SANCTUARY ETHICS REVIEW BOARD

SERB-008 — THE CATHEDRAL OF LIGHT

On Religious Authority, Concealed Governance, Institutional Coercion, and the Conversion of Protection into Obedience

An Institutional Inquiry into the Cathedral of Light, the Authority of the Prophet, the Rights of Religious Adherents, and the Use of Spiritual Allegiance to Advance Celestial and Personal Objectives

Issuing Authority: Sanctuary Ethics Review Board (SERB)
Docket: SERB-008
Classification: Institutional Ethics, Religious Autonomy, Governance, Disclosure, Coercion, and Extraordinary Authority
Date: October 24, 2026
Status: Preliminary Findings, Institutional Determination, and Notice of Continuing Investigation

Principal Institutional Respondent:

The Cathedral of Light

Principal Historical Respondent:

Inarius, Angel, Co-Founder of Sanctuary, Founder of the Cathedral of Light, and Self-Presented Prophet.

Additional Institutional Respondents:

- The Historical Leadership of the Cathedral of Light
- The Cathedral's Inquisitorial Authorities
- The Cathedral's Subsequent Religious and Military Leadership

Persons of Interest:

- Reverend Mother Prava
- Senior Priests of the Original Cathedral

- Members of the Knights Penitent
- Surviving Clergy and Religious Adherents
- Uldyssian ul-Diomed
- Former Members and Dissenters

Interested Institutions:

- The Angiris Council
- The High Heavens
- The Temple of the Triune
- The Horadrim
- The Mortal Authorities of Sanctuary

Affected Parties:

The religious adherents of the Cathedral of Light, persons subjected to its institutional authority, communities affected by its military operations, and the wider population of Sanctuary.

Principal Questions:

Whether the Cathedral of Light's religious teachings and institutional practices preserved the meaningful autonomy of its adherents.

Whether Inarius's concealed identity and personal objectives materially affected the ability of mortals to evaluate their allegiance.

Whether the Cathedral exercised authority over persons who had not voluntarily accepted its jurisdiction.

Whether the legitimate protection of humanity from infernal influence justified religious manipulation, coercive enforcement, or demands for institutional obedience.

Whether subsequent Cathedral leadership adequately distinguished the welfare of Sanctuary from the personal ambitions of its founder.

I. NOTICE OF INSTITUTIONAL INVESTIGATION

The Sanctuary Ethics Review Board hereby opens its eighth inquiry into the institutions exercising extraordinary authority over humanity.

The present investigation concerns the Cathedral of Light.

The Board recognizes that religious institutions may serve important functions within mortal civilization.

They may provide meaning, consolation, instruction, companionship, and community.

They may preserve moral traditions, organize charitable work, and assist persons confronting suffering beyond their individual capacity to endure.

The Board further recognizes that religious allegiance may be freely chosen.

A person's willingness to accept spiritual obligations does not, by itself, constitute evidence of coercion.

Nor does sincere devotion to a supernatural being become ethically defective merely because that being possesses extraordinary power.

The present inquiry does not concern the general legitimacy of religious belief.

It concerns the conduct of an institution whose founder concealed material aspects of his identity and exercised substantial influence over the persons who accepted his spiritual authority.

The Board acknowledges that the Cathedral of Light arose in circumstances involving a genuine threat.

The Temple of the Triune, established by the Prime Evils, sought to manipulate humanity for infernal purposes.

Opposition to that institution may therefore have served a legitimate protective objective.

However, the Board distinguishes between protection from manipulation and the substitution of one system of manipulation for another.

The existence of a dangerous rival does not establish that every method employed in opposition is permissible.

Nor does the fact that a religious institution provides genuine benefits eliminate the need to examine its governing purposes.

The Board recognizes that a congregation may sincerely believe it has found salvation.

It does not follow that its leadership has been granted unlimited authority to define the conditions of that salvation.

The investigation shall proceed.

II. SCOPE AND HISTORICAL DISTINCTIONS

The Board identifies two principal periods requiring examination.

A. The Cathedral During the Sin War

The original Cathedral of Light was established by Inarius to counter the influence of the Temple of the Triune.

During this period, Inarius adopted the identity of the Prophet.

The institution presented celestial teachings to humanity while functioning within a wider struggle for mortal allegiance.

Its founder possessed interests extending beyond the spiritual welfare of his adherents.

Those interests included the preservation of his control over Sanctuary.

B. The Cathedral During the Age of Hatred

In a much later period, the Cathedral of Light again operated as a substantial religious and military institution.

Inarius resumed a central role in its leadership.

Reverend Mother Prava exercised considerable institutional authority.

The Cathedral's activities included religious instruction, the enforcement of spiritual discipline, and organized military operations.

Its eventual campaign against Lilith culminated in catastrophic consequences for many of its participants.

C. Limits of Institutional Continuity

The Board recognizes that institutions bearing the same name across widely separated historical periods may possess different structures, members, and responsibilities.

Accordingly, the Board does not presume that the later Cathedral inherited every legal or ethical obligation associated with its earlier incarnation.

Nor does it attribute personal responsibility for ancient events to later members merely because they adopted the institution's name or doctrines.

The relationship between the two incarnations warrants separate examination.

Historical association is not identical to institutional continuity.

Institutional continuity is not identical to individual culpability.

These distinctions shall govern the present inquiry.

III. THE FOUNDING OF THE ORIGINAL CATHEDRAL

During the Sin War, the Prime Evils sought to influence humanity through the Temple of the Triune.

Inarius recognized the threat posed by infernal recruitment.

He responded by establishing the Cathedral of Light.

The Board recognizes that protecting mortals from the concealed influence of the Prime Evils represented a potentially legitimate purpose.

The Temple of the Triune had deliberately obscured the identities of its infernal sponsors.

Its adherents could therefore have lacked material information necessary to evaluate their participation.

However, Inarius's response involved the adoption of a concealed identity of his own.

He presented himself as the Prophet.

The Cathedral subsequently spread religious teachings associated with celestial order.

The Board observes that its founder occupied an extraordinary position.

Inarius was not merely a religious teacher offering an interpretation of events.

He was one of the beings responsible for creating Sanctuary.

He had previously altered the Worldstone to suppress the extraordinary capabilities of humanity's ancestors.

He also possessed a substantial personal interest in maintaining authority over the world he had created.

These circumstances created conflicts requiring examination.

The Board therefore distinguishes between the Cathedral's professed objectives and the personal objectives of its founder.

The protection of humanity from infernal domination might have justified the establishment of a defensive institution.

It did not automatically justify concealing from adherents that the institution's founder possessed an undisclosed interest in controlling humanity himself.

An institution cannot establish the independence of its spiritual guidance merely by declaring that its rivals are controlled by hostile powers.

The Board requests evidence concerning the Cathedral's founding purposes.

IV. THE IDENTITY OF THE PROPHET

The Board considers Inarius's presentation of himself as the Prophet.

The historical record establishes that Inarius adopted this identity while concealing his full nature from ordinary adherents.

The Board recognizes that individuals may employ symbolic names, religious titles, or ceremonial identities for legitimate reasons.

A title does not necessarily constitute a deception.

Nor does every religious leader possess an obligation to disclose every aspect of personal history.

Nevertheless, the ethical significance of concealed information depends upon its materiality.

The Board therefore identifies several facts potentially relevant to an adherent's decision to join the Cathedral.

First, the Prophet was an angel.

Second, he was a founder of Sanctuary.

Third, he had exercised extraordinary power over the inherited condition of humanity.

Fourth, he possessed interests concerning Sanctuary's governance that were not necessarily identical to those of the congregation.

Fifth, he was personally involved in the conflict between celestial and infernal institutions.

These facts may have affected how reasonable adherents understood the institution they were joining.

The Board therefore requests clarification concerning which facts were disclosed.

It further requests evidence of whether adherents understood that the Prophet was exercising powers beyond those ordinarily associated with mortal religious leadership.

The Board does not presume that disclosure would necessarily have reduced participation.

Some individuals might have considered the Prophet's angelic identity a powerful reason to join.

Others might have regarded his history as a reason for caution.

The relevant principle is that the decision should not be predetermined by deliberate concealment of material facts.

A person's willingness to follow a prophet cannot automatically establish willingness to be governed by an undisclosed creator of the world.

V. ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY AND POLITICAL GOVERNANCE

The Board identifies a central problem in the Cathedral's institutional structure.

Religious authority and political authority may overlap.

However, they are not necessarily identical.

An individual may voluntarily accept the teachings of a religious leader.

It does not follow that the leader possesses unrestricted authority over the individual's civil affairs, property, bodily integrity, or political allegiance.

Similarly, an institution may organize worship without acquiring an independent right to enforce its doctrines upon persons outside the congregation.

The Board therefore distinguishes three forms of authority.

A. Spiritual Authority

Authority recognized by adherents concerning religious teaching, moral guidance, or spiritual practice.

B. Institutional Authority

Authority exercised through membership rules, internal administration, and responsibilities voluntarily accepted within an organization.

C. Coercive Public Authority

Authority exercised through force, punishment, restriction of liberty, or other measures affecting persons regardless of voluntary religious membership.

These categories may interact.

However, the legitimacy of one does not automatically establish the legitimacy of another.

The Board therefore requests clarification concerning the Cathedral's governmental functions.

Did the Cathedral exercise jurisdiction over persons who had not joined it?

Did it maintain armed personnel empowered to detain or punish?

Were religious violations treated as offenses subject to compulsory enforcement?

Could adherents leave without retaliation?

Could civilians decline the Cathedral's authority without thereby becoming subjects of investigation?

The Board recognizes that the answers may differ across historical periods.

The distinction remains central.

The authority to teach a doctrine is not automatically the authority to compel obedience to it.

VI. THE QUESTION OF GENUINE RELIGIOUS BENEFIT

The Board acknowledges that the original Cathedral preached principles associated with cooperation, unity, and tolerance.

Historical accounts also describe the provision of assistance and relief through its representatives.

These activities may have produced genuine benefits for mortal communities.

The Board does not dismiss those benefits merely because the institution's founder possessed undisclosed motives.

Nor does it presume that clergy providing assistance were necessarily aware of those motives.

An individual may sincerely undertake charitable work within an institution whose leadership is compromised.

The benefit to those assisted may remain real.

Nevertheless, the existence of beneficial services does not establish that all institutional conduct was legitimate.

The Board therefore distinguishes between the value of a service and the conditions attached to its provision.

Assistance offered without coercive conditions may constitute an important public benefit.

Assistance made contingent upon ideological allegiance may present different concerns.

Where a population faces extraordinary danger, the distinction may become particularly significant.

Persons dependent upon an institution for safety may feel compelled to accept its authority even without an explicit threat.

The Board therefore requests evidence concerning whether the Cathedral conditioned essential assistance upon religious participation.

It further requests clarification concerning whether adherents could decline religious obligations while retaining access to services otherwise offered to the public.

No adverse finding shall arise solely from an institution's desire to encourage voluntary participation.

However, the Board considers the deliberate exploitation of material dependence a serious ethical concern.

The Board recognizes that bread offered to the hungry may be an act of compassion.

It does not follow that the recipient has thereby consented to permanent spiritual or political obedience.

VII. THE USE OF CELESTIAL POWER IN RELIGIOUS PERSUASION

The Board considers whether Inarius employed extraordinary abilities to influence mortal adherence.

As an angel, Inarius possessed capabilities beyond those ordinarily available to human religious leaders.

The possibility that these abilities affected the judgments of adherents requires examination.

The Board recognizes that an extraordinary appearance or demonstration of supernatural power does not automatically invalidate consent.

A person may freely choose to follow a being whose existence demonstrates extraordinary capabilities.

However, direct interference with independent judgment presents a different question.

The Board therefore distinguishes between:

1. Persuasion through speech and argument.
2. Inspiration resulting from an extraordinary experience.
3. Emotional influence arising from proximity to a powerful being.
4. Deliberate supernatural alteration of judgment.
5. Compulsion that materially eliminates the capacity to refuse.

These conditions are not ethically equivalent.

The available historical record supports inquiry into Inarius's use of extraordinary influence.

It does not justify presuming that every Cathedral adherent was incapable of independent thought.

Accordingly, the Board requests evidence concerning the nature and extent of any supernatural effects employed during recruitment.

It further requests clarification concerning whether affected persons understood those effects.

Where an individual voluntarily chooses allegiance following an extraordinary experience, the choice may remain meaningful.

Where the individual's capacity to choose is deliberately overridden, the appearance of agreement cannot be treated as sufficient.

The Board does not regard supernatural charisma as conclusive evidence of coercion.

It does not regard supernatural coercion as ordinary charisma.

VIII. ON THE TEMPLE OF THE TRIUNE AS AN ASSERTED JUSTIFICATION

The Board recognizes that the Cathedral of Light existed in direct opposition to the Temple of the Triune.

The latter was established by the Prime Evils.

Its leadership deliberately concealed the identities of its infernal sponsors.

Its objectives included directing humanity toward the interests of the Burning Hells.

These circumstances presented legitimate grounds for concern.

However, the Board rejects the proposition that the existence of an unethical rival establishes that every opposing method is justified.

An institution may correctly identify deception while employing deception itself.

It may oppose domination while maintaining systems of domination.

It may condemn coercion while using coercion to secure adherence.

The Board therefore considers whether the Cathedral's methods were distinguishable from those of the Triune.

The distinction cannot be established solely by comparing the moral identities claimed by the institutions.

It must be examined through their conduct.

The Board recognizes that the two institutions may have caused different degrees and forms of harm.

It does not assume equivalence.

Nevertheless, comparable practices require comparable ethical scrutiny.

The Board therefore requests that the Cathedral identify the principles distinguishing its recruitment practices from those of its infernal rival.

The statement that the Cathedral served the Light may explain its theological position.

It does not independently establish that its procedures respected mortal autonomy.

An institution does not become ethically legitimate merely because its principal competitor is worse.

IX. THE QUESTION OF DISSENT

The Board next considers the treatment of persons who questioned the Cathedral's teachings or authority.

A religious institution may maintain doctrines and membership requirements.

It may distinguish between beliefs consistent with its traditions and beliefs it considers incompatible.

The Board recognizes that voluntary associations require some ability to define their own identity.

However, disagreement with religious teaching must be distinguished from conduct justifying coercive punishment.

The Board therefore examines the role of inquisitorial authorities within the Cathedral.

Historical accounts identify institutional officers charged with enforcing the Cathedral's interests and investigating perceived threats.

The Board requests evidence concerning the scope of their powers.

Were inquisitors empowered to investigate dissenting beliefs?

Could they detain persons?

Could they impose physical punishments?

Did their authority extend beyond Cathedral members?

Were accused persons entitled to answer allegations?

Was any procedure available to challenge an inquisitorial determination?

The Board makes no blanket finding concerning the conduct of every inquisitor.

The available record requires examination of particular practices and incidents.

Nevertheless, the presence of a religious enforcement apparatus raises substantial questions concerning proportionality and freedom of conscience.

The Board recognizes that an institution may define heresy within its own doctrine.

It does not follow that a declaration of heresy establishes an unrestricted entitlement to injure the person accused.

X. ON THE CONVERSION OF PROTECTION INTO OBEDIENCE

The Board identifies a recurring danger in institutions organized to protect populations from extraordinary threats.

Protection may be necessary.

It may require coordination, secrecy, and temporary restrictions.

It may also create relationships of dependence.

An institution that successfully protects a population may acquire substantial public trust.

That trust can become a source of authority.

The ethical difficulty arises when the institution treats trust earned through protection as a permanent claim upon obedience.

The Cathedral presents substantial reasons to examine this possibility.

Its founder sought to protect Sanctuary from infernal control.

Yet the historical record also indicates his desire to preserve control over the world he had created.

These objectives may have overlapped.

They were not necessarily identical.

The Board therefore distinguishes between two propositions.

Protective proposition: Humanity faces dangers requiring organized defense.

Proprietary proposition: Because an institution provides that defense, humanity must accept the institution's permanent authority.

The first may be justified by evidence.

The second requires independent justification.

The provision of protection does not automatically create political ownership of those protected.

Nor does gratitude toward a protector eliminate the right to question that protector's decisions.

The Board therefore enters the following preliminary principle:

A population's dependence upon an institution for protection does not establish that the population has surrendered its right to evaluate the institution itself.

XI. THE RETURN OF INARIUS AND THE LATER CATHEDRAL

The Board turns to the Cathedral's later incarnation.

By the period associated with *Diablo IV*, the Cathedral had again become a powerful religious organization.

Inarius occupied a central position in its spiritual identity.

Reverend Mother Prava exercised substantial leadership responsibilities.

The organization maintained armed personnel and institutions devoted to spiritual discipline.

The Board recognizes the extraordinary conditions prevailing during this period.

Sanctuary faced renewed infernal threats.

Communities suffered from violence, corruption, and widespread insecurity.

The desire for spiritual reassurance and organized protection was therefore understandable.

The Board further recognizes that the Cathedral may have provided meaningful refuge and assistance to persons experiencing those conditions.

Nevertheless, the institution's later conduct requires examination independently of its original founding.

The Board therefore asks:

What authority did the later Cathedral claim over Sanctuary?

Did it recognize limits upon that authority?

Could adherents refuse military service?

Could members question the interpretations of prophecy advanced by their leaders?

What protections existed for persons accused of impurity, heresy, or disloyalty?

What distinction did the Cathedral maintain between religious discipline and compulsory public punishment?

The Board further requests clarification concerning the distribution of authority between Inarius and Prava.

The mere existence of a mortal administrator does not establish that institutional decisions were independent of celestial direction.

Equally, the existence of a celestial leader does not establish that every decision by subordinate officials was personally ordered by that leader.

Responsibility requires evidence concerning actual control, knowledge, and participation.

XII. REVEREND MOTHER PRAVA

The Board identifies Reverend Mother Prava as an institutional official whose actions warrant particular consideration.

Prava occupied a position of considerable authority within the Cathedral.

She directed religious personnel and participated in the organization of its military operations.

The Board recognizes that leadership during a period of extraordinary danger may require difficult decisions.

It does not presume that every such decision was improper.

However, the concentration of religious and military authority raises questions concerning accountability.

The Board therefore requests clarification concerning:

- The source of Prava's governing authority.
- The relationship between her decisions and instructions issued by Inarius.
- Procedures for challenging her determinations.
- The distinction between religious offenses and public threats.
- The treatment of persons who refused Cathedral allegiance.
- The conditions under which military personnel were deployed.
- The existence of independent oversight.

The Board further requests that Prava distinguish between loyalty to Inarius and responsibility toward the Cathedral's mortal members.

These interests may have aligned in particular circumstances.

They cannot be presumed identical.

The Board recognizes that a leader may sincerely believe in the authority of a superior.

Sincerity is relevant.

However, obedience to a superior does not automatically resolve questions concerning the treatment of those affected by the resulting decisions.

The Board does not presume that Prava was responsible for every intention of Inarius.

It does request that she identify which decisions she made, which she implemented, and which she possessed authority to challenge.

XIII. ON PROPHECY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF GOVERNANCE

The Board identifies the interpretation of prophecy as a central concern in the later Cathedral's activities.

Inarius believed that confronting and defeating Lilith would permit his return to the High Heavens.

The Cathedral's teachings associated his actions with humanity's salvation.

The Board recognizes that prophecy may occupy an important place within religious traditions.

Believers may interpret prophetic accounts as sources of meaning and guidance.

The present inquiry does not purport to determine whether prophecy is inherently valid or invalid.

It concerns the use of a particular interpretation to justify institutional action affecting others.

The Board therefore distinguishes:

Prophetic text: The original expression or record.

Interpretation: The meaning attributed to the text.

Institutional doctrine: The interpretation formally adopted by an organization.

Operational directive: The action undertaken because the institution accepts that interpretation.

These categories are related but distinct.

The existence of a prophecy does not establish that a particular interpretation is correct.

Nor does a sincerely held interpretation automatically justify every action undertaken in reliance upon it.

The Board therefore requests evidence concerning the Cathedral's interpretation of Rathma's prophecy.

What alternatives were considered?

What evidence supported the interpretation favored by Inarius?

Were contradictory interpretations permitted?

Did the Cathedral distinguish between Inarius's personal desire to return to Heaven and the interests of the mortal population?

The Board recognizes that a leader may believe his own destiny is connected to the welfare of others.

However, that belief requires scrutiny when it becomes the basis for exposing others to grave danger.

The Board recognizes that a prophecy may describe an anticipated event.

It does not recognize an anticipated event as automatic authorization for every act undertaken to bring it about.

XIV. THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST LILITH

The Board next considers the Cathedral's military campaign against Lilith.

Lilith presented a genuine threat to Sanctuary.

Her activities involved violence, manipulation, and attempts to direct humanity toward her own objectives.

The Board therefore recognizes substantial grounds for organized resistance.

However, the legitimacy of the objective does not establish the propriety of every military decision undertaken in its pursuit.

The Cathedral's campaign culminated in the movement of its forces into the Burning Hells.

Inarius sought to confront Lilith personally.

The operation resulted in catastrophic losses among Cathedral personnel.

Inarius himself was killed.

The Board recognizes that these events occurred under extraordinary and dangerous conditions.

The existence of casualties does not, by itself, establish that the campaign was unjustified.

Military operations against powerful hostile entities may involve unavoidable loss.

Nevertheless, the severity of the outcome warrants examination of the planning and authorization.

The Board therefore requests evidence concerning:

1. The strategic objective of the operation.
2. The intelligence supporting the anticipated outcome.
3. The risks communicated to participating personnel.
4. The feasibility of retreat.
5. The availability of alternative strategies.
6. The arrangements for treating casualties.
7. The command structure.
8. The relationship between Inarius's personal objective and the mission assigned to Cathedral forces.

The Board considers the final issue especially significant.

A religious leader's desire to secure his own redemption does not automatically establish that the lives of his followers may be expended in pursuit of it.

XV. ON THE USE OF RELIGIOUS ALLEGIANCE FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

The Board recognizes that individuals may voluntarily undertake military service in defense of religious communities.

Religious conviction may provide a sincere and legitimate motivation for personal sacrifice.

However, an institution accepting such service possesses responsibilities concerning the information provided to participants.

The Board therefore distinguishes between voluntary service undertaken for a clearly identified protective purpose and service obtained through materially misleading representations.

A person may willingly confront extraordinary danger to protect Sanctuary.

It does not follow that the same person has consented to undertake an operation principally intended to advance the private aspirations of a religious leader.

The Board does not conclude that Inarius's personal ambitions were the sole purpose of the Cathedral's campaign.

The threat posed by Lilith was real.

The protective purpose and the founder's personal objective may have coexisted.

Their relationship requires examination.

Where an institution presents an operation as necessary for collective salvation, it must consider whether the actual objectives are adequately disclosed.

The Board further recognizes that not every strategic detail can be made available to every participant.

Operational secrecy may be legitimate.

However, secrecy concerning tactical matters is distinguishable from concealment of a material conflict between the leader's interests and the mission's professed purpose.

The willingness to die for the protection of others does not automatically establish willingness to die for the personal vindication of the person issuing the command.

XVI. THE AFTERMATH OF THE CAMPAIGN

The Board considers the consequences of Inarius's death and the losses suffered by Cathedral forces.

An institution may continue to exist after the death of its founder.

Its members may retain sincere beliefs and legitimate communal interests.

The Board therefore rejects the proposition that the death of Inarius automatically invalidated every aspect of Cathedral religious life.

Nor does it presume that surviving adherents were obliged to abandon their beliefs.

However, the loss of a central authority figure may create significant governance questions.

Who possessed authority to interpret the institution's doctrines?

Who bore responsibility for the consequences of the failed campaign?

Were members informed of the circumstances of Inarius's death?

Were casualty records preserved?

Could survivors question the decisions that had led to the operation?

What protections existed against retaliatory treatment of persons who expressed doubt?

The Board recognizes that organizations may experience schism, uncertainty, and changes in leadership following catastrophic events.

These developments do not independently establish misconduct.

Nevertheless, the manner in which an institution responds to failure may reveal whether it possesses meaningful mechanisms of accountability.

An institution that cannot acknowledge error may become unable to correct it.

An institution that treats every question as disloyalty may become unable to distinguish criticism from betrayal.

The Board recognizes that faith may survive the failure of a leader.

It does not recognize that faith as a reason to prohibit examination of the leader's decisions.

XVII. THE RIGHTS OF ORDINARY ADHERENTS

The Board considers the status of ordinary Cathedral members.

Many adherents may have joined because they sought meaning, protection, community, or moral guidance.

Others may have inherited the religion through family or tradition.

Some may have participated in charitable work.

Some may have undertaken military service.

Others may have held positions within the institution without possessing significant authority.

The Board therefore rejects collective attribution of misconduct solely on the basis of membership.

Responsibility requires attention to individual conduct and knowledge.

A person who sincerely accepted the Prophet's teachings without knowledge of his concealed identity is not necessarily responsible for that concealment.

A person who volunteered for religious service is not automatically responsible for every policy adopted by senior clergy.

A person who obeyed an institutional directive under substantial pressure may occupy a different ethical position from the official who issued it.

The Board therefore recognizes the importance of distinguishing among:

- Founders and principal decision-makers.
- Senior officials possessing substantial authority.
- Personnel implementing institutional directives.
- Ordinary members.
- Persons subjected to coercion.
- Persons who opposed or challenged institutional misconduct.

These categories do not establish automatic innocence or culpability.

They identify differences relevant to the inquiry.

The Board does not consider religious affiliation sufficient evidence of individual wrongdoing.

Nor does it consider institutional membership sufficient reason to deny a person the protection of ethical standards.

XVIII. THE RIGHT TO LEAVE

The Board identifies freedom of withdrawal as a particularly significant aspect of voluntary religious participation.

A person may sincerely join an institution.

Beliefs may subsequently change.

Circumstances may reveal information previously unavailable.

The individual may conclude that continued membership is no longer appropriate.

The Board therefore considers whether Cathedral members possessed meaningful freedom to depart.

It recognizes that organizations may establish ordinary procedures for resignation or withdrawal.

They may also maintain doctrines concerning the spiritual significance of departure.

Such doctrines do not automatically constitute coercion.

However, withdrawal becomes ethically problematic where it produces threats, violence, detention, or other severe consequences intended to prevent departure.

The Board requests evidence concerning whether former adherents were subjected to compulsory penalties.

It further requests clarification concerning whether persons could decline continued service without being classified as enemies of the institution.

This question is particularly important where religious and military obligations overlapped.

The refusal to participate in a particular campaign does not automatically establish allegiance to the institution's enemies.

Nor does disagreement with the Cathedral establish allegiance to Lilith or the Prime Evils.

The Board recognizes that an institution may consider departure spiritually significant.

It does not recognize departure as automatic evidence of treason.

XIX. THE QUESTION OF THE FALSE DILEMMA

The Board identifies a recurring difficulty in the Cathedral's claims concerning Sanctuary.

The population faced genuine dangers from infernal powers.

The Cathedral presented itself as an instrument of protection.

However, the existence of danger does not establish that a population must accept every condition imposed by a particular protector.

The Board therefore questions whether the Cathedral treated allegiance to itself as equivalent to allegiance to the preservation of humanity.

These propositions are not necessarily identical.

A person may oppose Lilith without accepting Inarius's authority.

A person may resist infernal manipulation without joining the Cathedral.

A person may hold religious beliefs different from those of the Cathedral while remaining committed to the protection of Sanctuary.

The Board recognizes that extraordinary conflicts may produce genuine strategic choices.

It does not presume that every alternative was feasible or equally protective.

Nevertheless, the existence of difficult choices does not justify falsely presenting one institution as the only conceivable source of legitimate action.

The Board rejects the proposition that refusal to serve the Cathedral necessarily constitutes consent to serve the Burning Hells.

The same principle was applied to infernal recruitment in SERB-004.

The Board finds no reason to abandon it when examining celestial institutions.

XX. ON THE PERSONAL INTERESTS OF INARIUS

The Board returns to the relationship between the founder and the institution.

Inarius helped create Sanctuary.

He altered the Worldstone to suppress the powers of its descendants.

He established the Cathedral of Light in opposition to the Triune.

In the later period, he sought to fulfill an interpretation of prophecy that he believed would permit his return to the High Heavens.

These actions demonstrate that Inarius possessed interests beyond the ordinary spiritual administration of a congregation.

The Board does not presume that all such interests were illegitimate.

The desire to protect Sanctuary from Hell may have been sincere.

The desire to return from exile may also have been understandable.

Nevertheless, the coexistence of personal and institutional objectives creates a need for disclosure and oversight.

An institution may legitimately pursue a goal that also benefits its leader.

However, the leader's personal benefit should not automatically be treated as proof that the goal serves the institution's members.

The Board therefore requests evidence concerning whether Cathedral leadership recognized and evaluated these conflicts.

Did officials distinguish the protection of Sanctuary from Inarius's personal restoration?

Did they possess authority to reject a proposed operation?

Could they question his interpretation of prophecy?

Were competing strategies considered?

Did Inarius regard the continued existence of the Cathedral as subordinate to his own objectives?

The Board does not presume the answers.

It identifies the questions as necessary to evaluating the institution's conduct.

The Board recognizes that Inarius wished to return to the High Heavens.

It does not recognize the Cathedral's members as instruments automatically available for accomplishing that return.

XXI. PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Following review of the available historical record, the Sanctuary Ethics Review Board enters the following findings.

Finding 1 — Legitimate Religious Functions

The Cathedral of Light may have provided genuine spiritual, communal, and protective benefits to its adherents.

These benefits warrant recognition independent of misconduct that may have occurred within its leadership.

Finding 2 — Concealed Foundational Interests

Inarius's presentation as the Prophet obscured material aspects of his identity and interests.

The consequences for informed religious allegiance warrant substantial examination.

Finding 3 — Conflicts of Interest

The founder's personal interest in maintaining control over Sanctuary was not necessarily identical to the spiritual interests of the congregation.

Finding 4 — No Automatic Celestial Authority

Inarius's angelic nature and role in the creation of Sanctuary did not independently establish unlimited authority over the Cathedral's mortal members.

Finding 5 — Legitimate Opposition to Infernal Manipulation

The Temple of the Triune presented a genuine threat.

Opposition to that threat may have justified protective action.

Finding 6 — Limits of Protective Justification

The existence of an unethical rival did not automatically justify every practice employed by the Cathedral.

Finding 7 — Importance of Religious Autonomy

The sincerity of religious belief does not eliminate the need to examine material deception, coercion, or restrictions upon withdrawal.

Finding 8 — Distinction Between Doctrine and Compulsion

An institution may maintain religious teachings without thereby acquiring unlimited authority to impose them upon nonmembers.

Finding 9 — Unresolved Inquisitorial Authority

The scope and operation of the Cathedral's enforcement institutions require additional evidence.

Finding 10 — Distinct Historical Incarnations

The responsibilities of the original Cathedral and its later incarnation must be evaluated according to the circumstances and authority of the persons involved.

Finding 11 — Governance Concerns Under Prava

The later Cathedral's concentration of religious and military authority raises substantial questions concerning oversight and accountability.

Finding 12 — Interpretive Limits of Prophecy

The existence of a prophecy does not automatically establish the legitimacy of a particular interpretation or every action undertaken in reliance upon it.

Finding 13 — Military Responsibility

The campaign against Lilith possessed a potentially legitimate protective objective.

Its planning, disclosure, and relationship to Inarius's personal ambitions require examination.

Finding 14 — No Collective Culpability of Adherents

Ordinary Cathedral membership does not establish responsibility for misconduct by senior leadership.

Finding 15 — Meaningful Freedom of Withdrawal

Voluntary religious allegiance requires consideration of whether members could reject or leave the institution without coercive retaliation.

Finding 16 — Institutional Responsibility Following Failure

The death or departure of a founder does not automatically eliminate an institution's responsibility to examine prior decisions and their consequences.

Finding 17 — Distinction Between Protection and Ownership

The provision of protection does not establish an institution's permanent entitlement to obedience.

XXII. QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO THE ORIGINAL CATHEDRAL

The Board hereby requests responses, where surviving records permit, to the following questions.

Question One:
What information concerning Inarius's identity was disclosed to the original congregation?

Question Two:
Were adherents informed that the Prophet was a co-founder of Sanctuary?

Question Three:
Were they informed of his previous alteration of the Worldstone?

Question Four:
Did the founder disclose his interest in maintaining authority over Sanctuary?

Question Five:
What distinction was maintained between spiritual guidance and compulsory political obedience?

Question Six:
Were extraordinary supernatural powers used to influence recruitment?

Question Seven:
Could adherents refuse or withdraw from membership without retaliation?

Question Eight:
What authority was exercised by inquisitorial officials?

Question Nine:
Were persons outside the congregation subject to Cathedral enforcement?

Question Ten:
What procedures existed for challenging the decisions of senior clergy?

Question Eleven:
Were charitable services conditioned upon religious allegiance?

Question Twelve:
Did the institution distinguish opposition to the Temple of the Triune from loyalty to Inarius personally?

Question Thirteen:
What protections existed for persons who rejected both institutions?

Question Fourteen:
Did the founder regard the Cathedral as a means of protecting humanity or as an instrument for maintaining his control?

Question Fifteen:
Were these objectives ever evaluated independently?

The Board recognizes that the original institution may no longer possess surviving representatives capable of responding.

The absence of surviving witnesses shall be considered in evaluating the evidence.

XXIII. QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO THE LATER CATHEDRAL

The Board separately requests responses concerning the institution's later operation.

Question One:
What was the source of the Cathedral's governing authority during the Age of Hatred?

Question Two:
What powers were exercised by Reverend Mother Prava?

Question Three:
Could senior clergy challenge directives issued by Inarius?

Question Four:
Were adherents informed of the material risks associated with military service?

Question Five:
Did the Cathedral distinguish the defeat of Lilith from Inarius's desire to return to Heaven?

Question Six:
What evidence supported the interpretation of prophecy adopted by the institution?

Question Seven:
Were alternative interpretations permitted?

Question Eight:
What procedures governed accusations of heresy or impurity?

Question Nine:
Could members decline military service without institutional retaliation?

Question Ten:
What protections existed for civilians outside the Cathedral's religious jurisdiction?

Question Eleven:
What contingency arrangements were prepared for the campaign into the Burning Hells?

Question Twelve:
What procedures governed the evacuation or recovery of wounded personnel?

Question Thirteen:
What records were preserved concerning the losses sustained?

Question Fourteen:
What institutional changes followed the death of Inarius?

Question Fifteen:
Were surviving members permitted to question the decisions that preceded the catastrophe?

Question Sixteen:
Did the Cathedral acknowledge any authority beyond its own leadership to examine institutional misconduct?

Question Seventeen:
What distinction did the Cathedral maintain between the preservation of its doctrines and the preservation of humanity?

Question Eighteen:
Would the Cathedral continue to recognize the right of humanity to exist and govern itself if humanity rejected its spiritual authority?

The Board considers the final question fundamental.

A religious institution may seek converts.

It may offer teachings.

It may advocate its beliefs.

However, the ethical standing of persons cannot be made contingent solely upon their willingness to accept the institution's authority.

XXIV. INSTITUTIONAL DETERMINATION

The Sanctuary Ethics Review Board finds substantial grounds for examining the Cathedral of Light's methods of recruitment, governance, and enforcement.

The institution's original founding purpose included opposition to genuine infernal manipulation.

Its members may have received meaningful spiritual and material benefits.

The Board recognizes these facts.

Nevertheless, the founder's concealed identity and personal interest in controlling Sanctuary raise serious questions concerning institutional transparency.

The Board further finds that the later Cathedral's combination of religious and military authority created significant risks requiring oversight.

The existence of legitimate threats did not automatically justify compulsory allegiance.

The interpretation of prophecy did not eliminate the responsibility to examine operational decisions.

And the sincerity of ordinary adherents did not establish that every action by senior leadership was legitimate.

The Board therefore enters the following preliminary determination.

The Cathedral of Light's authority over willing adherents cannot be presumed to extend without limitation to the wider population of Sanctuary.

The existence of an infernal threat does not establish that every form of celestial protection is legitimate.

The sincerity of religious allegiance does not automatically cure material deception by institutional leadership.

And the personal aspirations of a religious founder cannot be treated as interchangeable with the interests of the persons who follow him.

The Board makes no determination concerning the ultimate truth of the Cathedral's theological teachings.

It does not purport to regulate private belief.

It does not presume that religious adherence is inherently coercive.

Its findings concern institutional conduct and the treatment of affected persons.

The inquiry remains open pending additional evidence.

XXV. CONCLUDING OBSERVATION

There is a particular difficulty in judging institutions founded upon the promise of salvation.

Their language may be sincere.

Their adherents may be devoted.

Their teachings may provide genuine consolation.

And their actions may preserve lives.

Yet the same institutions may acquire authority extending beyond the purposes for which their members originally sought them.

The Cathedral of Light arose amid extraordinary danger.

The Prime Evils had established a concealed system for influencing humanity.

The world faced powers whose intentions were neither benign nor compatible with mortal independence.

Inarius recognized the danger.

He established an institution to oppose it.

The Board acknowledges the legitimacy of that concern.

But the history of Sanctuary requires a further distinction.

Inarius was not merely an observer of humanity's struggle.

He was a founder of the world.

He had previously exercised extraordinary power over its inhabitants.

He possessed his own interests concerning its future.

And he had reason to fear both the influence of Hell and the independent development of the civilization he had helped create.

The Cathedral therefore occupied an ambiguous position.

It was an instrument of protection.

It was also an instrument of influence.

It offered spiritual teachings.

It served the purposes of a founder whose authority had never been independently established by the population he sought to govern.

The distinction matters.

A person may sincerely seek protection from danger without surrendering the right to determine the conditions of that protection.

A person may accept religious instruction without accepting unlimited political authority.

A person may admire a teacher without granting that teacher ownership of the student's future.

And a person may believe in a divine purpose without thereby consenting to every act undertaken by those who claim to represent it.

The Board recognizes that belief may require trust.

But trust differs from the elimination of judgment.

An adherent who trusts a spiritual leader does not necessarily relinquish the capacity to question that leader's conduct.

Nor does the existence of religious obligation establish that every administrative directive possesses sacred authority.

The distinction is particularly important where an institution claims that obedience is necessary for salvation.

Such a claim may carry extraordinary weight for those who believe it.

The Board does not purport to decide the theological validity of salvation.

It does, however, recognize that the fear of spiritual ruin may be employed to obtain compliance in circumstances where independent judgment would otherwise lead a person to refuse.

The ethical question concerns whether the institution knowingly exploits that fear.

A person who freely accepts religious discipline may exercise meaningful autonomy.

A person compelled through threats, deception, or severe institutional retaliation occupies a different position.

The outward act of obedience may appear identical.

The conditions producing it are not.

And it is those conditions that the Board must examine.

The Cathedral's history also reveals the danger of allowing protective institutions to define every criticism as an attack.

The Temple of the Triune was dangerous.

That danger was real.

But the existence of a dangerous enemy did not render the Cathedral infallible.

Nor did it establish that persons who rejected the Cathedral had thereby joined the enemy.

Humanity existed before the Cathedral claimed its allegiance.

Humanity possessed interests independent of the Cathedral's success.

And humanity's continued existence could not legitimately be made contingent solely upon acceptance of its founder's authority.

The Board therefore returns to a principle established throughout the Sanctuary proceedings.

The existence of a genuine threat does not eliminate the rights of those threatened.

Indeed, extraordinary danger may make those rights more important.

A population confronted by catastrophe may become unusually dependent upon institutions offering protection.

Its members may be frightened.

They may possess incomplete information.

They may lack the resources necessary to evaluate competing claims.

They may accept assurances that would receive greater scrutiny under ordinary conditions.

These circumstances create responsibilities for those who claim to lead them.

An institution entrusted with public confidence should not exploit the vulnerability upon which that confidence rests.

Its authority should remain proportionate to its legitimate responsibilities.

Its leadership should distinguish institutional interests from personal ambitions.

And its members should possess meaningful opportunities to question decisions affecting their lives.

The later Cathedral presents an especially grave example.

Inarius believed that defeating Lilith would permit his return to Heaven.

The Cathedral mobilized its forces.

Its adherents followed.

They entered the Burning Hells.

Many did not return.

The Board does not presume that the operation was undertaken solely for the benefit of Inarius.

Lilith presented a genuine danger.

Her defeat may have served legitimate protective purposes.

Nevertheless, the coincidence of collective danger and personal ambition required exceptional care.

For the same action may serve two purposes.

A leader may seek to protect others while also seeking personal vindication.

The existence of one purpose does not erase the other.

And where the lives of followers are placed at risk, the relationship between them becomes a matter of ethical significance.

The Board therefore considers whether the faithful were asked to confront a danger for Sanctuary or to fulfill a destiny claimed by their founder.

The two objectives may have overlapped.

They were not necessarily identical.

Nor could the sincerity of the faithful resolve the distinction.

Those who followed Inarius may have acted courageously.

Their sacrifice may have been genuine.

Their loyalty may have been freely offered.

Yet the moral significance of their courage does not establish that every decision made on their behalf was justified.

The Board has previously examined this principle in relation to Tal Rasha.

A voluntary sacrifice does not eliminate the obligations of those who accept it.

The same principle applies here.

An institution does not fulfill its responsibilities merely by obtaining willing followers.

It must still examine the purposes for which their willingness is employed.

The Cathedral's history therefore invites consideration of the difference between devotion and obedience.

Devotion may arise from love, conviction, or gratitude.

Obedience may arise from those same motives.

But obedience may also arise from fear, dependence, or the belief that refusal will result in condemnation.

The two conditions cannot be distinguished solely by observing that a person complied.

The Board therefore declines to accept compliance as conclusive evidence of legitimate authority.

A person may kneel willingly.

A person may kneel because standing is forbidden.

The posture is the same.

The moral circumstances are not.

And it is possible for a person to kneel willingly before a leader whose authority nevertheless exceeds its proper limits.

For consent to one relationship does not establish consent to every exercise of power undertaken within it.

The Board recognizes the sincerity of the ordinary faithful.

It recognizes their hopes, their fears, and their desire to protect the world in which they lived.

It does not regard them as mere instruments of their leaders.

Nor does it presume that every person who participated in the Cathedral's work possessed knowledge of its founder's private objectives.

The distinction is essential.

Institutions may act through persons who sincerely believe they are doing good.

Those persons may provide genuine assistance.

They may demonstrate courage.

They may suffer when the institution fails.

Their sincerity deserves recognition.

But it cannot be used to shield the decisions of those who possessed greater authority, greater knowledge, and greater control over the institution's direction.

The moral character of the faithful does not automatically establish the moral character of the institution.

Neither does institutional misconduct extinguish the moral worth of its members.

The Board therefore refuses to make either inference.

It will examine the actions of leaders.

It will consider the responsibilities of officials.

It will distinguish between voluntary participation and compelled obedience.

It will recognize benefits where benefits occurred.

And it will identify harms where the evidence establishes them.

The purpose is not to decide whether faith itself is justified.

The purpose is to examine whether those entrusted with faith treated the faithful as persons.

For there is a difference between guiding a congregation and possessing it.

There is a difference between offering protection and demanding submission.

There is a difference between teaching a doctrine and treating every question as rebellion.

And there is a difference between acting for the salvation of others and requiring others to serve the personal salvation of the actor.

The Board recognizes that Inarius was an angel.

It recognizes that he helped create Sanctuary.

It recognizes that he possessed extraordinary knowledge and power.

These facts are not disputed.

But none establishes that the mortals who followed him ceased to possess interests of their own.

The Cathedral could not derive unlimited authority from the existence of its founder.

Nor could its founder derive unlimited authority from the devotion of its members.

A congregation is not a personal estate.

A doctrine is not a deed of ownership.

A prophecy is not a substitute for informed judgment.

And the promise of salvation does not convert every demand for obedience into a legitimate obligation.

The Board recognizes the value of faith freely held.

It does not recognize faith as a waiver of personal autonomy.

The Board recognizes the legitimacy of protection from genuine danger.

It does not recognize protection as an unlimited claim upon obedience.

The Board recognizes the authority of religious institutions to teach their doctrines.

It does not recognize that authority as an unrestricted power to punish those who decline them.

And the Board recognizes that Inarius sought to return to Heaven.

It does not recognize that aspiration as establishing an obligation upon humanity to carry him there.

The inquiry remains open.

XXVI. DISPOSITION

SERB-008 shall remain open pending further evidence concerning the Cathedral's founding disclosures, governance, disciplinary procedures, military operations, and treatment of dissenting persons.

The Board enters no finding that ordinary religious allegiance to the Cathedral was inherently invalid.

It enters no determination concerning the ultimate truth of the Cathedral's theological doctrines.

It further declines to attribute every historical action of the original Cathedral to subsequent members or institutions without evidence of continuity and responsibility.

Nevertheless, the Board finds substantial grounds for examining the exercise of institutional authority in both historical periods.

The Board reserves separate proceedings concerning:

- The authority of religious inquisitors.
- The use of compulsory penitence.
- The interpretation and institutional deployment of prophecy.
- The campaign against Lilith.

- The responsibilities of Reverend Mother Prava.
- The treatment of conscientious objectors and religious dissenters.
- The status of former adherents.
- The continuing governance of the Cathedral following Inarius's death.

No directive requiring the alteration of religious doctrine is entered.

The Board recommends that affected persons retain meaningful opportunities to question, refuse, or withdraw from institutional obligations without unlawful or unjustified retaliation.

So entered.

Sanctuary Ethics Review Board
Office of Religious Autonomy and Institutional Governance
Division of Spiritual Authority, Disclosure, and Coercive Practice

---

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM A

Regarding the Identity of the Prophet

The Office of Institutional Disclosure has reviewed the historical representation of Inarius as the Prophet.

The Office acknowledges that religious titles may possess legitimate ceremonial and spiritual significance.

It further acknowledges that a leader may reasonably employ a name different from that used in other circumstances.

However, the Office has identified material information concerning the respondent's identity that may have affected the judgment of prospective adherents.

The respondent is therefore requested to clarify whether members were informed that their spiritual leader was also a co-founder of Sanctuary.

The Office further requests disclosure of any information concerning his previous alteration of the Worldstone.

For avoidance of doubt, the Office does not consider the description *radiant spiritual leader* sufficient to establish disclosure of prior population-wide metaphysical intervention.

The Board recognizes the title of Prophet.

It requests the name and relevant history of the person occupying the office.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM B

Regarding the Source of Celestial Authority

The Office of Jurisdictional Review has received a preliminary assertion that the Cathedral derives its authority from the High Heavens.

The Office acknowledges that the Cathedral's teachings were associated with celestial order.

However, the respondent is requested to identify any specific authorization issued by the Angiris Council.

The Board does not presume that such authorization existed.

Nor does it presume that the absence of authorization by the Council would necessarily render every religious activity illegitimate.

The relevant inquiry concerns the authority actually claimed and the basis upon which it was exercised.

The Office further observes that SERB-003 identified unresolved questions concerning the Angiris Council's jurisdiction over Sanctuary.

Consequently, even an established celestial authorization would not automatically dispose of the present inquiry.

The Office respectfully advises that a claim of authority delegated by Heaven remains subject to examination of whether Heaven possessed that authority to delegate.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM C

Regarding the Religious Status of Dissenters

The Office of Personal Autonomy has reviewed preliminary descriptions of persons who declined Cathedral allegiance.

The Office recognizes that the Cathedral may employ theological classifications when discussing beliefs inconsistent with its doctrines.

However, such classifications do not automatically establish wrongdoing by the persons described.

In particular, the Office requests clarification concerning whether the designation *heretic* was employed solely as a religious description or as grounds for compulsory enforcement.

The Board acknowledges that internal doctrinal distinctions may be legitimate.

Nevertheless, the right to maintain a doctrine does not establish unrestricted authority to injure those who reject it.

The Office respectfully requests that future allegations distinguish between disagreement with the Cathedral and conduct causing identifiable harm.

A statement that the accused refused to recognize the Prophet is not, without additional evidence, a sufficient description of the latter.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM D

Regarding the Military Objectives of Inarius

The Office of Institutional Risk has received information concerning the Cathedral's campaign against Lilith.

The Office acknowledges that Lilith presented a genuine threat to Sanctuary.

It further acknowledges that military action may have been necessary.

However, the respondent's personal desire to return to the High Heavens raises questions concerning the objectives of the operation.

The Office therefore requests that the Cathedral identify the benefits reasonably anticipated for its mortal members.

It further requests clarification concerning whether the operation would have been undertaken in substantially the same manner if Inarius's personal return to Heaven had not been anticipated.

The respondent may submit evidence concerning strategic necessity.

The Office recognizes the importance of considering such evidence.

The Board respectfully requests that the respondent distinguish the salvation of Sanctuary from the restoration of his own celestial position.

The two matters may be related.

They are not presumed identical.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM E

Regarding the Interpretation of Prophecy

The Office of Evidentiary Integrity has received a submission asserting that a particular interpretation of prophecy rendered the Cathedral's military campaign inevitable.

The Office acknowledges the religious importance of prophecy.

It further recognizes that individuals may sincerely believe an anticipated event cannot be avoided.

However, the interpretation of a prophecy does not independently establish the practical necessity of every action undertaken in reliance upon it.

The Office therefore requests identification of alternative interpretations considered before the campaign.

It further requests evidence concerning whether dissenting interpretations were evaluated.

The Board recognizes the existence of prophetic language.

It does not recognize the respondent's preferred interpretation as self-authenticating.

The submission shall remain in the record.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM F

Regarding the Responsibilities of Reverend Mother Prava

The Office of Institutional Accountability has reviewed the historical position of Reverend Mother Prava.

The Office recognizes that Prava occupied substantial religious and administrative authority within the later Cathedral.

It further recognizes that she acted during a period of extraordinary danger.

The Board makes no presumption that every decision by Inarius was personally authorized or independently endorsed by Prava.

Nevertheless, the Office requests identification of the powers exercised by her office.

In particular, it seeks clarification concerning the authority to approve military operations, discipline adherents, and review instructions issued by the Cathedral's celestial leader.

The Office acknowledges that these powers may have been constrained.

The extent of those constraints requires evidence.

The Board respectfully observes that an organization possessing both a celestial founder and a mortal administrator must identify which official is responsible for particular decisions.

The statement that all decisions were made in service of the Light does not independently resolve the question.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM G

Regarding the Rights of the Faithful

The Office of Religious Autonomy has received an inquiry concerning whether members who voluntarily accepted the Cathedral's teachings also accepted unrestricted institutional authority.

The Office acknowledges that religious membership may involve obligations.

However, the scope of those obligations must be distinguished from an unlimited surrender of personal autonomy.

The Board therefore requests evidence concerning the terms of membership and withdrawal.

The Office further advises that consent to worship does not automatically establish consent to military service, confinement, or compulsory punishment.

The Board recognizes the right of the faithful to follow a religious calling.

It also recognizes their right to ask where that calling ends and institutional command begins.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM H

Regarding the Distinction Between the Cathedral of Light and Tristram Cathedral

The Office of Records has received a preliminary request to consolidate the present proceeding with the previously reserved Tristram Cathedral disclosure inquiry.

The Office acknowledges that both matters concern religious structures and extraordinary threats.

However, the institutions are historically and operationally distinct.

The Cathedral of Light concerns the religious organization established by Inarius.

The Tristram Cathedral inquiry concerns a site associated with the Horadric imprisonment of Diablo.

The Board therefore declines to consolidate the proceedings.

The Tristram matter shall remain independently docketed as:

SERB-MUN-001 — Whether "Ancient Evil Beneath the Cathedral" Constitutes an Adequate Municipal Disclosure Notice.

The Office further advises that references to *the Cathedral* should identify the relevant institution or location.

The Board respectfully observes that the existence of multiple cathedrals associated with extraordinary danger does not establish that they are the same cathedral.

The filing distinction is sustained.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM I

Regarding the Death of the Founder

The Office of Institutional Continuity has received notice that Inarius was killed during the campaign against Lilith.

The Office acknowledges the historical event.

However, the death of an institutional founder does not automatically eliminate the continuing interests of surviving members.

Nor does it automatically resolve questions concerning decisions undertaken while the founder exercised authority.

The Board therefore requests that surviving leadership identify the arrangements governing institutional succession and historical review.

The Office recognizes that the founder's personal testimony may no longer be available.

The absence of testimony shall be considered according to ordinary evidentiary limitations.

It does not require dismissal of every unresolved inquiry.

The Board respectfully notes that the death of the founder is a significant administrative development.

It is not, by itself, an answer to the outstanding questions.

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE

SERB-008 — REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SALVATION AND OBEDIENCE

The Sanctuary Ethics Review Board has completed its preliminary examination of the proposition that the Cathedral's mission to protect and spiritually guide humanity established an obligation of obedience upon all persons subject to its influence.

The proposition is not sustained.

The Board recognizes the legitimate freedom of persons to adopt religious beliefs and accept spiritual obligations.

It further recognizes that the Cathedral may have provided genuine benefits to its members.

Nevertheless, the Board does not find that the existence of such benefits established unlimited authority over adherents or nonmembers.

The respondent is therefore requested to distinguish between voluntary religious commitment and compliance obtained through institutional coercion.

The Board further requests that the Cathedral identify the basis upon which it claimed authority to impose compulsory measures upon persons who rejected its teachings.

The following submissions have been entered into the record:

That the founder was an angel.

That the founder helped create Sanctuary.

That the founder opposed the Burning Hells.

That the founder possessed extraordinary power.

That the founder believed himself destined to return to Heaven.

The Board acknowledges these assertions.

However, none independently establishes that every person in Sanctuary was obliged to follow him.

The Board recognizes that Inarius desired salvation.

The Board recognizes that the Cathedral promised salvation.

The Board recognizes that its adherents sincerely sought salvation.

The Board now requests clarification concerning whose salvation was being pursued, by what means, and at whose expense.

A further description of the founder's radiance is unnecessary.

The radiance is already in evidence.

The question concerns the authority exercised beneath it.

END OF SERB-008

NEXT PROPOSED INQUIRY

SERB-009 — MALTHAEL

On Collective Extermination, Preventive Violence, and the Presumption That the Elimination of Risk Justifies the Elimination of Persons

Principal Respondent:

Malthael, Former Archangel of Wisdom and Subsequent Angel of Death.

Proposed Classification:

Mass Atrocity, Collective Punishment, Extraordinary Weapons, Institutional Accountability, and Population-Wide Harm.

Preliminary Questions:

Whether humanity's demonic ancestry constituted a legitimate basis for its extermination.

Whether the anticipated prevention of future infernal influence could justify the destruction of persons who had committed no established wrongdoing.

Whether Malthael's former position on the Angiris Council created additional institutional responsibilities.

Whether the use of the Black Soulstone to eliminate demonic essence from Sanctuary constituted a proportionate protective measure or an impermissible act of collective destruction.

Whether an institution may claim to preserve creation by deliberately destroying a substantial portion of its inhabitants.

Preliminary Administrative Observation:

The Board recognizes that the respondent sought to end the influence of the Burning Hells upon Sanctuary.

It further recognizes the substantial danger historically associated with the Prime Evils.

However, the presence of demonic ancestry within humanity does not automatically establish that every human constitutes a legitimate target.

The Board therefore requests clarification concerning the means by which the respondent distinguished actual infernal threats from persons whose ancestry merely contained an infernal component.

The Office respectfully observes that eliminating every person capable of being endangered by a threat does not constitute an adequate method of protecting those persons from that threat.

The inquiry is reserved.

END OF DOCUMENT