

# The Parish of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

Waterloo, Ontario  
www.stedmund.ca

## UPDATE

The Anglican Catholic Church of Canada / The Traditional Anglican Communion

July 7, 2011 - **Ss. Cyril and Methodius**

### *AUGUST SCHEDULE*

---

August 6	Saturday	The Transfiguration of Our Lord
August 7	Sunday	The Seventh Sunday after Trinity
August 14	Sunday	The Eighth Sunday after Trinity
August 15	Monday	The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary
August 21	Sunday	The Ninth Sunday after Trinity
August 24	Wednesday	St. Bartholomew the Apostle
August 28	Sunday	The Tenth Sunday after Trinity
August 29	Monday	The Beheading of St. John the Baptist

### *SERVICE TIMES AND LOCATION*

---

- (1) All Services are held in the Chapel at Luther Village on the Park - 139 Father David Bauer Drive in Waterloo.
- (2) On Sundays, Matins is sung at 10:00 a.m. (The Litany on the first Sunday of the month), and the Holy Eucharist is celebrated (sung) at 10:30 a.m.
- (3) On weekdays - Major Holy Days - the Holy Eucharist is usually celebrated at 7:00 p.m., 10:00 a.m. on Saturday.

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

---

- 1) **MEETING WITH OUR PRIEST-MENTOR** - this page 7.  
page.
- 2) **A Different Gospel - ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS** -  
this page.
- 3) **Accepting Pope Benedict's Generous Offer -  
WHY I BECAME CATHOLIC** - page 4.
- 4) **A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL'S MANIFESTO** -
- 5) **A REFUTATION OF MORAL RELATIVISM** -  
page 8.
- 6) **MARIAN DEVOTION - 5** - page 9.
- 7) **TIME TO PROCLAIM THE PRIMACY OF  
JESUS CHRIST IN CREATION** - the fifth of seven  
parts - page 10.

## MEETING WITH OUR PRIEST-MENTOR - SUNDAY 23 JUNE 2011

---

Our meeting with Fr. Bill Foote, a Priest of the Diocese of Hamilton, appointed by Archbishop Collins to work with us (the Ordinariate-bound groups in Ontario) towards the implementation of *Anglicanorum coetibus*, was delayed for over a month due to some misunderstandings at higher levels. We finally got together last Sunday afternoon. Eleven people attended out of our list of eighteen. Msgr. Kroetsch accompanied Fr. Foote.

Fr. Foote's journey from the United Church of Canada to the Anglican Church of Canada to the Anglican Catholic Church (Original Province) and finally to Roman Catholicism is similar in some respects to many of our own travels. He well understands the hurdles and the pains of separation and the final arrival at Journey's End!

Fr. Foote's emphasis, throughout the meeting, was always that there is no compulsion to join the Ordinariate: it must be a personal decision to do so. His job, as priest-mentor, is to present the facts and to answer questions. Fr. Foote answered several questions which had been sent to him prior to the meeting.

One of the fears expressed at the meeting was that those making the move to accept the Pope's offer may end up being absorbed into the Roman Church. (It is important to remember that the offer was made in response to petitions by many groups of Anglicans to the Holy Father.) Such an end is not possible since the movement is towards being "united but not absorbed." The Ordinariate will have its own Liturgy which is still under construction, but will be not unlike the 'Anglican Use' Liturgy.

For those who have already decided to move forward, the first step is to obtain a copy of their Baptismal Certificate and to give them to me. The plan is to commence catechesis (using the *Evangelium* course) in September and to have the course completed by Advent (*Evangelium* is also the course being used in the English/Welsh Ordinariate). Details are being worked out as we progress.

We look forward to starting the catechism course, and thank Fr. Foote for visiting with us. (Fr. Foote lives in Cambridge and we therefore look forward to many more meetings with him.)

By The Reverend Mervyn Edward Bowles

## ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS

---

### **A Different Gospel** (Galatians 1,6)

Last month I wrote about Protestant and RC missionaries who suffered much in taking the gospel of Jesus to what is now Zimbabwe and who, though potential rivals, became firm friends in the process. They were not the first Christian missionaries in that part of the world. In 1561 Fr Gonzalo da Silveira, a Portuguese nobleman and Jesuit Father, entered

from Mozambique, already a Portuguese colony. Initially he had success among the Shona people, even baptizing their king. But they later turned against him and strangled him to death. In Harare, capital of modern Zim, Jesuits now run an education and conference centre called Silveira House.

Cecil John Rhodes also had a gospel, which he served with self sacrificing devotion. The trouble was that it was a different gospel. In pre Christian times Alexander the Great thought the whole world would be a better, happier, safer place if it were Hellenized, if all spoke Greek, studied philosophy, were immersed in Greek culture. He conquered the Middle East and Egypt and even went down into India. (In later years the prevalence of Greek did facilitate the writing and reading of the New Testament, and the spread of the gospel.)

Similarly, Mr Rhodes thought the world would be a better, happier place if it were Anglicized. He therefore sought to spread the British Empire. One way of achieving his goal was to build a railway up the length of Africa, from the Cape to Cairo . (A brand of cigarettes was later to be called C to C, two shillings and sixpence a box of 50.) Other ways of achieving his goal were war, the Boer War against the two Afrikaner republics, and colonization, of Southern and Northern Rhodesia. Such enterprises needed money. Not really a problem as he controlled the diamond and gold mines of South Africa. But should Rhodesia, now Zim, produce more gold, so much the better. And the lure of gold would entice civilizers to his new colony.

At dawn on May the 6<sup>th</sup>, 1890, a column of 100 covered ox wagons set out from Mr Rhodes' diamond town of Kimberley. They were to trek north. Young Mr Frank Johnson was in charge, son of a Norfolk priest. Mr Frederick Selous, a famous elephant hunter (we'd now say notorious) was guide. Colonel Pennefather was military commander, a man with experience in other African wars, assisted by Captain Sir John Willoughby who was taking time off from the Royal Horseguards at Buckingham Palace. Once the column had arrived Mr Archibald Colquhoun was to become civil administrator of the new colony. He had had experience in Burma. He came prepared: 60 cases of whisky, 30 cases of champagne quantities of caviare and pate de foie gras, quantities of cigars of ordinary quality and two thousand more of best Havana. There were also cattle to slaughter for food. Inevitably, there was friction among these leaders. But what of the ordinary men?

Opinions differed then and do so still. Lord Blake, a modern Brit historian, has written: "For the most part neither heroes nor villains". Mr Labouchere, a contemporaneous MP, denounced them as "border ruffians of Hebraic extraction". Mr Marshall Hole, a settler who arrived not long afterwards and who wrote his memoirs, said: "No finer corps d'elite than the BSA Company Police and the Mashonaland pioneers has ever existed". Until the country started

calling itself Rhodesia, and later Zimbabwe, it was known as British South Africa. The mounted soldiers who accompanied the column morphed into policemen, the BSAP, with blue and gold dress uniforms, not unlike the Mounties. The settlers were Afrikaans, English, French, German, aristocrats, doctors, clerks, lawyers, artisans, ne'er do wells.

With the column were three Anglican priests. One stopped off at a small settlement en route where he died of dysentery. The senior was Canon Francis Balfour, a shy man who didn't really approve of settlers any more than his bishop did, Wyndham Knight-Bruce, but the latter hoped the canon might do some missionary work among the Shona. About the trek the canon wrote in his diary, "We had charming church among the rocks". Francis Balfour later became a much loved missionary bishop in Lesotho. In a window of Francis Assisi in Bloemfontein cathedral the saint has been given the bishop's face. There were also two Jesuits with the column, Fathers Hartman and Prestage. In modern Harare a Jesuit run school is called Hartman House.

The column bypassed King Lobengula and his warriors in Matabeleland, heading further north to where the Shona lived. At night the wagons were formed into a laager or square in case of attack, but battery operated searchlights kept the Matabele regiments at a safe distance.

On September 12<sup>th</sup> 1890 the column reached what is now Harare. Next morning early Canon Balfour celebrated communion in his tent. Then at 10 am the Union Jack was raised on a site which now faces both parliament and the Anglican cathedral. The men paraded and sang God Save the Queen. A 21 gun salute of 17 pounder artillery pieces was fired. Canon Balfour prayed, "Prevent us O Lord in all our doings . . ." Afterwards officers drank Queen Victoria's health in champers. Colonel Pennefather wrote in his diary, "Another jewel in the British crown". Messrs Colquhoun and Selous missed the Flag Raising. They had sneaked off eastwards to Manicaland for a recce. Might they perhaps later start a war to capture Mozambique for Her Majesty?

There proved to be little gold. Settlers took to farming. Canon Balfour built a church of mud, manure and thatch. The altar cross in it was made from cigar boxes. It is (was?) preserved in one of the chapels of today's large granite cathedral. A year later a party of Dominican nuns arrived to start a hospital. When the reverend mother/matron eventually died, admiring Anglicans put up a brass tablet in her memory in their own cathedral.

I repeat that from the earliest times Anglicans and

Protestants suffered from no Romanophobia. For example, ninety years later two missionaries of the Dutch Reformed Church, Afrikaners from South Africa, were murdered by terrorists/freedom fighters. The minister and his wife had been to a remote tribal area to celebrate nagmaal or communion with Shona people. Their funeral in the nearest town took place from the largest church building available, which happened to be RC. In South Africa it would have been unthinkable for DRC members to enter a church belonging to the "Roman threat". In Zim nobody batted an eyelid. And when it came to drought relief, agriculture, water supply, education, medicine, civil war, difficult governments, the churches all worked together. If the RC's tended to take the lead, not least in civil rights, as with Archbishop Pius Ncube, because they had more personnel and more money, they had our

admiration. It was natural in my former diocese for Anglican and RC clergy or nuns to have joint study days, joint quiet days. Of course there were differences of jargon. For example, the RC's called them "days of recollection", but such verbal differences created no barriers. When Pope John Paul II went to visit Archbishop Robert Runcie in Canterbury cathedral, we had a joint and public service of intercession to pray for God's blessing on that visit. (And incidentally, when I was leaving Canada some RC's contributed towards my retirement purse.)

God bless Africa, guide her rulers, guard her children, give her peace, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

**+Robert Mercer CR**

## WHY I BECAME CATHOLIC

---

### *Accepting Pope Benedict's Generous Offer*

I had always believed that is what I was - a Catholic, albeit an Anglican one. We said the creeds and expressed our belief in the "one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church." We were taught that is just what the Church of England was; part of that Catholic Church, separated from a great part of Christendom at the Reformation, but with good reason. We had avoided the excesses and errors of other churches; we were a pure church, one which had "washed its face."

This was just about tenable all the time the Church of England held to Catholic faith and practice. Of course, there were always others in the same Church who disagreed with us, but we had truth on our side. After all, did not every priest at his induction assent to the belief that the Church of England is part of the "one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church"? And had not an archbishop of Canterbury (Geoffrey Fisher) declared that "the Church of England has no doctrine of its own, only that of the universal Church?" And whatever others might personally believe, we knew that their orders were, like ours, received in due succession from the apostles (no matter how Rome might say otherwise).

From the 19<sup>th</sup> century on, though, we had thought of ourselves as part of a larger family, the "Anglican Communion," largely the fruit of British colonial success. There were millions outside England who were as much Anglicans as we were. Then, especially in North America, some of these fellow Anglicans began to break ranks, particularly over ordination. The first ordinations of women were

illegal; but the American church soon legitimized them, and our church followed suit.

The Church of England claimed to be synodically governed but episcopally led. In the early 1980s, it was a synod that first declared there were "no fundamental objections to the ordination of women." This has often been misquoted as saying there were no theological objections; but, in fact, theology was not discussed. It was all about "justice" and whether women were capable of "doing the job" of a priest. So began the process, first of ordaining women to the diaconate and then, in 1994, to ordaining them as priests.

This step was hedged about. Those opposed to women's ordination were said to have an opinion equally permissible as the opposite. There would be no discrimination against priests who would not, or could not, accept women's ordination. Men might still be ordained holding such views. To ensure this would continue, bishops were appointed who were themselves opposed to women's ordination, and they would care for those parishes and individuals who remained opposed. Some were already in office (mostly as suffragan bishops); eventually another three were consecrated for this task - the provincial episcopal visitors or "flying bishops."

There was a very strange theology that accompanied this, one of "impaired communion." It was a ramshackle solution, but so long as women's ordination was seen as experimental, and the Church of England was in a period of "reception,"

then it was possible to survive as a Catholic Anglican. Both Archbishop George Carey and his successor Archbishop Rowan Williams have said that the experiment was reversible. Few of us believed such a reverse would ever happen. And once women were ordained as bishops, it would become practically impossible.

Throughout this time, I was considering my position as an Anglican. Either our church was Catholic or it was not. If it could treat holy orders as a matter of mere opinion, then all pretense of Catholicity was undermined. Yet how could I abandon those faithful laity and priests who still clung to the hope that the Church of England might yet be as it claimed, "the Catholic Church of this land"? The problem for those bishops still in office (I had retired in 2001) was even more acute.

Then came *Anglicanorum coetibus*, the Holy Father's response to Anglicans who sought his help. It seemed, and it still seems, a most generous offer. We might be ordained to the Catholic priesthood while remaining married. We would have our own ordinary, who would be someone who understood us completely. And we were challenged to bring with us the best of our traditions, our Anglican patrimony.

For me, the whole question has been one of authority. By what authority could the Church of England change holy orders? How could it authorize the ordination of men and women remarried after divorce, when our Ordinal had said a bishop or priest must see that his family was a model of Christian living?

If it could determine these matters without reference to Scripture, tradition or the wider Church, where would it stop?

So, already in parts of the "communion" there are bishops living with their same-sex partners, and in other parts "lay presidency" at the Eucharist is becoming the norm.

I still weep for the Church of England and what it might have been. But still I pray that the ordinariate may grow and give hope to faithful Anglicans that the door remains open for them to join us, in communion with the one Church to which we have aspired so long.

By **Father Edwin Barnes** - April 29, 2011

## FROM HERE AND THERE

---

### 1) We are Ordinariate bound!

*By a vestryman of St. Luke's, Bladensburg, Maryland, in the June 2011 issue of The Epistle, their monthly parish newsletter.*

We have begun our Exodus from the Episcopal Church. Now where do we go from here? Should we go to the Anglican Church of North America (ACNA)? ACNA was set up as a refuge for Anglicans who could not abide the theological inconsistencies of the Episcopal Church. But some of those inconsistencies are incorporated in the doctrine and discipline of ACNA. Remember also: doctrine and discipline go hand in hand. You can't have one without the other!

Then what about the continuing churches? The question then is, which one? There is a multiplicity of ecclesial bodies continually subdividing because of disagreements over doctrine and polity. Where then should one go to continue to be an Anglican?

The answer may be nowhere or everywhere, depending on one's viewpoint and tolerance. Some of us may be drawn to the evangelicals with their emphasis on Holy Scripture and a more protestant

view of the church. Others may be drawn to the charismatics with their emphasis on the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Still others may be of the Anglo-Catholic mind and hold to a more sacramental understanding of the church. And then some of us might not really care. Where then shall we go? Or maybe the question should be not about going, but about returning.

There was a church in England long before the Reformation, and it subsisted within the Catholic Church. It even had its own use of the Roman rite. During the period of the Reformation some of the churches, including the Church of England, separated themselves from the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church, and in particular from papal authority. This act of separation was schismatic. Since those churches became schismatic by separating from the Catholic Church, then surely a return to the Catholic faith is a reversal of that schism. This is what is available to us now.

It is significant that the Pope and the Curia have established ordinariates for Anglican-use parishes. It is there that our Anglican heritage and identity will be preserved, while remaining as members of the Roman Catholic Church. For, we will no longer be,

as I have known, Anglicans in the Catholic tradition, but Catholics in the Anglican tradition. Perhaps this is the final step of the Oxford Movement!

**Gary Schenk**

## 2) Is the Age of Chivalry dead or has it just changed?

Hold a door open for a woman today and you are quite likely to get a snarl in return. Give up your seat to a female on the tube and you are immediately a suspect rapist. Men are having a hard time of being chivalrous in today's world!

Most sources list the origins of chivalry back to the time of the Crusades and the word itself comes from the French *chevalière* - normally taken to be a horseman of noble birth. A knight, in other words. And now all the images of maidens in distress being rescued by burly young men on horseback spring to mind.

I am sure that these roots are accurate, except for one thing. From where did the need for chivalry arise? Why should men have adopted a lifestyle aimed at being virtuous and protective of women (amongst other things)?

I have always been led to believe that it stems from love and respect for the Mother of God. Our Lady personifies womanhood. She, alone is unique in the world as being chosen to be both the Immaculate Conception and the Mother of Our Lord and so, all mankind. All women, therefore, are blessed by the grace of Mary and that is why we honour them with courtesy, not because of this 'fairest sex' nonsense.

Medieval knights (and Crusaders) adopted this approach of courtesy and protection to all women out of love and respect for the Blessed Mother. Of course, the 'woman' element must not get out of proportion; in many respects those choosing the chivalry road also adopted a religious rule, much like a tertiary order member might today.

So, typically, a Code of Chivalry emerged along the following lines:

To fear God and maintain His Church  
To serve the liege lord in valour and faith  
To protect the weak and defenceless  
To give succour to widows and orphans  
To refrain from the wanton giving of offence  
To live by honour and for glory  
To despise pecuniary reward  
To fight for the welfare of all  
To obey those placed in authority

To guard the honour of fellow knights  
To eschew unfairness, meanness and deceit  
To keep faith  
At all times to speak the truth  
To persevere to the end in any enterprise begun  
To respect the honour of women  
Never to refuse a challenge from an equal  
Never to turn the back upon the foe

Not a bad set of ideals to live and die by.

Now I have two instances to relate; the first, came as a result of most of my career being spent in the education sector. Holding a door open for a woman lecturer one day she snapped at me: "Are you doing this just because I'm a woman?" To which I replied: "Not at all, I'd do the same thing if you were a man". And I meant every word of that statement. That is why we should not get too hung up on chivalry just being about a regard for women; it is a set of Christian principles which we should apply ourselves to.

My second incident occurred just a few weeks ago when I was in London to attend the inaugural meeting of the *Guild of Blessed Titus Brandsma*.

I was standing on a crowded tube train when I felt a tap on my shoulder. Turning around I found myself face to face with a vision of loveliness; a young woman with a radiant smile and a truly beautiful countenance.

My joy was short-lived as she said to me: "Would you like my seat?". Totally crushed, my first reaction was to disdainfully reject her kind offer. I then realised that one must accept chivalry when it is offered; to have spurned the offer would have been just too rude. So, swallowing my pride I accepted gracefully. And that proved to me that chivalry is not the province of the male sex alone; Christian love is a two-way street!

**Richard Collins** on his blog - *Linen on the Hedgerow* - June 19, 2011

## 3) Liberals!

To my mind, **the most dangerous group in the Church is the "liberals"** and by that I mean, people who do not really believe in the supernatural, who downgrade the importance of sin, who try to explain away the miraculous and are generally given to rationalism. Those who think that they are a magisterium unto themselves, who decry infallibility and then make statements as though THEY are infallible. They sneer at those they consider uneducated or outdated. You will find them in

different places. Their humour is cruel and hollow and, in my opinion, they are the enemy within. I cannot laugh too much about them - they are not a joke but a frightening reality. In so far as they have and continue to affect the Church - have entered bishops' palaces, parishes, religious orders and even the Vatican they are, in my opinion, precisely the wolves who are often in sheep's (or shepherd's) clothing.

**Fr John Abberton**

#### **4) Papal Blessing**

This story has been attributed to several Popes but I believe that it was Pope Pius XII who was the Pontiff concerned. However, since starting this post I see that the story has several quite distinct versions. Here's my one.

A very anti Papal, anti Catholic journalist attended a Papal Audience and very provocatively asked the Holy Father for his blessing.

Without changing pace Pope Pius blessed him using the words:

"Ab illo benedicaris + in cuius honore cremaberis. Amen."

Which, is the blessing reserved for incense and in English it reads . . .

"Be ye blessed by Him + in whose honour thou art to burn. Amen".

**Richard Collins**

#### **5) Difference**

Just about the oldest joke in the book is about the little Catholic boy and the little Protestant girl who took their clothes off and went for a swim. Both of them went to their mothers afterwards and said, worried, 'Mummy, I didn't know there was such a difference between Catholics and Protestants!'

## **A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL'S MANIFESTO**

To the students and faculty of our high school:

I am your new principal, and honored to be so. There is no greater calling than to teach young people.

I would like to apprise you of some important changes coming to our school. I am making these changes because I am convinced that most of the ideas that have dominated public education in America have worked against you, against your teachers and against our country.

First, this school will no longer honor race or ethnicity. I could not care less if your racial makeup is black, brown, red, yellow or white. I could not care less if your origins are African, Latin American, Asian or European, or if your ancestors arrived here on the Mayflower or on slave ships.

The only identity I care about, the only one this school will recognize, is your individual identity - your character, your scholarship, your humanity. And the only national identity this school will care about is American. This is an American public school, and American public schools were created to make better Americans.

If you wish to affirm an ethnic, racial or religious identity through school, you will have to go

elsewhere. We will end all ethnicity-, race- and non-American nationality-based celebrations. They undermine the motto of America, one of its three central values - *e pluribus unum*, "from many, one." And this school will be guided by America's values.

This includes all after-school clubs. I will not authorize clubs that divide students based on any identities. This includes race, language, religion, sexual orientation or whatever else may become in vogue in a society divided by political correctness.

Your clubs will be based on interests and passions, not blood, ethnic, racial or other physically defined ties. Those clubs just cultivate narcissism - an unhealthy preoccupation with the self - while the purpose of education is to get you to think beyond yourself. So we will have clubs that transport you to the wonders and glories of art, music, astronomy, languages you do not already speak, carpentry and more. If the only extracurricular activities you can imagine being interested in are those based on ethnic, racial or sexual identity, that means that little outside of yourself really interests you.

Second, I am uninterested in whether English is your native language. My only interest in terms of language is that you leave this school speaking

and writing English as fluently as possible. The English language has united America's citizens for over 200 years, and it will unite us at this school. It is one of the indispensable reasons this country of immigrants has always come to be one country. And if you leave this school without excellent English language skills, I would be remiss in my duty to ensure that you will be prepared to successfully compete in the American job market. We will learn other languages here - it is deplorable that most Americans only speak English - but if you want classes taught in your native language rather than in English, this is not your school.

Third, because I regard learning as a sacred endeavor, everything in this school will reflect learning's elevated status. This means, among other things, that you and your teachers will dress accordingly. Many people in our society dress more formally for Hollywood events than for church or school. These people have their priorities backward. Therefore, there will be a formal dress code at this school.

Fourth, no obscene language will be tolerated anywhere on this school's property - whether in class, in the hallways or at athletic events. If you can't speak without using the f-word, you can't speak. By obscene language I mean the words banned by the Federal Communications Commission, plus epithets such as "Nigger," even when used by one black student to address another black, or "bitch," even when addressed by a girl to a girlfriend. It is my intent that by the time you leave this school, you will be among the few your age to instinctively distinguish between

the elevated and the degraded, the holy and the obscene.

Fifth, we will end all self-esteem programs. In this school, self-esteem will be attained in only one way - the way people attained it until decided otherwise a generation ago - by earning it. One immediate consequence is that there will be one valedictorian, not eight.

Sixth, and last, I am reorienting the school toward academics and away from politics and propaganda. No more time will be devoted to scaring you about smoking and caffeine, or terrifying you about sexual harassment or global warming. No more semesters will be devoted to condom wearing and teaching you to regard sexual relations as only or primarily a health issue. There will be no more attempts to convince you that you are a victim because you are not white, or not male, or not heterosexual or not Christian. We will have failed if any one of you graduates this school and does not consider him or herself inordinately lucky - to be alive and to be an American.

Now, please stand and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our country. As many of you do not know the words, your teachers will hand them out to you.

It's nice to dream!

This is what **Denis Prager**, an American radio show host, would like to say to his students if he were a principal!

## A REFUTATION OF MORAL RELATIVISM

Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day [founder and member, respectively, of the *Catholic Worker Movement*] defined a good society as one that makes it easy for you to be good. Correlatively, a free society is one that makes it easy to be free. To be free, and to live freely, is to live spiritually, because only spirit is free - matter is not. To live spiritually is to live morally. The two essential properties of spirit that distinguish it from matter are intellect and will - the capacity for knowledge and moral choice. The ideals of truth and goodness. The most radical threat to living morally today is the loss of moral principles.

Moral practice has always been difficult for fallen humanity, but at least there was always the

lighthouse of moral principles, no matter how stormy the sea of moral practice got. But today, with the majority of our mind-molders, in formal education, or informal education - that is, media - the light is gone. Morality is a fog of feelings. That is why to them, as Chesterton said, "Morality is always dreadfully complicated to a man who has lost all his principles." Principles mean moral absolutes. Unchanging rocks beneath the changing waves of feelings and practices. Moral relativism is a philosophy that denies moral absolutes. That thought to me is the prime suspect - public enemy number one. The philosophy that has extinguished the light in the minds of our teachers, and then their students, and eventually, if not reversed, will extinguish our whole civilization. Therefore, I want not just to present a

strong case against moral relativism, but to refute it, to unmask it, to strip it naked, to humiliate it, to shame it, to give it the wallop it deserves, as they say in Texas, America's good neighbor to the south.

How important is this issue? After all, it's just philosophy, and philosophy is just ideas. But ideas have consequences. Sometimes these consequences are as momentous as a holocaust, or a Hiroshima. Sometimes even more momentous. Philosophy is just thought, but sow a thought, reap an act; sow an act, reap a habit; sow a habit, reap a character; sow a character, reap a destiny. This is just as true for societies as it is for individuals.

How important is the issue? The issue of moral relativism is merely the single most important issue of our age, for no society in all of human history has ever survived without rejecting the philosophy that I am about to refute. There has never been a society of relativists. Therefore, our society will do one of three things: either disprove one of the most universally established laws of all history; or repent of its relativism and survive; or persist in its relativism and perish.

How important is the issue? C.S. Lewis says, in *The Poison of Subjectivism*, that relativism "will certainly end our species and damn our souls." Please remember that Oxonians are not given to exaggeration. Why does he say "damn our souls?" Because Lewis is a Christian, and he does not disagree with the fundamental teaching of his master, Christ, and all the prophets in the Jewish tradition, that salvation presupposes repentance, and repentance presupposes an objectively real moral law. Moral relativism eliminates that law, thus trivializes repentance, thus imperils salvation.

Why does he say, "end our species," and not just modern Western civilization? Because the entire human species is becoming increasingly Westernized and relativized. It is ironic that America, the primary source of relativism in the world today, is also the world's most religious nation.

This is ironic because religion is to relativism what Dr. Van Helsing is to Count Dracula. Within America, the strongest opposition to relativism comes from the churches. Yet a still further irony, according to the most recent polls, Catholics are as relativistic, both in behavior and in belief, as non-Catholics. Sixty-two percent of Evangelicals say they disbelieve in any absolute or unchanging truths, and American Jews are significantly more relativistic and more secular than Gentiles. Only Orthodox Jews, the Eastern Orthodox, and Fundamentalists seem to be resisting the culture, but not by converting it, but by withdrawing from it. And that includes most Muslims, except for the tiny minority who terrorize it. When Pat Buchanan told us in 1992 that we were in a culture war, all the media laughed, sneered, and barked at him. Today, everyone knows he was right, and the culture war is most essentially about this issue.

We must define our terms when we begin. Moral relativism usually includes three claims: that morality is first of all changeable; secondly, subjective; and third, individual. That it is relative first to changing times; you can't turn back the clock. Secondly, to what we subjectively think or feel; there is nothing good or bad, but thinking makes it so. And thirdly, to individuals; different strokes for different folks. Moral absolutism claims that there are moral principles that are unchangeable, objective, and universal.

We should examine the arguments for moral relativism first, and refute them, to clear the way for the arguments against it. So first, I will refute each of the common arguments for relativism, and then relativism itself.

The **Introduction** from *A Refutation of Moral Relativism* by **Peter Kreeft, Ph.D.** - Professor of Philosophy at Boston College and at the King's College (Empire State Building), in New York City (For the rest of this, visit [http://www.peterkreeft.com/audio/05\\_relativism/relativism\\_transcription.htm](http://www.peterkreeft.com/audio/05_relativism/relativism_transcription.htm))

## MARIAN DEVOTION - 5

---

There are five entries in our Prayer Book Kalendar which have reference to the Blessed Virgin Mary. One of these is the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary to Elizabeth on July 2 but there are no lections specified; so we have to look elsewhere. We can use those for the Annunciation or those found on Page 309-310 which are very appropriate since the Holy Gospel is that of the very incident that we are

discussing from Luke, chapter I.

This chapter is very well known to most Anglican Catholics since it is the source of two of the canticles sung or recited every day, the Benedictus at Morning Prayer and the canticle known as the Magnificat which is sung or recited every evening at Evening Prayer, and in which the Blessed Virgin voices her

wonder and happiness that her God has chosen her to be the Theotokos. She recognises that this is a great honour for a simple human girl that "All generations shall call me Blessed." And of course the Church has done so for two thousand years acknowledging that the Virgin Mary is blessed above all other human beings.

By The Reverend Mervyn Edward Bowles

## TIME TO PROCLAIM THE PRIMACY OF JESUS CHRIST IN CREATION 5 of 7

---

*"The Christian picture of the world is this, that the world in its details is the product of a long process of evolution but that at the most profound level it comes from the Logos. Thus it carries rationality within itself." (Pope Benedict XVI, as Cardinal Ratzinger, God and the World: A Conversation with Peter Seewald. Ignatius 2002 p. 139)*

### The Vision of St Paul

We have already seen how St. Paul shows us the deeply personal nature of our communion with the divine Person of Jesus our Saviour. In his letter to the Ephesians he states that God "chose us in [Christ] *before the foundation of the world.*" (Eph 1:4) Thus not only we ourselves but Christ also is part of God's plan from before creation, and so this is clearly before sin. The universe is created for us and even more for Christ. St. Paul continues to talk about God's eternal purpose, "which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth." (Eph 1:9-10) So Christ is the beginning and the end - the Alpha and the Omega - of the whole of creation.

Commenting on this passage Pope John Paul II says:

"In God's eternal design, the Church, as the unity of humanity in Christ the Head, becomes part of a plan which includes all creation. It is a 'cosmic' plan, that of uniting everything in Christ the Head. The firstborn of all creation becomes the principle of 'recapitulation' for this creation, so

that God can be 'all in all' (1 Cor 15:28). Therefore, Christ is the *Keystone of the Universe*. As the living body of those who belong to him by their response to the vocation of being children of God, the Church is associated with him, as participant and minister, at the centre of the plan of universal redemption."<sup>6</sup>

In his letter to the Colossians St. Paul again gives us this same vision of Christ, the "first born of creation" (Col 1:15), as pre-destined before creation: "all things were created through him *and for him.*" (v. 16) There are echoes here of Christ as the Heir to creation. Once again, he is clearly both the beginning and the end of creation: its origin and purpose. Again in his second letter to Timothy, he states: "God saved us and called us to be holy - not because of anything we ourselves have done but for his own purpose and by his own grace. This grace has already been granted to us, *in Christ Jesus, before the beginning of time.*" (2 Tim 1:9)

<sup>6</sup> General Audience, 31 July 1991.

Editorial **FAITH Magazine** November-December 2009 - [www.faith.org.uk](http://www.faith.org.uk)

**Gary S. Freeman**  
102 Frederick Banting Place  
Waterloo, Ontario N2T 1C4  
519-886-3635 (Home)  
519-747-5323 (Fax)  
[gfreeman@pwi-insurance.ca](mailto:gfreeman@pwi-insurance.ca)  
800-265-2178 or 519-747-3324 (Office)