

The Sodality of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

A Catholic Community of the Anglican Use, Diocese of Hamilton

www.stedmund.ca



July 15, 2012 - **St Bonaventure, Bishop and Doctor of the Church**

AUGUST SCHEDULE

August 5	Sunday	The Ninth Sunday after Trinity
August 12	Sunday	The Tenth Sunday after Trinity
August 19	Sunday	The Eleventh Sunday after Trinity
August 26	Sunday	The Twelfth Sunday after Trinity

SERVICE TIMES AND LOCATION

- (1) On Sundays, an **Anglican Use Mass** is celebrated at 1:00 p.m.
- (2) All Services are held at our own altar in St. Patrick's Church, 53 Wellington Street, Cambridge, Ontario

NOTES AND COMMENTS

- 1) **THE MASS AS SACRIFICE** - 2 of 7 - this page.
- 2) **ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS - GOD'S HIGHWAYMEN: THE RAILWAY MISSION** - 2 of 2 - page 3.
- 3) **DARK, DARKER, DARKEST** - about catechesis and profession of faith - page 4.
- 4) **THE CULTURE WARS CONTINUE** - page 5.
- 5) **NEWMAN AND LITTLEMORE** - 1 of 2 - page 6.
- 6) **FROM HERE AND THERE** - page 7.

THE MASS AS SACRIFICE - 2 OF 7

An Ambiguous Atonement?

So what's the problem with sacrifice? As we have suggested, some people had an ideological agenda. If the Mass is a *sacrifice*, it follows that you need a *priest* to offer it and an *altar* on which it can be offered. That puts paid to the Protestant preference for *ministers* and *tables*. But there's also a more understandable objection to viewing the Mass as a sacrifice. It has to do with mistaken theories of the Atonement. "Atonement", or "expiation", is about making reparation for a wrong or injury committed, specifically about reconciling sinful humanity to God. Jesus *did* effect our redemption by means of His atoning sacrifice on the Cross.

The problem comes with seeing Christ's atoning sacrifice, as some Evangelical Protestants do, in terms of punishment. Basically, we'd made God mad by our sins, offending His infinite majesty and breaking our communion with Him. We couldn't put this right ourselves. What's to be done? Jesus takes the punishment for us. An "'angry Father' [contemplates] the disobedience of man in human sin, decrees to condemn [us] to eternal death Against which sentence of divine justice the Son interposes Himself . . . so that in His total sacrifice 'the Father is appeased'."

We need to be careful. We don't drop the idea of sacrifice because our world wants God to conform to its expectations. The Pope writes: "The mystery of the atonement is not to be sacrificed on the altar of overweening rationalism." Atonement takes seriously the disaster of sin, the fundamental rupture it causes between us and God. It recognises our inability to repair this by ourselves. It acknowledges the absolute necessity of Christ. As St Paul says: "Since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, they are justified by His grace as gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, Whom God put forward as an *expiation by His Blood*." But . . .

But to buy into a view of atoning sacrifice as punishment is hugely problematic. First, the solution

is purely external. If Jesus just stands in to take the rap for us, in the long term what good has been achieved? How has human nature actually been changed for the better? God's plan is far more wonderful than that. And what sort of God would do that? It makes God the Father vindictive and unjust. Would He really send His only Son into the world simply to vent on Him all His accumulated wrath? That's not the God of Jesus Christ. "God is *love*." "For God so loved the world that He gave His only Son." These "punitive" theories are based on a wrong idea of God, and a wrong idea of sacrifice.

Sacrifice

It is time to pin down what we mean by "sacrifice". Young adults probably hear it most often from their parents. "Think of all the *sacrifices* your mother and I made to make sure you received a decent education - and what a disappointment you've been to us." That's how the world understands "sacrifice" - giving up something of value for a greater good.

But it is only a secondary definition. The primary meaning is always connected to religion. Try doing a Google Image search for "sacrifice." The results are fascinating - and frightening. We're back in pagan times, the days of Aztecs and ancient mythology. There's nothing about Christ. All the images are of human sacrifice.

But that's not the essence of "sacrifice". The literal meaning is "to do a sacred deed". It is to make someone or something holy; it is a consecration. It is worth quoting St Augustine's classic definition: "True sacrifice is every work done to establish us in a holy fellowship with God, every work tending to the attainment of that good in which alone we can be truly blessed." For something to be a sacrifice it has to be performed for the sake of God.

Sacrifice involves offering something to God in the attempt to achieve holiness, communion with Him. Sacrifice doesn't necessarily involve the killing of a victim - the technical term for that is "immolation".

That's important.

Without the Fall of man, without the original sin of Adam and Eve, Christ's sacrifice, His sacred deed, would have been to draw together the whole of humanity into a relationship of full communion with God in one act of joyful recognition and adoration. Without sin, Christ would have been "the Sacrifice of Praise": the Eucharist, thanksgiving in its fullest sense. But, of course, He did enter a sinful world.

Therefore, Christ's sacrifice is also one of immolation, of pain, suffering and death. Christ becomes a victim: "this pure victim, this holy victim, this spotless victim" as the revised translation has it.

By **Father Mark Vickers** in the May and June 2012 issue of *faith* magazine (I have omitted the quote 'references' which are, of course, in the original. If you are not able to access the original, I will forward a copy, upon request.)

ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS

GOD'S HIGHWAYMEN: THE RAILWAY MISSION - 2 of 2

Job 41, 19-20. "Sparks of fire leap forth. Out of his nostrils goeth smoke."

Now there are a million and one things Bulawayo can not offer the tourist. You'd be wiser sticking to the Riviera, the Great Barrier Reef or Sugar Loaf Hill in Rio. But Bulawayo still has steam trains, though only just. From infancy upwards the background to my life has been whistles and hoots, the clang of trucks, the chuff of steam, the smell of smoke, all in the clearest and brightest air, through which sound travels far. You can still stand on a bridge at the station (which prides itself on one of the longest platforms in the world) and breathe in the perfumes of the garrett engine making steam and smoke right beneath you. I was in my teens when I got to know some of the missionaries whose house was on the wrong side of the railway tracks. They were noted for their disciplined lives, pastoral zeal and prayerfulness. At least one of them, Father Andrew Hobson, was regarded as something of a saint, usually with shouting children following behind his bicycle a la Pied Piper, "Father Hobby, Father Hobby". The missionaries failed to convert me to playing bridge but they did convert me to a dash of gin in my soup.

Then in 1977 when I became the fourth bishop of Matabeleland I became ipso facto President of the Railway Mission. But the glory days were over, and the work was winding down. It finally ended in 1980. A memorial tablet (engraved with a steam engine) in the cloisters of Bulawayo cathedral reads, "The diocese of Matabeleland gives thanks for the work of the Railway Mission 1885-1980". However, I did enjoy a journey or three with the last Head and his wife, George and Gertrude Deacon, now retired in Herefordshire, from whom I occasionally hear. On such journeys I became covered in satisfactory layers of soot: the caboose was immediately behind the engine. Hwange was a major railway centre.

Once when a steam engine was derailed and "gushing gold vermillion", as it lay on its side, spilling embers, I rushed up to admire the awesome sight. "What the blankety blank are you doing?", an angry shunter shouted at me, "Trespassers forbidden". "I'm the railway chaplain's assistant". "Sorry, father, I didn't know."

Many a member of the C of E would enjoy a good read about the Mission. In 1930 Douglas Ellison, uncle of the future Bishop of London, published *God's Highwaymen*. In 1985 Tony Grain, a superb raconteur if ever there was, published *Mission Unaccomplished*. Both these books are out of print and hard to come by. The good news is that in 1995 John Roden, incumbent of Appleton Roebuck in the diocese of York, submitted a Ph.D. thesis to the University of York, *The Anglican Church Railway Mission in Southern Africa*. There is a copy in the library in Mirfield. What superb evocative photographs! I can smell the gum trees, the syringa trees. I can feel the heat of summer in Botswana, the cold of winter in the Orange Free State. I can hear giggles of children after baptism services. I can sense the dust through which the bride trails the train of her wedding dress. The C of E may devoutly hope that somehow Father Roden's (far from dry as dust) thesis converts into a book, and that the book finds a publisher.

But I'd not like to end this tribute to the Mission without quoting from one of the missionaries. As I can't find anything by Miss Maud Agg-Large 1929-1945 who, one hopes, wore cloche hats and satin shoes; and as I can't find Bishop Billy Gaul's first impression of the Victoria Falls, as seen by moonlight - which he compares with the vision in *Revelation* with its rainbows and its sound of many

waters; I shall quote from Miss Monica Hames 1935-1944 and 1949-1951:

"Left Bloemfontein in caboose Number 15065 at 4:11 a.m. after night spent parked in goods yard. Arrived DeBrug 6:00 a.m. There shunted up and down for quite a long time. Sallied forth to visit Mrs. Station Master. Found her to be an old friend of many years ago. Went to pumper's wife who could speak no English. Then on to the ganger's wife. Asked me to get her two and a half yards of net when in Johannesburg, so she could make a meat safe (this before fridges). In the first labourer's house a sick baby. Went back to caboose to fetch barley water and Oxo cubes for baby. Five more calls then back to caboose for my lunch at 2:00 p.m. Just boiling egg when cattle train bashed into caboose and shunted me up and down. Contented myself with bread and apples. Mr. & Mrs. Station Master came to tea at

3:00. At 5:30 Children's Hour. The next hour and a half were refreshments, children's games, Bible and prayers, all in Afrikaans. Mr. Station Master returns to complain about blacks. He's a great racist, but I make coffee for him. At 9:30 the train arrives and off we journey to Immigrant where we arrived at 11:00 p.m. and caboose is unhitched. Tumble into bed. I am dirty with grime. There's little water. How to wash tomorrow? Not much praying has been done today, but I've promised to send women some women's magazines, copies of my church newsletter and Sunday School lessons for their children. My mind goes back to last week, to Good Friday. Figure on the cross says to me, "I died for these people you try to love".

Msgr. Robert Mercer CR

DARK, DARKER, DARKEST

I was asked a couple of months ago, "why are those entering the Ordinariate required to go through an extensive catechesis and make a profession of faith, when most of those who are already Catholic do not believe these things?" Good question . . . if you are five years old. I do not say this as an insult. I use this harsh comment to shake us awake to see how extremely immature that type of thinking is. It is evil; it must be dealt with, and it must be dealt with immediately.

The rules for joining a family are necessarily more strict than the rules that would get someone thrown out of a family. In other words, the boundaries for entrance are strict in order to protect those inside, as well as to make the requirements clear at the very start. If someone who is already Catholic has rejected the teaching that they have been given, the punishment will be on their own heads. It does not mean that the rules should be thrown out the window. It does not mean that the Catholic Church allows people to believe anything that they want. "Cafeteria Catholics" are supposed to have been told what the actual teaching of the Church is, and if they choose to reject it, then they are supposed to be dealt with appropriately. Their existence does not mean, however, that the standards should be lowered (or we will only create even more Cafeteria Catholics).

We all need to begin with a firm acceptance of the faith. Even the infant being baptized has the parents confess in his behalf that he believes "all these things". We are supposed to start with things clear

and profess our submission to those truths that the Church gives us. If anyone (recent converts, or "cradle Catholics") turns his back on the faith, then he will be judged accordingly (I acknowledge the existence of those who have been taught wrong, but we are each responsible to learn more about the faith than what we have been told - this assumes reading outside of our own little circle).

Within the family, many things can be tolerated that would not be tolerated from those who are without. It is often said that we are more polite to strangers than to family - although this is sadly true at times, it is also a sign of what I am speaking about. This is because there are covenantal ties that bind people together, and those ties govern the relationship. For example: if a wife is a poor cook, it is not grounds for a marriage separation. If, on the other hand, a single woman is a poor cook, it may be grounds for a young man to ask whether he wants to marry her.

Dealing with Catholics who stray from the faith is not easy. Yet, it is not directly related to the issue of how we are supposed to protect the boundaries of entrance in the Church. I recall a conversation I once had with an Anglican clergyman about Confession. He gave me the typical line of "all can, some should, none must" (which is unabashed Protestant individualism and private interpretation run amok). When I reminded him that the Catholic Church had a stricter requirement, he responded "they obviously do not think much about that requirement since none of them actually obey it". I voiced disagreement with his summary attack on so

many Catholics, and he told me "I do not believe they would require us [those entering the Ordinariate] to do something they don't require others to do".

Finally we can boil this down to its true substance. At the heart of all these comments that I have been criticizing is the enlightenment attitude that "man is the measure of all things". With this perspective deeply ingrained, it is easy for anyone (Christians included) to say "I do not want to do this, and if I can find someone else who does not do it, then I can justify my rejection of it". During the medieval era, the faithful in the Church had a strong sense of submission to authority (yes, even to a fault at times). Only those with the ungodly thinking of the enlightenment could ever consider the medieval era to be a "dark ages". The so-called "dark ages" were not dark, but the enlightenment was; and today it is getting even darker! Things are indeed getting dark when Christians believe that the secular humanism of the enlightenment is more acceptable than the piety of medieval submission.

The very question ("why do I have to, if he doesn't?"), as I said before, reveals a radically immature frame of mind: "that's not fair!" The biblical frame of mind says, "if any one forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles". We should be asking, "what else can I do?" and not, "why do I have to do so much?" With or without the understanding I gave above of "boundaries" for entering the Church, one should see quickly how selfish the complaint is that I am speaking of. It starts with an attitude of superiority and rejects anything that leads to humility. This attitude reveals all too well that the speaker does not truly want to be an obedient Christian. He wants the Church on his own terms. Sadly enough, this enlightenment thinking is a plague that needs to be dealt with. If not counteracted, it will make our future darker than anyone has ever imagined the "dark ages" to be.

By **Fr. Chori Jonathin Seraiah** - June 13, 2012 - on his blogspot *The Maccabean*

THE CULTURAL WARS CONTINUE

We are in the midst of a cultural war, between modern secular proponents and Catholics who believe and accept the magisterial teachings of the church.

Many contemporary men and women have been formed through public schools and universities, through movies and television, through newspapers and magazines to accept as normal a whole set of conduct choices: abortion, mercy killing, *in vitro* fertilization, embryonic stem cell research, the homosexual life-style, same-sex marriage, use of contraceptives, premarital sex, etc.

Each one of these actions is held as a part of the modern, contemporary world view, as a development and improvement of social mores.

The Catholic Church, on the other hand, believes that each one of these forms of conduct is sinful, offensive to God, contrary to true development of the person and harmful both to the individual and to society.

The battle wages. The media generally support the secular views.

It was interesting to see how President Barack Obama's recent endorsement of same sex marriage was viewed by *The New York Times*, which immediately produced editorials and op-ed pieces

praising him for his stand.

Newsweek magazine carried a cover picture of the president with a rainbow halo over his head and the words: "The first gay president" (the title of an article by the Catholic writer Andrew Sullivan).

Praise came from *USA Today*. And so it was with innumerable other publications. A secular consensus was apparent. The voices of religious people - which were included in a few newspapers and magazines - were generally downplayed or ignored.

One of the great concerns for the church today is the number of Catholics who, for various reasons, accept the secular views in regard to at least some of the actions indicated. Numbers of Catholics resort to contraception and *in vitro* fertilization. Increasing numbers support gay marriage.

It seems Catholic Vice President Joe Biden precipitated President Obama's announcement about gay marriage by declaring that he (the vice president) had come to favor it.

On May 10, Catholic Nancy Pelosi, U.S. House minority leader, announced that her faith compelled her to favor same-sex marriage. "My religion compels me," she said, "to be against discrimination of any kind in our country, and I consider this (same

sex marriage) a form of discrimination." She welcomed the president's announcement.

The media carried reports of professors at Catholic universities who criticized the church for opposing gay marriage. They argued that supporting traditional marriage is only one opinion among several found in Catholic circles.

According to Kathleen Gilbert, Daniel Maguire (a former priest) at Marquette University in Milwaukee, even opined that the bishops might be considered "in moral schism since most in the church have moved on to a more humane view on the rights of those whom God has made gay." But the Catholic Church's views are clear, definite and wise.

They are based upon the sacred Scriptures and constant theological teaching down through the centuries. "He who hears you, hears Me" Our Lord said to his disciples and those words apply to the official teachers of the church. Change in manners or mores is not necessarily a step forward. What is the latest trend is not necessarily the wisest action.

Common sense itself is often a helpful judge as to the value of changes in conduct.

Recent scientific research has been cautioning people about the difficulties that occur with *in vitro* fertilization - the health problems of children born through the process, the immense challenge of what to do with the 400,000 frozen embryos (babies a few days old) in fertility clinics who will not be used by the parents/gamete providers.

In China abortion and one-child per family law has now resulted in a situation in which a million men cannot find brides, since so many girl babies have been aborted.

Acceptance of pre-marital sex - which Hollywood and TV programs have promoted for a long time in their productions - has brought about an epidemic of sexually transmitted diseases in our country.

And acceptance of same-sex marriage changes the very meaning of an institution upon which civilization has been built throughout the ages.

The cultural wars will continue. It would be a tragedy if Catholics in the United States sided with the wrong army.

By **Father John Leies** in *Today's Catholic*, the newspaper of the Archdiocese of San Antonio

NEWMAN AND LITTLEMORE - 1 OF 2

I don't know how many of you have ever made the pilgrimage to Littlemore.

No trip to Oxford should be complete without making your way along the ring road past the empty car factory, the mean streets, ugly houses and modern developments of Cowley before you turn down what is left of the main street of the hamlet of Littlemore. There, on a corner plot you see the crude buildings which had been a stable and grain store, that Newman had converted to house his little community of prayer. Newman went to Littlemore.

Littlemore was the humble daughter parish of the University Church of St Mary the Virgin - where Newman was Vicar. Blessed John Henry Newman had risen through his brilliance to the pinnacle of the Anglican establishment: Vicar of St Mary the Virgin, the University Church, a published author and poet, a scholar of national reputation, a fellow of Oriel College. Leader of the Oxford Movement, he had a national position of prominence, with wealthy and influential friends. He had everything the world could offer, but he went to Littlemore.

What was Littlemore? It was little. A collection of

outbuildings - a stable block in the bad part of town. A little collection of old farm buildings on the wrong side of the tracks. It was a lowly place - the sort of mean little parish where you sent an uneducated curate to labor for pitiful wages among the poor.

Littlemore was little, but it was also more. What do I mean? Do you see how symbolic this man's life was. He went down from the highest and most glorious position his society had to offer - down to the little place. A stable block sufficed, and it was because Littlemore was little - that it was more.

In going to Littlemore Newman was obedient to the pattern of the incarnation. He stooped down and became little, and so he became more.

At Littlemore Newman became a new man. He stepped away from the establishment, wealth and privilege of the Anglican Church and went to live in a humble, converted stable. Finally, after two years of a monastic existence, one dark night he received a humble itinerant Italian missionary - Blessed Dominic Barberi - a holy man who could hardly speak English, yet had the crazy idea that he would be able to convert all of England to the Catholic

faith. There, in a room that was once a stable the great Newman was received into the Catholic Church.

What a fool Blessed Barberi was to think that he could convert the English. What a fool Blessed Newman was. How blessed now both blessed are for both of them were fools for Christ, and what did their foolish act of obedience and faith and love teach us?

First of all, in choosing Littlemore Newman chose reality over illusion. After he became a Catholic he wrote of a new sense of concreteness and solidity to his faith.

I recognized at once a new reality which was quite a new thing to me. Then I was sensible that I was not making for myself a church by an effort of thought . . . I had not to force myself into a position, but my mind fell back upon itself in relaxation and peace and I gazed on her almost passively, as a great objective fact. I looked at her and I said . . . This is a religion.

How long in Anglicanism we struggled to make our own religion. How long I fought - thinking myself a modern Athanasius - defending the true faith when I was not myself yet a member of the true faith. I thought I was being true to the Catholic faith but all I was doing was carefully devising a counterfeit of the Catholic faith. I had to go to Littlemore.

My own Littlemore was Lancashire. I was safely ensconced in the Church of England. We lived in a large Victorian vicarage on the Isle of Wight. My dream had come true. I had become an Anglican country vicar. In charge of two beautiful old Norman churches - with job security and a wife and a family and all was well. Then in 1995 I was called to leave it all and move to Lancashire, in the North of

England, to a little house, and a job with a company that soon went bust and ten years with a part time job, waiting to be ordained as a Catholic priest.

I won't go into details of my own Littlemore, but I believe that all converts to the Catholic faith will have to go to Littlemore one way or another. They will be humbled. They will see that the Catholic Church makes them, they do not make the Catholic Church. They will know frustration and fear and despondency and loss. But as they do, they will know something they could not have known in any other way: a new reality in religion - something concrete - something hard - and hard means both tough and real, but also it means "difficult".

As you go to your own Littlemore and come to know this concrete reality of the Catholic faith, we also see the illusion that was Anglicanism. So Newman reflects in *Difficulties of Anglicans* on how he now views the Anglican religion:

as in fairy tales, the magic castle vanishes when the spell is broken, and nothing is seen but the wild heath, the barren rock, and the forlorn sheep walk, so it is with us as regards the Church of England, when we look in amazement on that we thought so unearthly and find so commonplace or worthless.

It fades. The dreaming spires of Oxford, the glow of the common room, the sophistication of the academics and the wit and bonhomie of the establishment men with their investments and their riches and their knowledge of the way of the world. All of it is seen for the plastic trophies and shimmering, but shallow prizes of the world. We need to go to Littlemore where little is more.

Fr Dwight Longenecker Sermon at **Solemn Choral Evensong**, Mount Calvary Church, Baltimore, January 22, 2012

FROM HERE AND THERE

1) Tolerance is the virtue of men who no longer believe in anything. **G.K. Chesterton**

2) Former Bishops Honoured by Pope Benedict XVI

Pope Benedict XVI has elevated three priests of the Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham to the rank of Chaplain of His Holiness (Monsignor).

Monsignor Edwin Barnes, Monsignor Robert Mercer, and Monsignor David Silk, have all received the

honour from the Holy Father, recognising their former ministry as Anglican bishops.

Mgr Barnes and Mgr Silk were received and ordained via the Personal Ordinariate in 2011, whilst Mgr Mercer was received and ordained in 2012.

The Ordinary, Mgr Keith Newton, said "By establishing Personal Ordinariates, Pope Benedict is seeking to be generous in making provision for those Anglicans who wish to come into the full communion of the Catholic Church. In every

possible way he has sought to recognise the fruitful Anglican ministry which we undertook before entering the Catholic Church; this honour for these three distinguished men is a further sign of our Holy Father's love and warmth toward this project".

The announcement was made on Thursday morning as the clergy of the Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham met for their summer plenary at Allen Hall, the diocesan seminary of the Archdiocese of Westminster.

From the website of ***The Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham*** - 20 June 2012

3) The Feast of St Benedict

July 11 is the Feast of St Benedict, the founder of western monasticism and co-patron saint of Europe.

Benedict was born c480 in Nursia, Italy. The son of a Roman noble man he had before him a life of academic learning, wealth and privilege but gave this up to live in solitude in Enfide, about 30 miles from Rome. As St Gregory writes, "giving over his books, and forsaking his father's house and wealth, with a mind only to serve God, he sought for some place where he might attain to the desire of his holy purpose; and in this sort he departed [from Rome], instructed with learned ignorance and furnished with unlearned wisdom" (St Gregory, Book II Dialogues). Benedict took his former nurse with him as a servant and they settled with "a company of virtuous men" who were in sympathy with his desire to live a life totally dedicated to God.

Whilst in Enfide, he performed what is now attributed to be his first miracle - he restored an earthenware vessel used for cleaning and separating seed from wheat, which his servant had accidentally broken. The eventual notoriety this brought forced Benedict to leave Enfide to live the life of a hermit in a cave near Subiaco. Romanus, a monk from the monastery above the cave, gave him the monk's habit and for three years he was the only person with whom Benedict had contact.

Upon the death of the abbot of another monastery the monks persuaded Benedict to become their abbot, but the experiment failed and the monks tried to poison him on two occasions. The first was with drink. but after Benedict prayed over the cup, the cup shattered. The second attempt was with bread. When Benedict prayed over the bread, a raven flew in and took it away. A cup and a raven are symbols that accompany images of St Benedict. The knowledge of these, and other, miracles brought many people to Benedict to seek advice and

counsel. It was from these people that he formed and built thirteen monasteries, of which he remained abbot of them all, living himself in one of them. He spent the rest of his life as a monk and formulated his Rule.

Whilst the Rule of St Benedict is clearly addressed to members of the monastic community, it is also directed towards instructing the laity. In his book *The Rule of Saint Benedict for Family Life Today*, Don Massimo Laponi expertly applies the Rule to day to day situations in which every family can be drawn closer to God. In his foreword to the book, Cardinal Franc Rodé (*Prefect of the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life*) writes,

The author of this book, who, among other things, has the merit of brevity but also knows how to say a lot in a few pages, enables us to see directly how topical is Benedictine wisdom not just for guiding religious communities, but also for giving new life and new hope to the family community. In fact, the institution of the family will not be saved by conferences and discussion groups, and not even by legislative reform - no matter how desirable it may be - but only by promoting a lived model of social life which is an alternative to the one which is now prevalent everywhere. "And it seems to me", our author writes, "that in fact there exists only one model which today can effectively be proposed to families: the Benedictine model that emerges from the Rule and tradition."

As we celebrate the feast of St Benedict, pray for the families of men and women who live in Benedictine houses throughout the world. Pray too for every family that it may be inspired and challenged by St Benedict.

Posted by the ***Guild of Blessed Titus Brandsma*** - 10 July 2011

4) Catholic Women who changed the world

St Thérèse of Lisieux

In 1897, when St Thérèse died, stricken by TB, most regarded her as an average nun, without extraordinary ability. History has shown otherwise. She was canonised in 1925, proclaimed a Doctor of the Church by John Paul II and her book *Story of a Soul* established a radical path to redemption, the "little way".

The idea of seeking holiness in humble, everyday life was inspired by Thérèse's convent life, which

was not always easy. On one occasion, she pinned up pictures of the saints by her bed, which some other nuns thought laughable. But she offered up these little hardships and had a strategy of being especially kind to those who held her in contempt. Accurate comparisons are made between Thérèse's writing and that of the literary giant James Joyce. Both Joyce and Thérèse mastered the stream of consciousness technique that records trains of thought in contrast to traditional storytelling.

Readers often say that after reading *Story of a Soul* they feel they know Thérèse. This is because her most personal insights are presented so humbly. Her devotees have ranged from Padre Pio to Princess Diana. In 2009, when St Thérèse's relics toured England, over 250,000 people venerated them. Miraculous incidents are reported wherever her relics go. One Carmelite seminarian, who was travelling with the relics in 2009, got his hand mangled in a car door reportedly in an instant his hand was completely cured.

Mary O'Regan - May 31, 2012 - *Catholic Herald*

5) The beginning of human life at fertilization is a scientific fundamental truth. It's horribly tragic that people in positions of influence can't grasp the reality of biology 101. This fundamental truth remains under relentless attack by the abortion industry and their allies - all for the sake of filling their cash registers while sacrificing the innocent. Recently, I've seen that the vacuum of life-affirming ethics is resulting in horrifying ramifications.

A recent article published in the *Journal of Medical Ethics* - a major publication - is just the latest manifestation of this appalling mindset. Two so-called ethicists in a mainstream medical journal are advocating that abortion should be expanded well past birth. They argue, "killing a newborn could be ethically permissible in all the circumstances where abortion would be."

It's the culture of death taken to its logical and tragic end.

In their view, both the unborn child and the newborn baby don't have the moral status of "actual" persons and are consequently morally irrelevant. As a result, there's room for "after-birth abortion" to be performed without any regrets. That means even perfectly healthy newborns can be aborted under this standard. Of course aborting a baby, regardless of their health status, is a travesty.

I and other pro-life leaders have long said that killing unborn babies opens the door for infanticide. Now

you have proof. The authors write, "The same reasons which justify abortion should also justify the killing of the potential person when it is at the stage of a newborn."

The authors stretch the boundaries even further by saying the social, psychological and economic costs of the potential parents have priority over the lives of their children. They also suggest that adoption isn't always in the best interests of "actual" people.

Here's perhaps one of the most infuriating and ironic parts of the paper coming from two ethicists (and I use that term loosely): At no point after birth do they say that it's morally repugnant to kill a newborn baby. This is the type of perverted thinking that comes into play when abortion is desperately and broadly pushed as the norm.

Here's a link to the article in its entirety [http://www.lifeissues.org/pdf/Journal_Of_Medical_Ethics.pdf]. I encourage you to read it. You'll be shocked by the matter-of-fact way they advocate the killing of children who may be even the slightest inconvenience.

No matter how anyone in the pro-abortion crowd spins it, the point at which life begins is an indisputable fact - it begins at fertilization. This latest instance just goes to prove that the slippery-slope of the culture of death knows no bounds. With the battle waging over protecting all life, our fight for the unborn has become more urgent than ever.

For innocent human life - born and unborn,

Bradley Mattes, Executive Director, *Life Issues Institute*

6) Pope warns against the power of finance and of the media

16 February 2012 - Yesterday afternoon the Holy Father visited the Major Seminary of Rome for the occasion of the feast of its patroness, Our Lady of Trust, which falls on Saturday. The Holy Father visited the chapel before going on to meet with auxiliary bishops of Rome, superiors of diocesan seminaries and 190 seminarians.

Following the reading of the Gospel, Benedict XVI pronounced a "*lectio divina*" on the passage from the Letter of St. Paul to the Romans in which the Apostle invites the faithful not to conform to this world but to transform themselves and renew their minds in order to discern the will of God, "the good and acceptable and perfect".

"We can reflect upon the Church today", he said in his off-the-cuff remarks. "There is much talk about the Church of Rome, many things are said. Let us hope that people also talk about our faith. Let us pray to God that it may be so".

The Pope then went on to refer to the force of evil which, in today's world, also emerges "in two great powers which are good and useful in themselves but easily open to abuse: the power of finance and the power of the media. Both are necessary, both are useful, but so subject to misuse that they often go against their true goals".

Today "we see how the world of finance can dominate mankind. Possession and appearance dominate and enslave the world. . . . Finance is no longer a tool to promote well being and to support the life of man, but a force that oppresses him, one which almost has to be worshipped". The Pontiff called on his audience not to conform to this power. "Be non conformists. What counts is not possession but existence", he said. Christians must not bow to this power, but use it "as a means, with the freedom of the children of God".

Turning then to consider the question of public opinion, Benedict XVI highlighted how "we have a great need of information, knowledge about the truth of the world; but there is a power of appearance which in the end counts even more than reality itself". Appearance "overlies the truth and becomes more important. Man no longer pursues the truth but wants above all to appear". Here too "there is a Christian non conformism. . . . We want not

appearance but truth, and this will give us true freedom".

"Christian non conformism redeems us and restores us to truth. Let us pray to the Lord that He may help us to be free in this non conformism, which is not against the world but is authentic love for the world".

Vatican Information Service

7) Three transcendentals "I think it is significant that we currently have a pontiff who has described himself as a 'decided Augustinian' and 'to a certain extent a Platonist'. As everyone knows, beauty was an important concept for both Plato and Augustine. In philosophical parlance beauty is described as a 'transcendental', along with goodness, truth and sometimes unity. The Franciscan scholar Benedict Groeschel has argued that human beings tend to have a 'primary transcendental'. By this he means that some people have a primary attraction to truth and he lists St. Thomas Aquinas as the prime example here; some people have a primary attraction for goodness and here he gives St. Francis of Assisi as his exemplar; and then there are those types who have a primary attraction to beauty, and here St. Augustine is his best candidate. In order to be holy one should have a deep attraction for all three transcendentals: for truth, beauty and goodness."

From an address by **Professor Tracey Rowland**, Dean of the John Paul II Institute for Marriage & Family, Melbourne, Australia, entitled ***The Anglican Patrimony***, June 18, 2012

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