

## THE LAST SACRAMENT EXPOSED

The Church says its main vocation is salvation. The Church claims to be the tool used by Jesus in Heaven to administer the salvation he won to the world. What is salvation from? The answer is eternity in Hell. The Church would say that a system that saves lifelong sinners from Hell on their deathbeds is better than one that helps people live good lives. And what could you expect it to say? A person going to Hell forever is worse than a person living a bad life and then going to Heaven after being forgiven at death.

The Church insists on maximum preparation for death.

The Catholic Bishops' Conference of England & Wales produced a document called A practical guide to the spiritual care of the dying person.

Quote "It is never acceptable to withdraw treatment for the purpose of hastening death. However, how one spends one's time on earth is more important than the length of one's life." This bigoted comment can be assumed to be saying that it is more important to live a Catholic life than a good long life!

Thankfully we see, "Healthcare workers do not have a duty to keep people alive at all costs. As death approaches a treatment which may briefly prolong life could impose suffering such that the patient considers the treatment to be excessively burdensome."

But there is a warning about pain management. Overtreatment or inappropriate treatment can render people unconscious or semi-conscious when this is not necessary for effective symptom relief. This could deprive people of the opportunity to make a good death, setting things right as much as they can, making peace, saying their goodbyes. It will rarely be the case that pain cannot be controlled without deep sedation. Nevertheless, it may be that there is a compromise to be made between comfort and lucidity and different people will want to compromise at different levels. Some people will prefer less comfort for more lucidity."

This vile teaching is caused by the sacrament of the anointing of the sick. It worries about people being too drugged to know they want it and to get ready for it. It makes people worry about it and suffer so that they can commune with God.

Catholicism offers absolution from sin on the deathbed and gives the sacrament of the sick which has its own power to forgive sins. This sacrament is immoral for our morality demands that good lives be made necessary and the sacrament in principle denies that!

The Sacrament of the Sick is the last of the Catholic seven sacraments, the seven rites that give salvation. It used to be known as extreme unction or the last sacrament. Now it is called the anointing of the sick.

The oil in this sacrament is only put on the parts of the body (eyes and hands etc) that lead to sin and is not put on the part that needs healing. It is about the spirit not the body though the Church suggests it can heal. This sacrament of the Catholics allegedly gives the grace to make the soul more pleasing to God, the grace of comfort and the remission of sins. It can even heal physically if that is God's will. But if you read the letter of James which supposedly speaks of this sacrament it is definite that the anointing WILL heal sickness.

There is something strange about this rite when there is no evidence that it has healing power. Those who get better were going to get better anyway. And as for the spiritual benefits, the sacrament of forgiving sins in confession and communion can deliver those. If communion is really so good then the sacrament is useless. It was no wonder that the Catholics who became the first Protestants were not sorry to get rid of the sacrament. In doing so, they had to resist the superstition that it was dangerous to die without being anointed by the priest. And that was not easy for them. After all, it was held that if you die without the sacraments you are in danger of succumbing to Satan on your deathbed and going to burn in Hell forever. Also, you needed the sacraments to remove sin that could put you in Hell.

The only reason for the existence of the sacrament is to make people afraid of dying without the priest so that they will serve the priests and the Church better. It is cynical exploitation flavoured with moral terrorism.

Archbishop Terrence Prendergast of Ottawa in 2016 was clear that a Catholic priest cannot anoint a person who is dying anyway but who opts for assisted suicide. That is moral terrorism again and nobody cares what this does to the families.

When you ask a person to forgive you, it is hard and you have to work hard to justify their forgiveness. The reason is that

the person is still hurt and at risk of being hurt further when he or she forgives. Asking for forgiveness from God does not have this emotional element. It is plainly just about avoiding what you deserve. Its disgusting.

Jesus forbade you to love yourself with all your heart EVEN IF YOU WILL NOT DO THIS IN A WAY THAT MAKES YOU DANGEROUS TO OTHERS! You are not allowed to love your spouse, or your child, or your mother or father with all your heart. You are to love them as yourself. We often do ourselves harm. When we harm others we harm ourselves for it leads to misery for ourselves. So Jesus' teaching is uninspirational and really a burden to those who want to love. The humanist should love humanity with all her heart. The Christian following Jesus is expected to love God with all her or his heart as Jesus commanded it. If you feel you love your mother more than yourself that is a sin. If you want to love anybody more than yourself and that would make you happiest it is still vilified as a sin. Such doctrines are vile. The teaching of Christ masquerades as wisdom but it is simply vulgar religious bullying with a thick sugar-coating.

Imagine you are suffering horrendously on your deathbed. You are permitted by the Church to ask God for death just so that you can be with him. It is a sin to want death just because it will terminate the agony. If belief in God comforts you on your deathbed, it is because you don't understand the harsh and troublesome implications of this belief. The struggle to love God as he requires is only going to be additional torment on your deathbed. A faith that infers that such torment is a great thing and to be inflicted on oneself is an evil faith. The thought that everlasting torment may only be minutes away will be an additional torment. The believer will possibly think this unlikely but irrational panic would only be expected as death looms. A parent who knows her child is very unlikely to be inside the burning house will nevertheless panic and suffer as if she knew it was likely the child was there. Its a normal reaction.

The Church would say that wanting rid of the suffering would imply that you think you can't offer your heart to God in the midst of suffering with bravery. It would say that it is foolish to want to be rid of the suffering for if you die you will have to face more of it in Purgatory!

The first Bible text that allegedly speaks of the sacrament is Mark 6:13. This simply says that the apostles expelled many demons, anointed the sick with oil and healed many. It doesn't say that the oil cured anybody or got their sins forgiven. It would be that there were no definite or obvious miracles involved when Judas Iscariot was one of these healers. It seems doubtful that God would do miracles through a monster if that was what Judas was. The healings and exorcisms could have been indistinguishable from natural healings and recoveries from mental illness.

The second and last is James 5:14, 15.

"Is anyone among you sick? Let them call the elders of the church to pray over them and anoint them with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer offered in faith **will make the sick person well; the Lord will raise them up.** If they have sinned, they will be forgiven. Therefore confess your sins to each other and pray for each other so that you may be healed. The prayer of a righteous person is powerful and effective." Clearly healing is promised as is forgiveness of sins but the reality is that this rite heals nobody. Even if a priest does not promise healing, the fact is he is overridden by this text which does so he is no better than a purveyor of false hope. It does not follow that if a religion teaches something that its representatives will respect that and that is what is happening there.

The text says that when Church ministers anoint the sick and pray for them with faith their sins "shall be forgiven". Catholics say that the shall proves that anointing of the sick is a sacrament that pardons sin. The shall does not back them up for even they say the anointing may forgive sins not shall – it all depends on whether the anointed is penitent. If pardon depends on this then perhaps the sins are only forgiven by virtue of the rite being an expression of repentance by the anointed (the anointed uses it as a sincere prayer for pardon its like a sign language prayer) and prayer for her or his deliverance from the guilt of sin by the minister? The passage does not attribute the pardoning to any sacramental power. It doesn't say when the sins will be forgiven. A sacrament would require the forgiveness when the rite is undergone. James' assertion that the prayer of faith shall save the sick man is disrespectful to God because God said that one prayer for the salvation of the world is enough. So, it is inaccurate to suggest that God needed the minister's prayer to save and if James suggested that, then he didn't know what he was talking about. James is saying that God vindictively refuses to forgive the sick unless he has the minister's permission. And he never said that only ordained ministers could have the power to do it. Remember how Catholics teach that priests have powers that nobody else has – for example, they can put the Holy Spirit in you by giving you the sacrament of confirmation. They could have been lay elders.

Some Christians point out that the text never asks for the doctor to be sent for. It presumes that the rite is a treatment. Some conclude that it is a sin to have a doctor and others say that the anointing is more important than the doctor but that doctors are permitted.

Catholics are obliged to believe that the text teaches that the anointing is a sacrament for the Church used her alleged infallibility to make this clear. The Church says that she cannot add to what is taught in scripture and apostolic tradition which are the word of God. But her teaching cannot even be found in the second century never mind the first. She is not

infallible.

The sacrament of last anointing is not in the Bible.

Rome claims that many dying sinners are stuck in mortal sin – cut off from God – until the priest arrives to rub some chrism on them. If God really cannot stand sin then he would not force people to stay in it even for a second with such an arrangement. If eternal punishment awaits them after death then God is diabolical and Jesus could not seriously be said to have died to save them.

Rome cannot say that the persons are granted the graces on account of the priests not being able to get to them yet because that would mean that the sacrament is not necessary and that the priest would be wiser to sit by his fire at home with a cup of cocoa. If the priest can't or won't go it is not the sick person's fault and so the person is still entitled to the grace and will get it so it matters not if the priest goes or not. The Church claims that it is a mortal sin for the priest not to go.

“Those who are about to undergo an operation which may cause danger of death cannot receive Extreme Unction before the operation, unless their condition is so serious that there is already danger of death” (page 103, Life in Christ, Part III). It is hard to believe that God would create a sacrament for the sick to prepare them for death and nobody else.

The sacrament is totally pointless. Prayer can give all its graces except pardon in some circumstances. But Rome says that the sacrament of reconciliation, priests forgiving sins, will do for that. The sacrament of the sick is mainly for healing the soul. The sacrament of reconciliation supposedly does that anyway so what is another sacrament needed for? People say they have been healed by prayer without the sacrament. So what is the sacrament for? It is totally unnecessary and so is just another typical Catholic superstition.

A sacrament is a miracle and if the anointing of the sick is a sacrament then God does absurd miracles and if he is that silly who knows what is real? We might as well believe that the bucket of water put over the door that came down on us was put there by God and not a joker.

It is no answer to say that when God gives grace through prayer and reconciliation and that is not unnecessary miracle working. First, reconciliation itself is a preposterous and far from necessary miracle. A prayer of penitence should do. Responses to prayer are not necessary miracles. And answering a prayer for grace and making a rite necessary for grace for two different things. They are miracles yes but the latter is unnecessarily conferring miraculous power on a rite while the first sticks to essentials.

The doctrine of the sacrament commands priests to risk their lives to give the sacrament say in war conditions. There have been cases where priests and those they were anointing died because getting the sacrament was prioritised over maybe making them safer or getting a doctor to them. And this fanaticism has been celebrated in the Roman Catholic Church.

An unnecessary sacrament that priests are asked to take such chances for is surely diabolical. The sacrament is evil. It is pro-unjust discrimination because those who were on the planes that were deliberately crashed into the World Trade Centre could not avail of the sacrament even if there had been enough priests around to administer it and only those who are dying of illness or old age can receive it validly. How low could one get to discriminate against the dying? The sacrament is supposed to heal the soul of sin and prepare one for death and no matter how much they want it they cannot have it and they are dying and the Church callously slaps them across the face. They are kicked when they are down. The Church cannot change this teaching for tradition says it is only for the sick who are in real danger of death and the Church puts dogma before decency.

The teaching that needing and being ready for the sacrament is no good for receiving the sacrament if there is no oil to do the anointing is an outrage.

The fanaticism of the Roman Catholic Church is plain to be seen. Is that what you want your children to grow up in? Do you want your children to esteem priests who make people desire and pray for the sacrament of the sick to be administered to them if they have the misfortune to be victims of a fatal hit and run when such a teaching will cause untold distress to the dying person in such a situation?

What happens if a loved one needs the sacrament and dies without it? If the concerned person has prayed for her or him, the Church might claim that there is nothing to worry about for God would have heard the prayers. But that is not a consolation for prayers cannot help a person unless the person lets them. Catholics delude themselves that somehow even the worst person becomes a saint to be and accepts God in the last few seconds of their life. That is pure Protestant predestination.

What is the point of religion if that delusion is in fact true? It contradicts the major Catholic doctrine of free will. It is giving false hope and false consolation and is an insult to the suffering person and the dead person. The fact remains that the sacrament of the sick must be important for salvation and can't be if nearly everybody goes to Heaven. The sacrament

calls for worry - period.

Catholic Canon Law permits Catholic priests to administer the sacraments of Eucharist, Penance and Anointing of the Sick to an Anglican only when he or she is in danger of death or some other grave and pressing need, and provided the Anglican in question cannot approach an Anglican priest, spontaneously asks for the sacrament, demonstrates the faith of the Catholic Church in respect of the sacrament and is properly disposed (Canon 844). The priest who puts doctrines before a person's faith and before their peace of mind on their deathbed is a piece of shit. Also, if somebody has had a massive heart attack the sight of a priest will certainly shock her or him and finish her or him off.

The anointing of the sick makes a fool out of the Lord. It originated with a brainwave. Priests who saw in it a marvellously effective way to get people to submit to them invented it. Many are so alarmed at the thought of dying without the sacrament that they attend Church faithfully and pay the priest every week.

Some worry if a loved one died without a priest anointing her or him and giving the last rites. If they prayed for the person, the Church tells them not to worry for the prayers helped the person. That is a cop-out and contradicts the Church's own teaching that getting the sacrament is very important and that prayers cannot help a person who resists God.

If anybody finds you, they will or should be more worried about getting a priest or ringing a priest than a doctor. For example, if their cellphone credit is running out they should expend their last phone call on a priest.

The Church belittles death with its doctrines of the afterlife and how to prepare. The doctrine that the people should die forgiving everybody and loving everybody is total nonsense and places an extra burden on the dying. On your deathbed virtue is not important – only avoiding the alienation of those who are looking after you is important but the Church goes a lot further. Do not belittle yourself to make peace with their God – to belittle yourself for their invention is the same thing as belittling yourself for them. On your deathbed indulging yourself is what matters and that is in enjoying hateful thoughts towards your enemies then so be it.

Catholics believe that the sacrament of the anointing of the sick forgives sins if you cannot confess sins and there is no time to do so. The chances of going to Heaven are heightened. To many who are in serious sin it will mean the only hope of eternal salvation. So when you find yourself dying because of a car crash you will be more concerned about getting a priest to anoint you than about dying. You cannot be more concerned about dying because there is no time to think about that. Your salvation is more important now. Your horror at there being no priest will be tremendous. You will not die in peace. The cult of Roman Catholicism uses dogma to abuse and terrorise the dying and a religion like that deserves no members. It is a doctrine that Jesus supposedly revealed which means he should have no followers if he did. Nothing good done by a religion can justify that religion's existence when it teaches dogmas like that for a cult that abuses children and the dying can do nothing that makes even partial amends for that. The Church plays on the fear of death which is the reason it has any members at all. It admits as much as when it says that is the spiritual state you are in at death that really matters not the life you live. The Atheist removes the fear of death and has no need to join a cult.

The sacrament shows the true colours of the Catholic Church.

VICTIM ANN LOVETT 31 JAN 1984

Ann Lovett, 15, Granard, Co Longford, concealed her pregnancy in Catholic Ireland. She was found dying in a pool of blood after giving birth to a baby boy. The baby was dead and wrapped in her coat. She needed a doctor and the first adult on the scene, the man who found her prioritised going to the priest. The priest despite saying she needed a doctor and being told by the man that she was dying did not phone for one ... the last rites came first and Ann died shortly later in hospital. Main cause of death was exposure.