainly not!].

"Among the many authorities that could be cited, we have chosen that of Pope Leo XIII, because he is not a medieval, but a modern, exponent of papal doctrines, which no Roman Catholic would deny. Anyone familiar with the phraseology of the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution cannot help but see in the expressions of Pope Leo a *declared opposition* to the fundamental principles upon which our [U.S.] government is founded. He urges his followers not to be content with attending to their religious duties, but '*Catholics should extend their efforts beyond this restricted sphere, and give their attention to national politics.*' – *Id., p. 131.*

'It is the duty of all Catholics . . . to strive that liberty of action shall not transgress *the bounds marked out by nature and the law of God* [???]; to endeavor to bring back all civil society to the pattern and form of Christianity which *We* [not the Bible] have described. . . . Both these objects will be carried into effect without fail if all will follow the guidance of the Holy See [not the Bible nor the Holy Spirit!!] as their rule of life and obey the bishops.' --- *Id., p. 132.*

**'Especially with reference to the so-called 'Liberties' which are so greatly coveted in these days, all must stand by the judgment of the Holy See'** – *Id., p. 130.*

"In his encyclical letter of January 10, 1890, on 'The Chief Duty of Christians as Citizens,' (*id., pp. 180-207*) he urges all Catholics to put forth united action in politics in

order *to change the governmental policies* so as to bring them into harmony with papal principles. He says:

‘As to those who mean to take part in public affairs they should avoid. . . . leading the life of cowards, untouched in the fight. . . .

‘Honor, then, to those who shrink not from entering the arena as often as need calls, believing and being convinced that the violence of injustice will be brought to an end and finally give way to the sanctity of right and religion.’ – *Id.*, pp, 199-201.

“They are urged to support (in elections) only those men who will stand by the principles of union of church and state:

‘The Church cannot give countenance or favor to those whom she knows to be imbued with the spirit of hostility to her; who refuse openly to respect her rights; who make it their aim and purpose to turn asunder the alliance that should, by the very nature of things, connect the interests of religion [whose religion?] with those of the state. On the contrary, she is, as she is bound to be [by whom?] the upholder of those who are themselves imbued with *the right way of thinking* [in fact, the very opposite of the Biblical way] as to relations between church and state, and who strive to make them work in perfect accord for the common good [vox populi!]. These precepts contain the abiding principle by which every Catholic [not every true Christian!] should shape his conduct in regard to public life. In short, where the Church does not forbid taking part in public affairs, it is fit and proper to give support to men of acknowledged worth [using tax dollars?], and who pledge themselves to deserve well in *the Catholic* [not Christ’s] *cause*, and on no account may it be allowed to prefer to them any such individuals as are hostile to [the antichristian doctrines of the Roman Catholic] religion . . . . . Whence it appears how urgent is the duty to maintain *perfect union of minds*.’ [Is this the mind of Christ or the antichrist?]

‘Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, *complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself*.’ – *Id.* p. 193.

‘The pontifical prudence of the Pontiff embraces diverse and multiform things; for it is his charge not only to rule the Church, but generally so to regulate the actions of Christian citizens. [What about the Bible, the Law of God, Christ Himself, the Holy Spirit?—these are the real authorities, according to the plan of salvation that should regulate and judge the actions of all mankind, the papacy in particular]. . . .

‘*The faithful should imitate the practical political wisdom of the ecclesiastical authority.*’ – *Id.*, p. 202. [What did Jesus teach regarding church and politics?]

‘But if the laws of the state are manifestly at variance with the divine law [and the laws the Roman Catholic Church are manifestly at variance with real Law of God], containing enactments hurtful to the Church, . . . or if *they violate in the person of the Supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ*, then truly, to resist becomes a positive duty, **to obey, a crime.**’ – *Id.*, p. 185.

‘If, then a civil government strives. . . . to put God aside. . . . it deflects woefully from its right course and **from the injunctions of nature**. Nor should such a gathering together and association of men be regarded as **a commonwealth, but only as deceitful imitation and make-believe of civil organization.**’ – *Id.*, p. 181.

“These are the exact statements of Pope Leo XIII, taken from its authentic records, published by the Catholics under the seal of the Church; and they show that the Papacy stands for the same principles today as it did in the Dark Ages. How truthfully the Pontiff says: ‘*And in truth, wherever the Church has set her foot, she has straightway changed the face of things.*’ – *Id.*, p. 107.

“A letter from the Vatican outlining the plans of Pope Leo XIII respecting the United States was published in the New York Sun, July 11, 1892, and contains the following

significant statement:

‘What the Church has done in the past for others, she will now do for the United States. . . . He [the pope] hails in the United States, and in their young and flourishing church the source of new life for Europeans. . . .If the United States succeed in solving *the many problems that puzzle us*, Europe will follow her [America’s] example.’ – *New York Sun*, July 11, 1892; quoted in *Liberty*, 1907, No. 4, p. 10.

“How remarkably this coincides with the prophetic prediction: ‘His deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast.’ Rev. 13: 3. Yes, it is true that ‘as America, the land of religious liberty, shall unite with the Papacy in forcing the conscience and compelling men to honor the false sabbath, the people of every country on the globe will be led to follow her example.’ – *E.G. White, Testimonies, Vol. VI, p. 18.*

“The doctrine of Pope Leo XIII is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and it is taught in her schools in the United States. One of their schoolbooks, ‘Manual of Christian Doctrine, by a Seminary Professor,’ printed by J.J. McVey, Philadelphia, 1915, and carrying the sanction of the Catholic Censor and the seal of the Church, has this to say concerning the ‘Relations of Church and State’:

‘Why is the Church superior to the state?

‘Because the end to which the Church tends is the noblest of all ends. [What ends?]

‘What right has the pope in virtue of his supremacy?

‘The right to annul those laws or acts of government that would injure the salvation of souls or attack the natural rights of the citizens.

‘What then is the principle obligation of the heads of state?

‘Their principle obligation is to practice the Catholic religion themselves, and, as they are in power, to protect and defend it.

‘Has the State the right and duty to proscribe schism or heresy? [that is, as defined by the RCC and not by the Bible]

‘Yes, it has the right and duty to do so.

‘May the state separate itself from the Church?

‘No, because it may not withdraw from the supreme rule of Christ.

‘*What name is given to the doctrine that the state has neither the right nor the duty to be united to the Church to protect it?*

***‘This doctrine is called Liberalism. It is founded principally on the fact that modern society rests on liberty of conscience and or worship, on liberty of speech and the press.***

**‘Why is Liberalism to be condemned?**

**‘Because it denies all subordination of the state to the church.’**

“We respectfully ask: With such avowed principles taught in Catholic schoolbooks, would it be safe to allow Romanized textbooks to be used in our public schools?

“Pope Paul IV sets forth this same papal doctrine. We read:

‘On February 15, 1559, appeared the Bull *Quum ex apostolatus officio* of which the most important heads are these ;

‘(1) The Pope as representative of Christ on earth has complete authority over princes and kingdoms, and may judge the same.

‘(2) *All monarchs, who are guilty of heresy or schism, are irrevocably deposed, without the necessity of any judicial formalities. They are deprived forever of their right to rule, and fall under sentence of death. If they repent, they are to be confined in a monastery for the term of their life, with bread and water as their only fare.*

‘(3) No man is to help an heretical or schismatical prince. The monarch guilty of this **sin** is to lose this kingdom in favor of rulers *obedient to the Pope.*’ – ‘*Life and Times of Hildebrand*,’ Arnold Harris Mathews, D.D., p. 288. London: 1910.

“Later papal encyclicals show the same attitude toward Protestants. Here is a sample

from the encyclical of Pope Pius X. Speaking of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, it says:

“That tumult of rebellion and that perversion of *faith and morals* they call reformation and themselves reformers. But, in truth, they were corrupters, for undermining with dissensions and wars the forces of Europe, they pave the way for the rebellious and *the apostasy of modern times*, in which were united and renewed in one onslaught of those three kinds of conflict, hitherto separated, from which the *Church has always issued victorious, the bloody conflicts of the first ages*, then the internal pests of heresies, and finally, under the name of evangelical liberty, a vicious corruption and perversion of discipline unknown perhaps in medieval times.’ – ‘*Encyclical Letter of Our Most Holy Lord Pius Y*,’ quoted in *Supplement to ‘The Tablet,’ June 11, 1910, p. 950. London: England.\**

\* NOTE: “For further evidences that the Papacy claims the right of interfering with the affairs of civil governments, see ‘The Middle Ages,’ Henry Hallam, L.L.D., F.R.A.S., Vol. I, chap. 7, Parts I, II.

“APPLICATIONS OF PAPAL PRINCIPLES TO CIVIL GOVERNMENT. The **Jesuits** in this country endeavor to make us believe that *it is not within the pope’s domain to ‘meddle with the civil allegiance of Catholics’* or to interfere with a ruler’s governing of his subject[s] and that, should any pope ‘try such interference, he would be going beyond the limits of his proper authority; Catholics would be under no obligation to obey him—nor would they obey him.’ ---‘*The Pope and the American Republic*,’ by J.E. Graham, p. 3. *But it is understood that this is only ‘mission’ literature written for the American people, who can best be won by such sentiments, and it does not apply to Catholic countries; nor will it apply to our own when conditions here can be changed.*”- *Facts of Faith*, Christian Edwardson, pp. 256-262, chap. “Americanism Versus Romanism,” Southern Publishing Association, Nashville 8, TN. U.S.A., 1943.

## OUR COMMENTARY:

The Papacy through Pope Leo XIII says that :

1. ‘It is the duty of all Catholics . . . to strive that liberty of action shall *not transgress the bounds marked out by nature and the law of God*; to endeavor to bring back all civil society *to the pattern and form of Christianity which We have described*. . . . Both these objects will be carried into effect without fail *if all will follow the guidance of the Holy See as their rule of life and obey the bishops*.’ --- *Id.*, p. 132.

What “natural law” defines as transgression the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of conscience? **Absolutely none**. In fact, the exact opposite is true. See Genesis chapters 1- 3. It was by the Creator’s design that man, created in His own image and likeness would love, adore, and worship their Creator and Him alone, lovingly, willingly, and spontaneously—the very essence of true freedom and liberty. This is the liberty that Adam and Eve exercised---on the wrong side—they exercised it in disobedience to God’s express command, His law, and suffered the consequences; they became sinners and subject to death and decay. “The wages of sin is death.” Rom. 6: 23. “Sin is the transgression of the law of God.” 1 John 3:4.

Here the Papacy makes it clear that “the pattern and form of Christianity” that they want all Catholics to “endeavor to bring back all civil society” to, is that which “We,” that is, *they*—not the Bible—“describe(s).” Moreover, what they say is “the law of God” is, in fact, their own man-made laws which boldly supersede and directly contradict God’s law and the Bible.

2. The Papacy says: ‘**Especially with reference to the so-called ‘Liberties’ which are so greatly coveted in these days, all must stand by the judgment of the**

## **Holy See.”**

The liberty God gave to all and of which the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution still guarantees, to this point, is here rejected, saying that “all must stand by the judgment of the *Holy See*,” instead of the *Holy Spirit*! This is an open rejection of what Christ Himself and the apostles taught and wrote!

3. Quoting from “Manual of [Catholic] Christian Doctrine by a Seminary Professor”:

**‘What name is given to the doctrine that the state has neither the right nor the duty to be united to the Church to protect it?’**

**‘This doctrine is called Liberalism. It is founded principally on the fact that modern society rests on liberty of conscience and or worship, on liberty of speech and the press.**

**‘Why is Liberalism to be condemned?’**

**‘Because it denies all subordination of the state to the church.’”**

Let all be vigilant and beware of the deceptive strategists who have successfully made the credulous public picture “conservatives” and “rightists” as the good ones against “liberalism” which is allegedly “immoral,” “amoral,” “pro-choice,” “pro-abortion,” “pro LGBT community,” “against religion,” “pro-Islam,” and “socialist/communist”! The real agenda beneath all these crafty political-religious maneuvering, posturing and “political” and “cultural” controversies, which will soon appear in its naked reality, is the Papacy’s long-stated goal to tear down the wall separating church and state as defined in the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights which has ever been the real secret of America’s power and prosperity, and revive the despotic power and rule the Roman Catholic Church wielded over the Old World for over a thousand years during the Dark Ages. This is their goal: “Subordination of the state to the church.”

4. **“Pope Paul IV sets forth for this same papal doctrine. We read:**

**‘On February 15, 1559, appeared the Bull *Quum ex apostolatus officio* of which the most important heads are these:**

**‘(1) The Pope as representative of Christ on earth has complete authority over princes and kingdoms, and may judge the same.**

**‘(2) All monarchs, who are guilty of heresy or schism, are irrevocably deposed, without the necessity of any judicial formalities. They are deprived forever of their right to rule, and fall under sentence of death. If they repent, they are to be confined in a monastery for the term of their life, with bread and water as their only fare.**

**‘(3) No man is to help an heretical or schismatical prince. The monarch guilty of this sin is to lose this kingdom in favor of rulers *obedient to the Pope.*’ – ‘*Life and Times of Hildebrand*,’ Arnold Harris Mathews, D.D., p. 288. London: 1910.**

**“Later papal encyclicals show the same attitude toward Protestants.”**

Judgment to eternal life or death is an exclusive right and prerogative of God in Christ, the Lawgiver and Life giver---never to any man or church. Jesus warns all, particularly those who claim to have the religious and civil right to condemn people to eternal death: Matt 7: 1, 2: “Judge not, that you be not judged. For with what judgment you judge, you will be judged; and with the same measure you use, it will be measured back to you. Matt. 7: 1, 2, N.K.J.V.

The deprivation of a fair and just judicial process to determine guilt or innocence and immediate sentence to death is not the rule in a republican and democratic form of civil government, much, much less in the in the kingdom of God. In fact, in the Sermon of the

Mount where Jesus explained the magnification the law and the principles of the spiritual nature of *His kingdom on earth* which He inaugurated, saying:

“You have heard that it was said, ‘And eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.’ But I tell you not to resist an evil person. But whosoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also. If anyone wants to sue you and take away your tunic, let him have your cloak also. And whoever compels you to go one mile, go with him two. Give to him that asks you, and from him who wants to borrow from you do not turn away. You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy. *But I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, and do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who spitefully use you and persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven; for He makes His sun rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust.*” Matt. 5: 38-45, N.K.J.V.

According to Christ himself, His duly appointed Representative or Vicegerent *on earth* after His resurrection and ascension, is the *Holy Spirit*, the third Person of the Godhead—not any man. The Holy Spirit was never “elected into this office” but was appointed this role in the divine plan of redemption of the everlasting gospel prepared before the foundation of the world, before the fall of man. To assert that it is a man that is Christ’s Representative or Vicegerent, and not the Holy Spirit, is sinning against the Holy Spirit. The Bible defines blasphemy as “claiming to be God.” See Matt. 9: 3; 26: 65; John 10: 33, 36. It is defined as one of the ways of committing the unpardonable sin. Mark 3; 28-30. Attributing the works and miracles of Christ to Satan, is another way. Matt. 12: 22-32. That it is the Holy Spirit and not any man who is Jesus Christ’s Vicegerent is so is clearly stated in the gospel of John, chapters 14: 26; 15:26; and 16: 7-14. Please read these verses for yourself.

So we see here what *monasteries* were also for. They were not merely “residences for monks or nuns” as we have been commonly taught but was a place where *repentant* monarchs deemed guilty of “heresy” or “schism,” that is, by the Papacy’s definition of such were confined for life with only literal bread and water as their fare! Oh how so unmerciful and unChristlike, thus, Antichristian. The Papacy has its own definition of “sin.” Anyone who dared disobey the pope, in obedience to Christ and the law of God and what the Bible clearly teaches, was guilty of “sin” and was deemed guilty of heresy and schism and immediately condemned to death. Such was the fate of millions and millions of faithful Protestants during the Dark Ages, beginning with the godly Waldenses (or Vaudois) who took up the work of preserving the flame of truth with their lives for centuries after the last of the apostles died.

Of the Waldenses, we read:

“Amid the gloom that settled upon the earth during the long period of papal supremacy, the light of God’s truth could not be wholly extinguished. In every age there were witnesses for God, ---men who cherished faith in Christ as the only mediator between God and man, who held the Bible as the only rule of life, and who hallowed the true Sabbath. How much the world owes to these men, posterity will never know. They were branded as heretics, their motives impugned, their characters maligned, their writing suppressed, misrepresented or mutilated. Yet they stood firm, and from age to age maintained their faith in its purity, as a sacred heritage for the generations to come.

“The history of God’s people during the ages of darkness that followed upon Rome’s supremacy, is written in heaven, but they have little place in human records. Few traces of their existence can be found, except in the accusations of their persecutors. *It was the policy of Rome to obliterate every trace of dissent from her doctrines or decrees. Everything heretical, whether persons or writings, she sought to destroy. Expressions of doubt, or questions as to the authority of papal dogmas, were enough to forfeit the*

*life of rich or poor, high or low.* Rome endeavored also to destroy every record of her cruelty toward dissenters. Papal councils decreed that books and writings containing such records be committed to the flames. Before the invention of printing, books were few in number, and in a form not favorable for preservation; therefore there was little to prevent the Romanists from carrying out their purpose.

*“No church within the limits of Romish jurisdiction was long left undisturbed in the enjoyment of freedom of conscience. No sooner had the Papacy obtained power than she stretched out her arms to crush all that refused to acknowledge her sway; and one after another, the churches submitted to her dominion. . . .”*

*“In lands beyond the jurisdiction of Rome, there existed for many centuries bodies of Christians who remained almost wholly free from papal corruption. They were surrounded by heathenism, and in the lapse of ages were affected by its errors; but they continued to regard the Bible as the only rule of faith, and adhered to many of its truths. These Christians believed in the perpetuity of the law of God, and observed the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, Churches that held to this faith and practice, existed in Central Africa and among the Armenians of Asia.*

*“But of those who resisted the encroachments of the papal power, the Waldenses stood foremost. In the very land where popery had fixed its seat, there its falsehoods and corruption were most steadfastly resisted. For centuries the churches of Piedmont maintained their independence; but the time came at last when Rome insisted upon their submission. After ineffectual struggles against her tyranny, the leaders of these churches reluctantly acknowledged the supremacy of the power to which the whole world seemed to pay homage. There were some, however, who refused to yield to the authority of pope or prelate. They were determined to maintain their allegiance to God, and to preserve the purity and simplicity of their faith. A separation took place. Those who adhered to the ancient faith now withdrew; some, forsaking their native Alps, raised the banner of truth in foreign lands; others retreated to the secluded glens and rocky fastness of the mountains, and there preserved their freedom to worship God.*

*“The faith which for many centuries was held and taught by the Waldensian Christians, was I marked contrast to the false doctrines put forth from Rome. Their religious belief was founded upon the written word of God, the true system of Christianity. But those humble peasants, in their obscure retreats, shut away from the world, and bound to the daily toil among their flocks and their vineyards, had by themselves arrived at the truth in opposition to the dogmas and heresies of the apostate church. Theirs was not a faith newly received. Their religious belief was their inheritance from their fathers. They contended for the faith of the apostolic church,—‘the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.’ Jude3.” — *The Great Controversy, Ellen G. White, pp. 61, 62, 63, 64, Pacific Press Publishing Association, Mountain View, CA, 1888, 1907, 1911.**

I hope and pray that all crusading news sources—whether traditional or the emerging social media---will find out these facts soon and write on it so that their readers may be disabused of gross errors that have been perpetrated for so long now they are assumed to be gospel truth. The Huffington Post posted 06/10/2014 Patricia Miller’s blog entitled **“Why the Catholic Church’s Suppression of Abortion Dissent Should Concern Us All.”** I quote this important article in full [all emphasis mine]:

*“In recent years the U.S. Catholic bishops have been among the strongest proponents of ‘religious freedom,’—by which they mean the right of Catholics to express values, such as opposition to same-sex marriage or contraception, in their daily lives. For example, they’ve pushed strenuously for a broad-based exemption to the Affordable Care Act [A.K.A “Obamacare] to allow any employer claiming a religious objection to contraception to refuse to provide it to employees.*

*“But a recent incident illustrates that the institutional church doesn’t extend that same*



freedom of religious expression [actually “rights] to the many of its followers who dissent from its official position on abortion. The *National Catholic Reporter*, which is by far the most liberal of the semi-official Catholic publications, refused an ad for my book, *Good Catholics: The Battle Over Abortion in the Catholic Church* [italics in original], which charts the *clashes between pro-choice Catholics and the Catholic hierarchy* over whether ‘good Catholics’ can support abortion rights or vote for pro-choice politicians. A spokesperson said the publication couldn’t ‘respect arguments that try to say that abortion can be a good thing’ and likened giving space to abortion dissenters to *promoting polygamy*.

“I’m not sure the person delivering that message grasped the *irony* of censoring an ad about a book that largely about attempts to suppress abortion dissent. The episode is *emblematic* of how any discussion of abortion has been completely suppressed within the church—even to the point of trying to deny history. Legitimate questions of how to comport Catholic doctrines with competing demands for women’s autonomy and access to health care and the rights of others in *pluralistic society* have been reduced to expressions that *pro-choice Catholics* think abortion is a ‘good thing.’

“In the summer of 1964, for instance, with support growing for the legalization of abortion in the circumstances of rape, incest and fetal deformities, the Kennedy family summoned some of the nation’s most prominent Catholic theologians to Hyannis Port to deliberate how [to] ‘formulate a *political stance* on abortion that would be compatible with Catholic teaching. They concluded it wasn’t possible to enforce the Church’s strict prohibition of abortion without ‘significant attendant social evils’ and said that the Catholic lawmakers could support some legalization of abortion. The principle that religiously observant policymakers could separate elements of [Catholic] doctrines from its application in a *pluralistic society* would guide generations of lawmakers.’

“Several years later, shortly before the *Roe v. Wade* decision, Father Robert Drinan, dean of Boston College Law School, argued that from the perspective of Catholic moral teaching it would be better to repeal all laws banning early abortion and leave the decision to individual conscience rather than have the government [or the Church] to decide who should and shouldn’t be born. This helped provide legitimacy to the still contentious idea that abortion should be a woman’s decision.

“And in 1984, when vice presidential candidate Geraldine Ferraro came under withering criticism from conservative bishops for her pro-choice stance, nearly 100 priests, nuns, and theologians signed an ad in the *New York Times* saying there was a diversity of Catholic opinion on abortion and that abortion ‘can sometimes be a moral choice.’ The ad provided legitimacy to pro-choice Catholic politicians, *but also spurred years of crackdown by the Vatican on dissent*. The theologians lost teaching positions; nuns and priests were threatened with removal from their orders; **liberal** bishops saw their careers stalled. *Official discussion of abortion was extinguished but not dissent. Today, the majority of Catholics support abortion rights and fewer than 20% recognize church leaders as the final moral authority on the issue.*

“At the end of the day, the acceptance of the church’s abortion teaching is an *internal matter*. *But the suppression of dissent should give us all pause because the church frequently asserts itself in the public square on the issue.* The U.S. bishops almost got a provision in the ACA to exclude all abortions from private health care plans---ever for health reasons or for nonviable pregnancies. *The forced a creation of a cumbersome segregation methodology for public funding that experts feel will cause insurers to drop abortion coverage. But this is the result of decades of suppression of opposing views.* How should we evaluate claims made by an institution that engages in energetic censorship and presents itself in democratic assemblies seeking concessions to that position or asserting its right to ‘**religious freedom**’? We can’t demand that the church change its position to abortion. But policymakers can question they weight they accord that position if it’s based on **fundamentally undemocratic practices.**” – Patricia Miller blog. See [HYPERLINK "http://www.huffingtonpost.com/patricia-miller/](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/patricia-miller/)

why-the church-\_b\_5475532" [www.huffingtonpost.com/patricia-miller/why-the-church-\\_b\\_5475532.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/patricia-miller/why-the-church-_b_5475532.html)

What was Christ's teaching regarding His Vicegerent, His Representative—the Holy Spirit? Ellen G. White put it forth so clearly from the Bible. She wrote:

“When He the Spirit of truth, is come,” said Jesus, ‘He will guide you into all truth.’”

“The Comforter is called ‘the Spirit of truth.’ His work is define and maintain the truth, and thus becomes the Comforter. There is comfort and peace in the truth, but no real peace or comfort can be found in falsehood. It is through false theories and traditions that Satan gains his power over the mind. By directing men to false standards, he misshapes the character. Through the Scriptures the Holy Spirit speaks to the mind, and impresses truth upon the heart. Thus He exposes error, and expels it from the soul. It is by the Spirit of truth, working through the word of God, that Christ subdues His chosen people to Himself.

“In describing to His disciples the office work of the Holy Spirit, Jesus sought to inspire them with the joy and hope that inspired His own heart. He rejoiced because of the abundant hope He had provided for *His church*. The Holy Spirit was the highest of all gifts that He could solicit from His Father for the exaltation of His people. The Spirit was to be given as a regenerating agent, and without this the sacrifice would have been of no avail. *The power of evil had been strengthening for centuries, and the submission of men to this satanic captivity was amazing.* Sin could be resisted and overcome only through the mighty agency of the Third Person of the Godhead, who would come with no modified energy, but in the fullness of divine power. It is the Spirit that makes effectual what has been wrought out by the world's Redeemer. It is by the Spirit that the heart is made pure. Through the Spirit the believer becomes a partaker of the divine nature. Christ has given His Spirit as a divine power to overcome all hereditary and cultivated tendencies to evil, and to impress His won character upon His church.” – *The Desire of Ages*, p. 671, Pacific Press Publishing Association, Mountain View, CA: 1940.

To be continued next month.

PAGE

PAGE 1