

The Sodality of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

A Catholic Community of the Anglican Use, Diocese of Hamilton

www.stedmund.ca



May 12, 2012 - **Sts Nereus and Achilleus, Martyrs**

JUNE SCHEDULE

June 3	Sunday	Trinity Sunday
June 10	Sunday	Corpus Christi
June 17	Sunday	The Second Sunday after Trinity
June 24	Sunday	The Third 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) Ordinariate-Bound

Over the past 6 months a number of Anglican communities, across the country, have been received into the Catholic Church, and are Ordinariate-bound, in accordance with Pope Benedict's Apostolic Constitution, *Anglicanorum coetibus*.

Communication is not the best, yet, but allow me to set out the 'facts' as I understand them:

The **first** and **second groups** of Anglicans to be received were in Calgary - the former *Anglican Church of Canada* Parish of St. John the Evangelist, and the Toronto Ordinariate Group (all of whom were former members of the *Anglican Church of Canada*) who were both received on December 18, 2011.

The **third group** to be received, and the first *Anglican Catholic Church of Canada* community to be received, was ours, now The Sodality of St. Edmund, King and Martyr. We were received on January 1, 2012.

The **fourth, fifth, sixth** and **seventh groups** to be received were Victoria (The Fellowship of Blessed John Henry Newman), Ottawa (The Sodality of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary), Spencerville (The Sodality of St. Barnabas), and Barrhaven (Holy Nativity), who were all received on April 15, 2012.

The **eighth** and **ninth groups** to be received were

Oshawa (The Sodality of the Good Shepherd), and (the Sovereign Mohawk Territory of) Tyendinaga (Christ the King), who were received on April 22, 2012.

With the exception of 'Calgary' and 'Toronto', all the other groups were former ACCC communities.

While no firm dates have been established, there are 3 other groups (all former ACCC communities) currently preparing for reception.

All of the above communities (with the exception of 'Calgary') are relatively small, but we are all now on **solid ground** and anticipate significant growth.

If any of the above information is inaccurate, please let me know.

2) **TOLERANCE** - this page.

3) **ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS - OILS** - page 4.

4) **AN INTERVIEW WITH FR DWIGHT LONGENECKER** - 2 of 2 - page 5.

5) **NEW MONTREAL BISHOP** - page 6.

6) **THE GIFT OF AUTHORITY - The Pope, the Church, and the Magisterium** - 6 of 7 - page 7.

7) **THREE MYTHS ABOUT THE CHURCH** - 3 of 3 - page 8.

8) **FROM HERE AND THERE** - page 9.

TOLERANCE

The essential spirit of any given age or society is often most directly revealed by what it estimates to be the principal virtues, and the most heinous vices. If we were to allow the mass media to be our guide in this matter, we could easily conclude our age rates tolerance as among the highest of virtues. There is certainly much emphasis given to tolerance today. We are constantly being reminded how important it is to be tolerant of one another. And, negatively, we are regularly warned of the evils of intolerance.

What are we to make of the emphasis that is currently given to the subject of tolerance? Should it be regarded as just one more sign of the vigorous moral health of the society in which we live? Or does it lend itself to another, considerably less

favorable, interpretation?

In attempting to answer these questions it is well that we begin at the beginning. It might seem, at first glance, that tolerance should be classified as a moral virtue. Regarded as such, if the question is, "should we strive to be tolerant and avoid being intolerant?" the unhesitant response would be, "Yes". After all, who would not want to be virtuous, who would not want to avoid vice? If tolerance just as such is a moral virtue, then tolerance just as such is a good thing. But are we justified in unqualifiedly accepting tolerance as a moral virtue? I think not.

We need to clarify our ideas concerning this important subject. What is tolerance? The word "tolerance" derives from the Latin verb *tolare*, which means to bear, to endure, to put up with. The object

of tolerance, that which is borne or endured or put up with, is invariably something negative. We speak, for example, of people who have a low tolerance for distractions, meaning that they are easily distracted. Or, to cite another example, the physiologists tell us that women, on average, have a higher tolerance for physical pain than do men, meaning that they can put up with pain better than can men.

Now, the thing to note about tolerance is that, just as such, it has no immediate moral dimension to it. The inability to tolerate distractions may be simply a matter of natural temperament, and the ability to tolerate pain can be explained in terms of one's physical make-up, things over which a person has no direct control. Whether or not tolerance takes on a virtuous character very much depends on its being an attitude which is deliberately assumed.

To the best of my knowledge, St. Thomas never regards tolerance, just as such, as a moral virtue. It would seem that the actual moral virtue that tolerance comes closest to is patience. The virtue of patience, unlike tolerance, is not the mere enduring of something difficult or painful, but it is doing so for a higher end. Saint Thomas teaches that patience represents a conscious, willed effort to preserve a rational good in the face of sorrow. The patient person puts up with difficulties for the sake of a good that transcends those difficulties. So, we take note of the fact that the saints are always patient, because they bear all the crosses that are sent to them for the supreme good which is the love of God.

Is it ever permissible to tolerate things which are not merely negative but positively evil? Not only is it permissible, sometimes it is unavoidable. There are certain circumstances in which particular evils must be put up with, and this is because any attempt to get rid of them would very likely only give rise to yet greater evils, and our second state will be worse than the first. But such circumstances should be considered exceptional, and the salient point to stress here is that to tolerate evil in such circumstances does not at all mean to approve of it. The evil is simply "put up with," borne, as a painful presence which, if it were possible to do so, one would promptly take action to get rid of it. A critical distinction has to be made, then, between

tolerance as simply putting up with an evil which at the moment cannot be gotten rid of, and tolerance which, beyond taking a permissive attitude toward evil, actually approves of it. It is this second understanding of tolerance, tolerance which involves both permitting and approving of evil, which is being so energetically fostered in our society today. And it is to be just as energetically resisted. We will call this understanding of tolerance - a grave misunderstanding, really - indiscriminate tolerance.

Indiscriminate tolerance, which is indifferent to the moral quality of the object to which it is directed, is quite irrational, and radically destructive in its effects upon society.

The fervent advocates of indiscriminate tolerance would want us to believe that they are completely "open" and "non-judgmental" in their own attitudes, and that they are willing to tolerate just about anything. But the fact of the matter is that they are very selective in their tolerance, and the one thing they will absolutely not tolerate is that free play be given to opinions contrary to their own. What is considerably worse, many of the advocates of indiscriminate tolerance are promoting an attitude that entails the permitting and the approving of behaviors which are intrinsically evil. In other words, they are advocating a subjective tolerance for what is objectively intolerable. In their vocabulary "tolerance"

It is imperative, in trying times such as these, that we battle unstintingly on behalf of the objective status of the moral law, and thereby preserve our own moral integrity. We must not allow ourselves to be cowed or intimidated by a distorted understanding of tolerance, and of the role it should play in society. We must keep our moral wits about us. Let us think clearly and speak without evasion or ambiguity concerning the moral law. Tolerance is good only if it implies no endorsement whatever of evil. If there is anything in this world which is emphatically and unquestionably intolerable, it is the approving toleration of evil.

By **Dennis McInerney**, from the March 2004 Newsletter of *The Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter*, North American District

ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS

DUMFRIES, SCOTLAND: OILS

1 Corinthians 6,20 and 7,23. "Ye are not your own. Ye are bought with a price".

"It is more than time for me to wash my hair. It's far too greasy". "Elvis Presley used so much Brylcreem no girl can have wanted to fondle his hair". "Oh, he wears so much hair gel he looks like an American GI left over from World War II". There are exceptions of course but, by and large, we Brits don't like oil, grease. We don't like it in our hair, in our food, all over our clothes.

It was otherwise with the Jews. *Psalm 133*: "Look how good and joyful a thing it is when brethren live in unity. It is so joyful that it's like the perfumed oil poured upon the head of High Priest Aaron, which ran down his beard and reached his collar". The Prayer Book* translation claims that the oil even ran down to the skirts of his robes. We Brits wouldn't want it in our hair, on our collars, or even on the turn ups of our trousers.

Olive oil doesn't feature much in our lives. It was otherwise with the Jews. *Psalm 4*: "You have given me more joy than when harvest produced an increase of oil". Jews used it for the smooth working of such machinery as there was. Used it for cooking. Used it in eating. Used it for lighting in lamps. Used it as medicine. *Luke 10*. The Good Samaritan poured oil into the wounds of the roadside victim.

If a guest came to your house you honoured him by anointing his head or his feet with perfumed oil. *Psalm 23*: "You have set a table for me to eat at. My cup of wine is full. You have anointed my head with oil." And so *Mark 14*. At Passion tide, ie about now, a woman came up to Jesus, broke open an expensive alabaster container, and poured expensive oil upon His head. Jesus graciously accepted the honour.

Kings were anointed to their sacred office in a holy ceremony. *1 Kings*. "Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet anointed Solomon king and the people said God save the king". Words and a ceremony we ourselves are familiar with from Handel's music at the anointing of our own queen. High Priests were anointed to their sacred office. I have already quoted *Psalm 133* about Aaron. Objects sacred to God were anointed with oil. *Genesis 23*. Jacob slept with a stone for a pillow (which may or may not be the stone of Scone**). He had a dream of heaven. In the morning he poured oil upon that stone. The portable temple, the holy tent used by

the Jews in their wanderings, and the ark inside that tent, were both anointed. *Exodus 30* orders what perfumes are to be used with the oil, cinnamon, myrrh, cassia and sweet cane.

It was self evident to the Jews that if sacred objects and sacred persons were anointed to serve God, then the coming Saviour must of all people surely be anointed, either literally or metaphorically speaking. And that's what they called their longed for Rescuer, the One with oil on His Head, the Greased Up One. The Hebrew for *anointed* is *Messiah*. The Greek for *anointed* is *Christos*. Now we say Jesus Christ quickly as though we were using a Christian name and a surname. But we are actually saying Joshua the Anointed. And incidentally, the Greek for *oil* is *chrism*.

When things are associated with the Anointed One, they too are anointed. When people are associated with the Christ they too are *chrismated*. Altars and church bells, for example. But much more importantly, you. At baptism and/or at confirmation and/or at the ordination of priests and/or at the consecration of bishops, heads and/or hands are anointed. You now belong to Joshua the Anointed. You are marked with His sign. You are branded by Him. Our Saviour or Rescuer even claims the sick for Himself. He sent the Twelve out on a little training exercise. *Mark 6* "They cast out many devils and anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them".

In today's ceremony we ask our Lord to consecrate oil for Him to use to our benefit. Traditionally there are two sorts. Oil for the sick, which may or may not result in their physical healing, their psychological healing, or their peaceful trust in Jesus whether in illness or in death. Oil for use in other sacraments such as confirmation, or in sacramentals such as the consecration of altars.

And these oils bring me to my text from *1 Corinthians*. Ye are not your own. Ye are bought with a price. Or put more bluntly, You don't belong to yourself. Somebody has bought you. And this Passion tide we remember what it cost Christ to claim us as His own, to make us *anointed*s in the *Anointed One*, a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation (*1 Peter 2,9*).

1 Peter 1,18. "You were bought not with silver and

gold but with precious blood".

Glory be to Jesus
Who in bitter pains
Poured for me the life blood
From His sacred veins. (Blue 138, Green 99)

Robert Mercer CR

* Scots B.C.P of 1637

** On which Scots kings used to be crowned. For many years it was under St Edward's throne in Westminster Abbey. More recently it has been returned to Scotland.

AN INTERVIEW WITH FR DWIGHT LONGENECKER – 2 of 2

We have extensively covered the Ordinariates established through an Apostolic Constitution for Anglicans seeking full communion with the Catholic Church while maintaining much of their patrimony. We caught up with Fr Dwight and asked him a few questions concerning the Ordinariates. His responses are insightful and inspiring:

Q: How many Anglicans is it likely will take advantage of the new provision?

A: No one knows for sure. The Traditional Anglican Communion is one of the groups that has petitioned Rome. They are made up of a confederation of traditional Anglican Churches that have broken from the mainstream Anglican Communion. They have a global presence and claim membership of 400,000 souls. If they all accepted the pope's offer, and there were other groups from the Anglican Communion and other smaller churches in the Anglican tradition, then the numbers could reach 500,000. However, some of the members of the Traditional Anglican Communion have got cold feet and have decided against joining.

So far in England there are five bishops, about sixty priests and several hundred laypeople. In the USA there will be many more. The Australian ordinariate will be established later in the year, and numbers there are uncertain.

What interests me more than numbers is the possibility that in the future these new 'Anglican Catholic' churches might attract significant numbers of non-Anglican Protestants. I know from my experience of Evangelical Christianity that there are many traditional Evangelicals who long for a liturgical, historical and traditional church. They would have problems coming into the Catholic mainstream for various reasons, but they may well find an 'Anglican Catholic' congregation to be an easy way into full communion with the Catholic Church.

Q: Individual Anglicans have always been free to join the Catholic Church at any time, and many have in fact done so in recent years. Why are these special arrangements necessary?

A: The special arrangements allow Anglicans to maintain and promote their special 'Anglican

patrimony.' They can have their own identity and not simply be absorbed into the modern Catholic Church. This patrimony is precious, historical and beautiful. It includes the splendid languages of the Book of Common Prayer, Anglican hymns, their sacred choral tradition, their spirituality and their particularly English ethos. The Holy See considers this worth keeping, and believes it will enrich the modern Catholic Church.

Q: Anglican clergymen, including both priests and bishops, have petitioned for this provision. Will married Anglican clergy be able to receive ordination as Catholic priests or bishops?

A: Married men who are presently Anglican clergy may be presented for ordination once they have been received into the church and been properly selected and trained. This is already what happens under the Pastoral Provision. People should be clear that the norm for men applying for ordination within the Anglican Ordinariate will be the discipline of celibacy. However, there is provision for the Anglican Ordinary to ask for married men who are not already Anglican priests to be ordained. This will be considered on a case by case basis according to 'objective criteria' approved by the Holy See. This 'objective criteria' has not yet been published.

Q: Could an influx of married priests into the Catholic Church through the Anglican personal ordinariates exert pressure on the Church to modify celibacy as the priestly norm?

A: I don't think so. The married Anglican clergy will operate pretty much within the Anglican ordinariate and although they may help out in Latin Rite parishes, they will be fringe members of the wider Catholic community. Also, given time, the celibacy rule for the new generation of Anglican ordinariate priests will kick in and married priests will be the exception, not the rule.

Q: Will non-Anglican Catholics who are attracted to the distinctive liturgy and spirituality of the Anglican tradition be allowed to join parishes within the personal ordinariates?

A: Anyone with a link to Anglicanism may join the Ordinariate. This includes Anglicans who convert, but it also includes those who have already converted to the Catholic faith and wish to nurture and enjoy their Anglican heritage. Other members of the Ordinariate will be those converted through the evangelistic enterprise of the Ordinariate parishes. I doubt whether anyone will stop a Latin Rite Catholic from attending worship at an Ordinariate parish, but they are prohibited from joining formally.

Q: What consequences might this new arrangement have for the Catholic Church's ecumenical relations with the Anglican Communion?

A: It will change the old fashioned style of ecumenical discussions radically. I think ecumenical discussions with the Anglicans will continue, but they will increasingly be between two parties that are on divergent paths. This has really altered the course of the old style ecumenism in a major way. One

could almost say that Pope Benedict has totally rewritten the play book.

Q: Is there any evidence that Christians from other traditions with a desire to enter the Catholic Church might be seeking similar accommodations?

A: I don't think so. Instead I believe we will see that the new Anglican Ordinariate will provide a bridge for other Protestant Christians. Once it is established, liturgically and traditionally minded Lutherans and Methodists may very well find that the easiest way in to full communion is through the Anglican Ordinariate. Also, if some of the Ordinariate parishes are 'broad church' in their worship styles (in other words, not too high church) many Evangelicals who are heading toward a liturgical and traditional church may find their way 'home to Rome'.

The interview was conducted on January 18, 2012 by **Catholic Online**. **Fr Dwight Longenecker** is a former Anglican priest who has been ordained under the Pastoral Provision. He is parish priest of Our Lady of the Rosary Parish in Greenville, South Carolina.

NEW MONTREAL ARCHBISHOP

Only two days after his appointment to head up the Montreal Archdiocese, **Archbishop Christian Lepine** is already facing attacks from activists in Quebec's homosexual and feminist movements.

Archbishop Lepine, 60, was questioned on his strong pro-life and pro-family stances at a press conference Wednesday morning. The newly-minted prelate avoided stirring up any heated controversy with his carefully worded answers, which he grounded in Pope John Paul II's teachings on human sexuality, known as the theology of the body, and the Church's mission to proclaim the Gospel.

Asked about abortion, Lepine emphasized that "God is the author of life" and "the first right is the right to life." He said he hopes to attend the National March for Life in Ottawa this May, as he has done in the past.

The archbishop was also questioned on his decision in 2009 to allow an event at his Repentigny parish to help parents develop the "heterosexual potential" of their children. The future archbishop was forced to cancel the remaining two sessions after the first sparked a media firestorm and threats of protest.

Explaining the incident, Lepine said, "The Church welcomed people living according to the homosexual lifestyle, a lifestyle that they themselves felt caused them harm. . . . It was to help them find strength in Jesus Christ."

The remarks have the Quebec Council of Gays and Lesbians up in arms.

"This bishop believes in reparative therapy," Steve Foster, the group's president, told the *Journal de Quebec*. "It shows that for the Church, gays and lesbians are sick people who need to be cured."

Alexa Conradi, president of the Quebec Women's Federation, also denounced Archbishop Lepine's appointment as "extremely unfortunate," saying he is "so out of touch with Quebec values."

"The religious leaders have given over the reigns to people who are more conservative," she told the *Journal de Quebec*.

Such opposition is par for the course for any Catholic clergyman who takes a public stand in support of the Church's moral teachings in the radically secularized former Catholic province.

When Cardinal Marc Ouellet, then-Archbishop of Quebec City and current prefect for the Vatican's Congregation for Bishops, reiterated the Church's condemnation of abortion in cases of rape in 2010, he became the subject of heated criticism by media, politicians, and even some clergy.

The remarks sparked a motion backed unanimously in Quebec's National Assembly to reaffirm "the right . . . to free and accessible abortion services." One notable journalist said he hoped the Cardinal would die "from a long and painful illness."

At the press conference, Archbishop Lepine also defended the Church's stance on denying Communion to those who are divorced and remarried.

"You can pray, but I don't think you're ready to take communion. If you're not ready yet, that's all right," the bishop said he would tell such individuals, adding that they can still encounter Christ in prayer and through a "spiritual communion."

The archbishop's appointment has been hailed by Catholics as a sign of the pope's effort to reform the Quebec episcopate to better equip it for the new evangelization.

Lepine was working as a parish priest only eight months ago when he was first tapped as an auxiliary bishop for Montreal. He was only a bishop for six months before his appointment to head up Canada's second largest diocese yesterday.

Leading commentator Fr. Raymond de Souza wrote in the *Catholic Register* Wednesday that his "dramatic" elevation is a clear sign that Pope Benedict XVI, under the advice of Cardinal Ouellet, has rejected the "safe option" in appointing bishops.

"Ouellet evidently decided that the norm in Quebec needed changing, and so has advised the Holy Father to change it - emphatically," wrote Fr. de Souza.

March 22, 2012 - LifeSiteNews.com

THE GIFT OF AUTHORITY - 6 of 7

The Pope, the Church, and the Magisterium

A talk given by Matthew Teel to the Our Lady of Hope Society, meeting at St. Therese Little Flower Catholic Church, Kansas City, Missouri, on Sunday, September 14, 2008. The topic Fr. Ernie [Davis] gave me for today is really the heart of why I converted to the Catholic Church in the first place: namely, the role of authority in the Church. Mr. Teel, a former Episcopal priest, now teaches philosophy and religion at Crowder College, Webb City, Missouri.

Here's what I have learned in being a dad for twelve years:

When you are speaking to your child, especially about something very important, you give them very clear and simple directions, so that they can understand what you're saying. And you tell them what the results will be if they decide not to follow through. And sometimes, that doesn't even require coming up with some elaborate punishment for them; sometimes, the results of their actions will be enough.

"Abby, don't stand on the coffee table or you'll fall and hurt yourself."

"Abby don't stand on the coffee table or you'll fall and hurt yourself."

"Abby don't - okay, see? What did I tell you? I told you you'd fall and hurt yourself and you did. Yes, I know it hurts. Yes, I still love you. But now you know, don't you?"

A good parent says, "This is what you need to do, and this is what will happen if you don't do it." Or he says, "Don't do that. And if you, here are the consequences." And it seemed to me that, no matter how much I loved Anglicanism - and she was a good mother to me in many ways - she had to do more than let me parent myself.

Here's another:

A good parent does not say something that can be interpreted in a variety of ways, unless it doesn't MATTER if it's interpreted a variety of ways.

My oldest daughter is a little Jesuit. We tell her all the time: she needs to go into the law as a profession: she will find the loophole in whatever direction you give her.

"I told you not to eat cookies before dinner."
"Yes, but you didn't say I couldn't eat a SANDWICH before dinner."

A good parent will frame his directions in such a way that he will catch the loopholes. Do you do that because you're the tyrant your children always say you are? No, you do it for their own good, even if they don't understand that.

Let me ask you: would you leave a morally ambiguous babysitter in charge of your children? Of course not. Would you leave NO babysitter in charge of your children? Of course not. But that's what I, as an Anglican, was asked to believe about Jesus: he left no one in charge. And if he did, the directions are so ambiguous they can be interpreted in a thousand different ways. Only a cruel or neglectful parent would do that.

Just like that: the Church has a RIGHT to teach what it believes to be the Truth. She has a DUTY to give clear directions, so that anyone who hears them will understand, even if they don't immediately understand why it's important. And most especially: she has a RESPONSIBILITY to do that, because it is the job God has given her to do.

After several years of trying to deal with life in the Episcopal Church -where there were no clear teachings, no clear directions, no advice, nobody exercising any authority - it occurred to me that only a very cruel God would say to us, "Strive to enter by the narrow way," and then not tell us where the narrow way is.

If he tells us that we must take up our cross, then he also has a right and a duty and a responsibility to tell us HOW to do it. But I could never get anyone in the Episcopal Church to answer that question for me. Because no one was in charge.

At last, it occurred to me that Jesus must have left behind a Church that was at least as good as I am at giving clear directions, outlining consequences, and exercising authority in the things that matter. Anglicans don't have an authority and, by and large, they don't want an authority. They don't want someone telling them what to believe or what to do. "Anglicanism is Christianity for adults." But I realized that I do need an authority: because spiritually, I'm not an adult. I'm a child.

THREE MYTHS ABOUT THE CHURCH - 3 of 3

1. Purple ecclesiology

2. A church in decline

3. Christianity is the oppressor, not the oppressed

[T]he venues where these three myths tend to be most deeply entrenched - the secular media, the academy, political circles and so on. . . . Yet they're remarkably widespread inside the church too, among people who really ought to know better. If Catholics perpetuate these ideas, it's hard to fault the outside world for being seduced by them.

3. Christianity is the oppressor, not the oppressed

Of all the popular misconceptions about Catholicism, and about Christianity in general, this is arguably the most pernicious.

Stoked by historical images of the Crusades and the Inquisition, and even by current perceptions of the wealth and power of church leaders and institutions, it's tough for Western observers to wrap their minds around the fact that in a growing number of global hotspots, Christians today are the defenseless oppressed, not the arrogant oppressors.

Here's the stark reality of our times: In the early 21st century, we are witnessing the rise of a whole new generation of Christian martyrs.

Christians are today, statistically speaking, by far the most persecuted religious group on the planet. According to the Frankfurt-based Society for Human Rights, fully 80 percent of all acts of religious discrimination in the world today are directed against Christians. The Pew Forum estimates that Christians experience persecution in a staggering total of 133 nations, fully two-thirds of all the countries on earth.

As part of that picture, the Catholic relief agency "Aid to the Church in Need" estimates that 150,000 Christians die for their faith every year, in locales ranging from the Middle East to Southeast Asia to sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Latin America. This means that every hour of every day, roughly 17 Christians are killed somewhere in the world, either out of hatred for the faith or hatred for the works of charity and justice their faith compels them to perform.

Perhaps the emblematic example is Iraq, where a strong Christian community that took two millennia to build has been gutted in the arc of a little more than two decades. Prior to 1991, the year of the First

Gulf War, there were more than 2 million Christians in Iraq, while today the high-end estimate is that somewhere between 250,000 and 400,000 may be left.

Given the special responsibility the United States bears for Iraq, the fact that the fate of Iraqi Christians is not a driving, front-burner priority in American Catholic life is nothing short of a moral outrage.

As the U.S. bishops gear up to fight a new set of church/state battles on the domestic front, the foregoing suggests a special challenge to American Catholics to keep our eyes on the prize. In the States, a threat to religious freedom usually means you might get sued, while in many parts of the world, it means you might get shot. Surely we can all agree that's a more dramatic set of circumstances.

By **John L. Allen Jr.** - *National Catholic Register's* senior correspondent - March 8, 2012

FROM HERE AND THERE

1) "Socialism is the religion people get when they lose their religion." **Richard John Neuhaus**

2) '**Cafeteria' Catholics** currently believe a myriad of items. [They] believe differently from what the Catechism, the Pope, the Bible, or any known Catholic authoritative source tells them. They believe in items that are convenient to believe in and yet are perfectly comfortable to call themselves Catholic. [Hence the name!] From skipping Mass on Sunday and ignoring the Lenten fast, to being one of the 80% of Catholics who don't believe in the Real Presence or who vote for political candidates who espouse abortion. [And the list goes on.]

From an article, ***Killing the Geniuses***, by **Kevin Roeten**

3) **St George, protector of human life**

"You have protected me from the assembly of the malignant" (Ps 64.3)

As well as being the patron of England, St George is the patron of Egypt, Bulgaria, Aragon, Catalonia, Romania, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Iraq, Lithuania, Palestine, Portugal, Serbia, Ukraine and Russia. And of course, Georgia where there are 365 Churches dedicated to him.

Thanks to the rise of irrational rationalism, even many Catholics go along with the idea that because there was a legend about St George, he must himself have been a legend. The dedication of Churches to him from the fourth century onwards rather tells against this fancy.

We may provisionally accept the general consensus that he was born sometime between 256 and 283, that he was a soldier in the Imperial Guard at Nicomedia under Diocletian, that when the most savage of persecutions began, including the requirement that every soldier sacrifice to the false

gods, St George openly professed his faith and was martyred. When I offer incense on the feast of a martyr I often reflect that all they had to do to save their lives was to offer a few grains of incense to the false gods.

The first Church in his honour in England dates back to the reign of Alfred, but his popularity grew during the crusades. His was very much a popular cultus rather than centrally organised, and by the time of the hundred years' war, he was invoked continually by the soldiers, immortalised of course in the line of Henry V "Cry 'God for Harry, England and St George!"

The legend of the defeat of the dragon has its own significance for England today. The people of Silene had to bring a sheep in order to appease the dragon so that they could draw water. When a sheep was not available, a maiden was substituted, the name being drawn by lot. St George happened along when the princess was to be sacrificed. He fortified himself with the sign of the cross and slayed the dragon.

Today in England, human sacrifice takes the particular form of abortion and the killing of human embryos either for experimentation or in the process of IVF. This sacrifice is made in order to avoid some difficulty, to create new life according to our own demands, or to use the human life to produce a cure for other, older people.

We pray to St George for the protection of human life in England today, for the true, worthy and noble respect of maidenhood, and for the triumph of the truth against falsehood, good against evil, God against Satan.

Cry "God for Elizabeth, England and St George."

From the ***Hermeneutic of Continuity*** blog

4) A 'consensus' says nothing about truth!

5) What you should be thinking when you hear noisy kids at Mass

Some people think that kids who make any noise at Mass need to be in a sound-proof room (i.e. a "cry room") so they don't bother anybody.

Here's the deal: The average "cry room" holds like 5 families. Multiply that times about 3 Masses and that means the average parish is set up to accommodate 15 young families for Sunday Mass each week.

The average parish has about 1200 families. About half of those (~ 600) have kids under the age of 18. Of those, there are probably (I'm guessing now) 200 or so with kids under the age of 3. Pretty much every kid under three years old I know is loud and rowdy and has trouble understanding how to be reverent at Mass.

So the average parish needs to accommodate 200 families with at least one kid who is rowdy and loud. And it has space for 15 in the cry room (and we wonder why we only have 15 show up to Mass).

It just doesn't add up. So, please, don't expect that every family with young kids should be in the "cry room." It's impossible.

The "cry room" is not there for rowdy kids who can't pay attention. It's there for when the rowdy kids who can't pay attention are having an especially difficult day.

The place for the rowdy kids who can't pay attention is in the pew next to you. So you can hear their car noises and blibber blabber and have your hair pulled by them during the homily.

So we can watch them eat cheerios, drop crumbs on the floor and then get all steamed up about how terribly misbehaved kids are these days and how negligent these half-wit parents are who are raising them. All while we should instead be thinking about what we've done, what we've failed to do and the many things we are far guiltier of than this two year old child - a child with an innocence and faith in life that we will never again grasp.

Now you tell me whose presence is less worthy at Mass?

Sure lots of parents need to learn how to discipline their kids better and teach them how to sit still and keep quiet when they're supposed to. But those families aren't learning how to do that. Why? Because they are at home by themselves on Sunday morning, making excuses for not going to Mass and not watching how other families do it successfully. Because the few times they mustered the courage to try it, they got snide remarks from the priest or annoyed looks from parishioners. Because they ended up in a crowded cry room like second-class participants. Because they didn't feel welcome. And they didn't feel equipped. Because they are still learning how to raise kids. And because they haven't yet learned how truly important Mass is for their growing family.

We need to teach them. We need to help them. We need to smile at them. We need to encourage them. We need to invite them. We need to celebrate the noise of children. What a beautiful noise to hear at Mass. It's the sound of a living, breathing, growing Church.

By **Matthew Warner**, March 4, 2012 in ***The Catholic Register***

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)