

MASS - WHEN THE PRIEST AND THE PEOPLE PURPORT TO OFFER A SPOTLESS VICTIM TO GOD

Ordination or Holy Orders is one of the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church. Only bishops have the magic power to make men bishops or priests. They pass on the power if they are ordained properly themselves.

Just as the Church has found that many marriages are invalid – and these are the few it was able to know about – obviously there must be invalid ordinations as well.

The Council of Trent made it official Catholic teaching that a sacrament can only be conferred by intending to at least do as the Church does. “If anyone shall say that intention, the intention at least to do what the Church does, is not required in ministers while performing and giving the sacraments then let him be accursed” (Session VII, Canon 11). So an unbelieving bishop can validly make new bishops as long as his intention is this: “I don’t believe this stuff but if there is anything in it then I intend to make this man a true bishop and give him grace.” Obviously, then ordinations done by a bishop like this should be repeated to be on the safe side. What if because of his unbelief he can’t intend to consecrate? What if he thinks, “What a superstition this rite is! I am so sure there is no power in it and I can’t give any and I don’t even intend to.”

The decree would imply that unbelievers cannot give real sacraments. The Church says they cannot give real ordination. Inconsistently, though it may recognise their baptisms.

There is nothing the Church can do to guarantee that you are getting a real sacrament. The Church says that it trusts in God to protect her from such disasters as ministers giving invalid ordinations. When God lets the Church be bothered with invalid marriages and lets it be fooled by false popes why be so sure? The Church has admitted to excommunicating people and groups unfairly causing grave division in the Church by its invalid excommunications. This does even worse damage than the consecration of fake priests and fake bishops.

Suppose somebody is invalidly baptised. If that person becomes a priest or bishop that person will not be a true priest or bishop. Church law is that the sacraments can only be validly received by a baptised person. If a priest is invalidly ordained he cannot become a valid bishop for it is necessary to be a priest first. The doctrines surrounding the sacrament of ordination are so ridiculous that one must question the sanity or normality of any man that becomes a priest.

Transubstantiation refers to the conversion of the bread and wine at Mass into the body and blood of Christ. This is a major and basic doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. The Church worships the consecrated bread and wine as Jesus Christ who it teaches is God. The bread and wine are given the worship due to God without qualification. It is blasphemy to worship something as God unless you have proof that it is God as much as you do that God exists at all.

It is against the Bible for it says that anything that cannot protect itself from desecration is not divine but is an idol, a false God. The Bible has no time for people making excuses for adoring as God what is not God. The idolaters of old made plenty - "O Apollo lives in the statue or somehow the statue is him and he let the robbers break it for a purpose we are unaware of." God makes it simple: if it is not immune to harm then its not God and there is no excuse for adoring it.

If you were pretending that the bread was the body of Jesus you would do what the Catholics are doing. If they are not getting carried away by playing charades then nobody is.

In John 6, Catholics claim to find proof that Jesus taught transubstantiation. The word mistranslated eat is trogein, which means to crunch or to gnaw like an animal or to tear apart with teeth. He says that whoever does this has eternal life and he will raise him up on the last day. This is clearly symbolism so the flesh is symbolic too. It is said he spoke that way to convey the reality of eating his body in the form of bread. But if he used an exaggeration to convey eating then what other exaggerations are there in the text? Maybe flesh and blood as well? Why couldn't he simply say that God has the power to change bread and wine into his body and blood without anything seeming to have changed?

We read 1 Corinthians 11:25 and learn that that the cup is the new covenant in Jesus’ blood. The cup wasn’t literally the new covenant. The cup is not referred to as blood in this account which Paul spells out in the context of correcting abuses. So you can be sure he did not require his people to say the cup was blood.

Why not say that you have transubstantiated your copper into gold and your gold into copper? The doctrine violates commonsense and if the Catholics have the right to spout nonsense like that then you have the right to say that you have turned your keyring into Napoleon

Bread and wine which are blessed and believed to link you to the body and blood of Christ which they represent. This is called communion. The Catholic Church holds that the bread and wine cease to be bread and wine but become the body and blood of Jesus. It is a sectarian rite in Catholicism for people who are better than most Catholics are barred from it indicating that your beliefs and religious affiliation are regarded as more important than your kindness and decency.

