

# The Parish of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

Waterloo, Ontario  
www.stedmund.ca

## UPDATE

The Anglican Catholic Church of Canada / The Traditional Anglican Communion

September 11, 2010 - **St. Protus and St. Hyacinthus**

### October Schedule

October 3	Sunday	The Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity
October 10	Sunday	Harvest Thanksgiving
October 17	Sunday	The Twentieth Sunday after Trinity
October 18	Monday	St. Luke the Evangelist
October 24	Sunday	The Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity
October 28	Thursday	St. Simon and St. Jude, Apostles
October 31	Sunday	The Twenty-second Sunday after Trinity

### 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) **Mark your calendars!** The Right Reverend Robert Mercer CR will be with us to celebrate St. Edmund's Day! St. Edmund's Day is November 20, but we have transferred our Feast of Title to Sunday, November 21 - Bishop Mercer will Confirm two young ladies and Celebrate Mass. Please keep this weekend open - details will follow. (For those that may not know, Bishop Mercer was our Ordinary from 1989 to 2005, is now living in England, and is 'theoretically' retired.)
- 2) **Email or snail-mail?** If you received this **UPDATE** by snail-mail but would prefer to receive it by email, we'd be delighted - simply send us a note!
- 3) **THE ANGLICAN PATRIMONY** - this page.
- 4) Book Review - **Lift High the Cross - ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS** - page 3.
- 5) The sixth of six parts - **ADDRESS BY CARDINAL LEVADA** - page 5.
- 6) **MAYBE NOT ALL OF THE ANGLICAN PATRIMONY!** - page 6.
- 7) **THE NEW DANCE ON A PINHEAD** - page 7.
- 8) Authority and obedience - **IF I TOLD YOU TO WEAR BLUE SHOES . . .** - page 8.
- 9) How to be good and do good - **WHAT DOES 'DOING THE RIGHT THING' ENTAIL?** - page 9.

## THE ANGLICAN PATRIMONY

---

### *The Love of the Liturgy and the Love of the Least of These*

Anglo-Catholicism confounds some of our progressive brothers and sisters who assume that any people who use incense and say "And with thy spirit" must be guilty of the unforgivable 21<sup>st</sup> century offenses of intolerance, elitism, and heartless conservatism. Somehow it has entered the received wisdom that, when the Grinch stole Christmas, he wore a maniple.

I love the looks I get when I tell those laboring under this misconception that 100 years ago there was far more concern that Anglo-Catholics were dangerous socialists agitating among the poor and causing them to have ideas above their station. Most in the States know nothing of the great work done in London's East End or that, closer to home, Anglo-Catholics created some of the first integrated churches and free hospitals. Even those of us within the movement can too often forget that we gained toleration for our liturgical practices only because of the incontestable good that our predecessors accomplished through years of untiring service to the poorest of the poor.

As a Roman Catholic monk, one of my selfish interests in the success of the Ordinariates is that they have the potential to offer the wider Church a model of parishes renowned both for the beauty of their worship and for doing a crack job at the Corporal Works of Mercy. Too many progressives find a liturgy full of folksy, earnest clichés to be the *sine qua non* of worship, sadly revealing their unstated premise that this is the best that those in need could possibly understand. Historically, Anglo-Catholics would have none of this, believing

dignified worship also dignified the worshiper who was reminded whose child he was.

Roman Catholic social teaching since the time of Leo XIII has been one of the glories of the Church, but too often in the last 40 years it has been held hostage to this impoverished aesthetic. Anglo-Catholics, on the other hand, have a tradition of sisters who can work in an inner-city hospice and still sing from the Monastic Diurnal and of sacristies with thuribles that were gifts from the Guild of the Iron Cross for Working Men and Boys. We know hymns like Dearmer's *Father Who on Man Dost Shower* and most of us probably remember the stirring words of Frank Weston of Zanzibar to the Anglo-Catholic Congress of 1923 linking our devotion to the Blessed Sacrament to our protecting the dignity of our brothers and sisters:

But I say to you, and I say it to you with all the earnestness that I have, that if you are prepared to fight for the right of adoring Jesus in his Blessed Sacrament, then you have got to come out from before your Tabernacle and walk, with Christ mystically present in you, out into the streets of this country, and find the same Jesus in the people of your cities and your villages. You cannot claim to worship Jesus in the Tabernacle, if you do not pity Jesus in the slum.

Now that's a real theology of liberation.

There were always political differences within the movement, but shared belief bridged the political and allowed those with differences to pray together.

In an earlier day, the reader of *The Nation* and the reader of *The National Review* could serve Mass together because they were confident that they were inwardly bound together in common faith as they were outwardly bound in common prayer. As we have seen this sort of Christian tolerance and generosity of spirit disappear in the increasingly winner-take-all politics of the provinces of the Anglican Communion, it would be a pity if those who have too often been the victims of this change lose that history ourselves.

I think that this belief that worship transcends political agendas even as it sends us out into the world to practice the love of Christ may well be one of the most important of the "elements of sanctification and of truth" referred to in *Anglicanorum Coetibus*. Many of those who have doubts about the Ordinariates foresee them

precipitating an invasion of grins. Won't it be wonderful if we can show the skeptics that, in addition to Newman and Pusey, Anglo-Catholics are also the heirs of Fr. Paul of Graymoor, who worked among the homeless; of Sister Constance, who died ministering to the victims of yellow fever; and of countless others whose lives were a witness to their belief that whatever they had done for the least of these, they had done for Him.

By **Br. Stephen Treat, O.Cist.** - July 20, 2010

(Br. Stephen is a monk of the Cistercian Abbey of Our Lady of Spring Bank in Sparta, Wisconsin. Like many others, his path led from an evangelical childhood in the South to Anglicanism, and then into the Roman Catholic Church in 2006. He entered Our Lady of Spring Bank in the summer of 2008.)

## ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS

---

### *Lift High the Cross*

By John Gunstone pub Canterbury Press. 348 pp.  
Notes, index, photo's, £25, ISBN 978-1-85311-817-3.

Our former student at the College of the Resurrection, Philip Corbett, recently co authored *Defend and Maintain*, a history of the Church Union from its foundation in 1859 until 2009, distributed by the Additional Curates Society of Birmingham. 116 pp, index, photo's. ISBN 978-0-85191-328-5. One of its chapters is *Anglo Catholic Congresses and the Union*.

Now another former student, John Gunstone, has written a whole book about the Congresses (and allied gatherings) from the first in 1920 until the Centenary Congress in 1933. Canon Gunstone is an author and journalist with twenty five other books to his credit. I seem to remember his writing in the 1960's or 70's for the *Church Times* with sympathy about the charismatic movement.

Over the years the Congresses involved a wide range of participants in a variety of ways: Archbishop Athenagoras of the Orthodox church, Bishop Butler OSB of Westminster, G K Chesterton, T S Eliot, Bishop Henson of Durham, Sheila Kaye-Smith, C S Lewis, Mother Margaret OHP, Princess Margaret, Dorothy L Sayers, Evelyn Underhill, to say nothing of an evangelical Bishop of Salisbury, a President of a Rubberworkers' Union, a Lord Justice, an Admiral of the Fleet and a Marshal of the Royal Air Force, though some of these personalities were involved at dates outside the scope of this history. Over the years a variety of CR brethren participated

in the Congresses: Biggart, Bull, Frere, Gore, Graham, Huddleston, Talbot, Thornton.

One seldom takes up a biography, diary, history or memoir connected to Anglo Catholicism without anticipating laughter from affectionate anecdote or bon mots or character sketches or mordant wit or ironic self deprecation. Which is only right and proper: it is God who gets the laugh on our first Christian matriarch, Sarah; her son our second patriarch is called Laughter (*Genesis* 18,11 - 15 and 21,1 - 8). Throughout salvation history God wins by losing, stoops to conquer, lives by dying. However, the two histories noticed here are so full of meticulously researched detail that there's little space left for humour. These histories gather up and store for us much information which may perhaps be of use when we make decisions for the future.

But here and there are treats, as in Gunstone. A Dean of Winchester complained that Anglo Catholic clergy uniformly wore black. He would have been pleased to read that at a large Priests' Convention in 1921, "There were beautiful young clergymen in delicate grey suits, grey Homburgs with black ribbons and pale wash-leather gloves. Several others wore the white linen of the tropics. Elderly men with figures which showed the march of time, wore Panama hats set at a jaunty angle". As Dean Inge commented, "The Anglo Catholic party is breaking up into petty factions and will not survive

more than a few years".

When the Congress of 1923 sent greetings to the Pope there was outrage. In 2010 a Scots Prime Minister who is Presbyterian invites the Pope to pay a state visit to Great Britain. Some situations do

change for the better. "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it" (*Psalms* 118,23 - 24).

+Robert Mercer CR

## FROM HERE AND THERE

---

### 1) On the direction of liturgical prayer

Interviewed by the *Catholic Herald*, **Cardinal Archbishop George Pell** [Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia] said the following on the direction of liturgical prayer:

"I am keen that we strengthen the vertical dimension of the liturgy, if we can, in the popular understanding, so that it's very obviously not just community-centred, it's God-centred, it's an act of worship. I'm very sympathetic to that. I'm even sympathetic for the Canon of the Mass that the priest has his back to the people." Asked, "As something obligatory?" he replied, "Yes. Now there's nothing like a consensus in favour of that at the moment. I think I would be in favour of it because it makes it patently clear that the priest is not the centre of the show, that this is an act of worship of the one true God, and the people are joining with the priest for that."

On the *onetimothyfour* blog - March 23, 2009

### 2) EVER WONDER . . .

**Why** the sun lightens our hair, but darkens our skin?

**Why** women can't put on mascara with their mouth closed?

**Why** is 'abbreviated' such a long word?

**Why** don't you ever see the headline 'Psychic Wins Lottery'?

**Why** is it that doctors call what they do 'practice'?

**Why** is lemon juice made with an artificial flavour, and dishwashing liquid made with real lemon juice?

**Why** is the man who invests all your money called a broker?

**Why** is the time of day with the slowest traffic called 'rush hour'?

**Why** didn't Noah swat those two mosquitoes?

**Why** do they sterilize the needle for lethal injections?

You know that indestructible black box that is used on planes? **Why** don't they make the whole plane out of that stuff?

**Why** don't sheep shrink when it rains?

**Why** are they called apartments when they are all stuck together?

If flying is so safe, **why** do they call the airport the terminal?

From *Inspired*, the parish magazine of St. Katherine's, Lincoln, U.K.

### 3) Rome and Orthodoxy

Meeting together at the *Council of Ferrara-Florence* (1438 – 45), Catholics and Orthodox spent just 10 days discussing papal primacy. By contrast they devoted some 10 months to debating the Procession of the Holy Spirit and the addition of the *Filioque* ("and [from] the Son") to the Creed. About four months were taken up with the subject of Purgatory and the blessedness of the saints.

Today our priorities are certainly different. Both Catholics and Orthodox would now consider that the chief difficulty is precisely the issue to which *Ferrara-Florence* devoted no more than a small fraction of its time: the papal claims.

At Ravenna, in October of 2007, the Joint International Commission for the dialogue between the two Churches unanimously approved a substantial agreed statement on "Ecclesial Communion, Conciliarity and Authority" in which the question of papal primacy was directly discussed.

Fundamental to the Ravenna statement is the principle that primacy and conciliarity are strictly interdependent. There can be no proper functioning of collegiality at the episcopal level unless one among the bishops is recognised as primate. But equally the primate cannot function except in

consultation with the college of bishops.

The Ravenna statement takes as its basis a threefold distinction: at the local level, the authority of the diocesan bishop; at the regional level, the authority of the bishop who has primacy in a particular area; and at the universal level, the authority of the Bishop of Rome as Sovereign Pontiff.

This [Ravenna] statement, . . . is of great importance. It is the first time, at any rate in recent history, that on an official level the Orthodox Church has accepted in principle the universal primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

Excerpts from *Primate or protos?* in the July 29, 2009 issue of *The Tablet* - by **Metropolitan Kallistos Ware**, Assistance Bishop in the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain, and a member of the Joint International Commission

4) From *Faith of our fathers* in the August, 2010, issue of *New Directions*, by **Father Arthur Middleton**:

. . . Christian belief moulds and fashions human conduct . . .

. . . a Christian cannot separate what he believes from the moral consequences of that belief.

. . . if we examined the lives of those shining examples of practical Christianity in all ages, an Augustine or Francis of Assisi, we would find that the overwhelming majority would attribute what was good in their lives to their definite beliefs.

You cannot be a Christian and live by the values of a secular culture.

5)



Our ad in *The Interim* - Canada's Life and Family Newspaper.

## ADDRESS BY CARDINAL LEVADA - 6 of 6

### **Five Hundred Years After St. John Fisher: Pope Benedict's Initiatives Regarding the Anglican Communion**

The Eastern Churches - like the Ukrainian Catholic Church so numerous in Canada - are in the fullest sense of the term *churches*, since they have valid apostolic succession and thus, valid Eucharist. They therefore are called Churches *sui iuris* because they have their own legal structures of governance, all the while maintaining bonds of hierarchical communion with the Bishop of Rome. The term *church* is applied differently to the Anglican Communion for reasons rehearsed over a century ago by Pope Leo XIII in *Apostolicae cura*, so the legal framework for Anglican communities seeking full communion precisely as communities has to be different from that of the Eastern Churches. They remain part of the Western Latin Church tradition. That is why the Holy Father has decided to erect "personal ordinariates," in order to provide pastoral care for such groups who wish to share their gifts corporately with their Catholic sisters and brothers, and with whom they have shared a long history before the Reformation in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

The Apostolic Constitution of Pope Benedict XVI is a courageous way of seeking to ensure that distinctive elements in the Anglican world which foster Catholic unity, can remain distinctive when groups of Anglicans enter full communion. This is to the enrichment of everyone, even though these distinctive elements are to be lived ordinarily by those who come from an Anglican background.

Already in 2003, *The Book of Divine Worship*, being elements of the Book of Common Prayer revised and adapted according to the Roman Rite for use by Roman Catholics coming from the Anglican tradition, was published with the approval of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops of the United States of America and confirmation by the Apostolic See.

*Anglicanorum coetibus* envisages not only the inclusion of significant elements of Anglican ritual for Anglican groups coming into full communion, but also certain pastoral practices that are part of their heritage in order to provide a greater continuity for

enriching their spiritual and ecclesial life in the future. Moreover, among the distinctive elements of Anglican heritage should be included the spiritual and intellectual gifts of the Oxford Movement in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The then-Anglican cleric Newman, together with his fellow Tractarians, have left a legacy that still enriches a common Catholic patrimony.

This is the first time that the Catholic Church has reached out, in response to men and women of Western Christianity who desire full communion, and accorded them a distinctive place in the path toward full communion. This is not surprising. Twenty-eight years ago, the great historian of ecumenism, Yves Congar, wrote that, if we take seriously that the Holy Spirit has been working among our fellow Christians, we have to take seriously the ways they express their beliefs. When their particular expression of faith adds harmony to ours, and ours add harmony to theirs, the logical step is to pass from talking longingly about unity to living in unity - a unity whose essence is revealed in harmonious diversity.

The unity Christ desires is visible. It is not elusive or even unreachable. Likewise, the totality that Christ desires is visible. These assertions lie behind the famous teaching of *Lumen gentium* that the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church. But it is equally true to say that the unity Christ desires for his Church can always be added to, just as there is

room for another instrument in the orchestra. The totality that Christ desires does exist in terms of the elements of sanctification and truth that the Church possesses. But the sharing of those elements, and the manner of celebrating them, is still far from complete. We sometimes do not know the value of what we possess, and we need the Spirit-filled insights of others to recognize the treasures we have.

#### IV. Conclusion

The Eucharist is the summit and the source of Christian life. It is celebrated in notably different ways in the various Churches that make up the Catholic world. Each liturgical rite sheds light on the mystery of the Eucharist - its re-presentation of the sacrifice of Calvary; its strengthening of the Mystical Body, the Church; the Real Presence of our Savior; the foretaste of the heavenly banquet, and so on. May the diversity in unity that is the Eucharist - Joseph Ratzinger has said there is really just one Eucharist with many altars - be a model for the Christian unity to which we are all committed.

This Address by **His Eminence William Cardinal Levada**, Prefect of the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, as part of the *St. John Fisher Visitor Lecture Series*, was presented on Saturday, March 6, 2010 at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

### **MAYBE NOT ALL OF THE ANGLICAN PATRIMONY!**

---

Anglican Patrimony appears to be quite a fluid term. Different individuals have different definitions, and others are wondering which one is accurate. Having spent years in Protestant circles looking at Anglicanism (and Episcopalianism) from the outside, as well as having spent a few years as an Anglican, and more recently a couple of years as an Anglican wanting to be Catholic, I have seen an interesting twist in the idea of an "Anglican Patrimony". I know some Anglicans who are perfectly clear on what they define the Patrimony as, and a few others whose theology is a bit more fuzzy (figuring it out is like trying to nail jello to a wall).

As a Baptist, I came upon one church after another that had written its own statement of faith. Each one had a different phrase or point that they felt was essential that the others did not have. I, myself, had wanted some kind of "confession of faith" that was more broadly based. I sought after something that would have some historicity to it; I liked reading the Church Fathers, and I earnestly longed to be able to say, "our confession was first written hundreds of years ago" (to me that felt like it would be ancient).

Eventually, I found the London Baptist Confession of 1689 and thought I had seen the shekinah glory. From there, the transition was quite easy to the Westminster Confession of Faith (the confession written by Presbyterians in 1647). The two were very similar and that meant there was little that was new. Though I had a few "exceptions" over issues that I was unconvinced about (I never believed the Pope was the Antichrist) I stayed with that as "my" confession for many years.

When I joined the Reformed Episcopal Church some of the priests referred to themselves as "Presbyterians with a Prayer Book" so that made the move into a logical next step in my spiritual journey. That meant the Thirty-Nine Articles. The substance of the Articles was not terribly different than what I was used to in Reformed Presbyterian circles. I read them, studied them, discussed them, wrote articles on them, and bought a number of books that gave deeply specific exegesis.

At this point, I became acutely aware of something that disturbed me. Whereas in Protestant

Evangelical circles there were numerous opinions as to what each statement of the confessions exactly meant, they each believed that there really had to be only one true opinion. In all these Anglican commentaries, I was finding a resistance to "over-defining" and something of a joy in being non-specific. I even had one priest tell me that the "unofficial mascot" of Anglicanism was the duck-billed platypus; because he was so hard to narrow down and define, and "Anglicans like it that way". About the same time, I was at a synod meeting and listened to a debate over the particulars of one statement in the diocesan constitution. The first comment was, "can we be more clear and define exactly what it means for the priest to ensure 'reverent music' in the liturgy?" The response was, "no, most of us prefer things less specific, that is what it means to be Anglican after all."

Then I picked up a copy of the Catechism of the Catholic Church and I started to read. By comparison with the Confessions I once held to, or the Articles that (I thought) I held to, this was massive. I even once asked myself if anyone could really be sure about that much? As I read, I found a wealth of information and specific definitions that was exactly what I had been looking for all my life. Yes, this "statement of faith" had only been written a few years before, but its content was the same as what the Church held to centuries before any Protestant Confession came on the scene. This was definitive truth that was not a resistance to clarity. With an allowance for variation in non-essentials, it was an encouragement to faithfulness in the essentials. Things that were left vague in the Anglican denomination I was a part of (artificial contraception, tradition, ecclesiastical authority, etc.), were now a "given", and with the authority of the

historic Church behind it. I found such joy in digesting these words, that I began to find that the "via media" of Anglicanism was not much different than the "everyone interprets for himself" that I came across so often in Protestantism.

If being "non-specific" in the arena of theology and practice really is a part of the Anglican Patrimony, then that is something we should not try to maintain in the Ordinariates. Though there are Anglicans who are pleased with the specificity of the Catechism of the Catholic Church, there are others who prefer things left open and vague; apparently so that each priest can "choose for himself" and not have any rules to tie him down. This may work fine when everyone agrees on the historic faith, but when the historic faith is jettisoned (as in the TEC) chaos will soon follow. If we let each man decide for himself we are slowly, but surely, led into positions that our forefathers would have gagged at. The "undefined Anglican" way can easily be confused with being gracious towards our brethren and thus giving them the benefit of the doubt in those non-essential areas where we may not see eye to eye. The latter practice is a good thing, and it shows brotherly love and the biblical principle of treating others as better than ourselves. Yet, the desire to maintain a lack of clarity so that we can be free of restrictions is a dangerous thing. The sinfulness of our hearts cannot be trusted, and the latitude that comes with being "undefined" can only lead to another disaster like The Episcopal Church. When we enter the Ordinariate, let us rejoice in the specifics; thank the Magisterium for their teaching; and give praise to God that we have a clear direction to go in and a definition of who we are and how we are to live.

By **Fr. Chori Seraiah** - July 25, 2010

## THE NEW DANCE ON A PINHEAD

---

It's been a long time since Nietzsche announced that God is dead. But debates over the existence of God have taken on an urgency in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, mainly argued by atheists eager to take on those long-dead monks who counted the angels dancing on the head of a pin. Theology is not a popular subject at the dinner parties of urban political sophisticates; a host who says grace before a meal could curdle the gazpacho. But atheism is a fashionable topic in Washington.

Some atheist tomes become best sellers, but all taken together cannot remotely compete with sales of the Bible. No hotel guest reaches into the drawer of a bedside table for the *50 Voices of Disbelief: Why We Are Atheists*, nor are any of these volumes ever likely to find a sponsor like the *Gideons*, who

have distributed more than a billion Bibles, translated into 80 languages. The Bible has even made the top 10 highest grossing book apps for the *iPad*. Atheists think of themselves as nonconformists, but the catechism of unbelief is as old as the doctrines against the mythical Greek and Roman gods. A modern atheist is likely to quote Lucretius, the Roman poet who in the first century B.C. famously wrote: "To such heights of evil are men driven by religion." Who can dispute that? Or that "to such heights of evil are men driven by disbelief"?

Modern atheist intellectuals (and those who only imagine they're intellectuals) are more likely to mock believers as rubes, rascals and rednecks. Religious men and women - descendants of those who

endowed our great universities and medical centers - have throughout history shown great acts of courage and sacrifice, like the medical missionaries slain in Afghanistan. But atheists are unwilling to celebrate the belief behind such generosity and goodness. Satan remains a more colorful figure than a benevolent God. Marlowe, Milton and Goethe knew that. Shakespeare understood that "the evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones."

I've spent several long summer afternoons reading the books of the New Atheists, looking for original illumination on behalf of godlessness, but finding instead smug, shallow and arrogant assertions. Atheists by definition believe in nothing, and anyone would find it hard to make something of nothing.

The most rigorous criticism of the atheist authors comes from David B. Hart, cultural critic in *First Things*, who says atheists make him melancholy because they lack the moral intelligence and courage of their forefathers in faithlessness, and thus purchase their atheism cheaply. Hart likens their pretensions to those of a man who considers himself a great lover because he has the price of admission to a brothel: "So long as one can choose one's conquests in advance, taking always the paths of least resistance, one can always imagine oneself a Napoleon or a Casanova . . . one without a Waterloo, the other without the clap."

The latest into the fray are the brothers Hitchens, Christopher and Peter, both former Marxists who are the Cain and Abel of the contemporary duelists over God. Christopher, author of *God Is Not Great*, wins arguments with wit and drollery. He speculates that the title of his book might be one word too long. But

his writing on atheism is short on sophistication. "With all this continual prayer," he asks with the air of an adolescent, "why no result?" But since he's been diagnosed with cancer, he seems to appreciate not only his physicians but the "astonishing number of prayer groups" working on his behalf.

His brother Peter is less concerned with proving the existence of God, which he thinks is better done with poetry, than with showing the damage done to society by zealous atheists like those he and his brother once celebrated. More prosaic than Christopher, he is more successful in exposing the viciousness of the secular Leninists, Trotskyites and Stalinists.

In *The Rage Against God: How Atheism Led Me to Faith*, Peter criticizes the culture of the 1960s, when adults, without a fight, surrendered their children to the adolescent rebellion where many of them still reside. He's tough on the double standard of leftists who boast of their contempt for the Judeo-Christian tradition and give Muslims, whose treatment of women, homosexuals and traditions of freedom of speech atheists say they abhor, a pass. The left's hostility toward Christianity is specific "because Christianity is the religion of their own homes and homeland." Even so, the leftists get no ticket to Utopia.

"The concepts of sin, of conscience, of eternal life and divine justice under an unalterable law, are the ultimate defense against the Utopian's belief that ends justify means and that morality is relative," he writes. These are the safeguards against the worship of human power. Believe it or not.

By **Suzanne Fields**

## IF I TOLD YOU TO WEAR BLUE SHOES . . .

---

One of the reasons I stuck to the little Cathedral of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Ottawa was the holy presence of Bishop Robert Mercer. It was not only what he said, but how he said it that made me know I had found my church home. As he and his successor Bishop Peter Wilkinson, with the help of suffragan Bishops Carl Reid and Craig Botterill lead us to communion with the Holy See, I feel settled, deeply peaceful and somehow protected from much of the spiritual warfare that seems to be carpet bombing many of us.

One Sunday several years ago, during the "breakfast" after Mass, Bishop Mercer and I had a chat about authority and obedience that I have never forgotten.

"If I told you to wear blue shoes, I hope you would disobey me," he said in that indisputably Bishop Mercer way. "I have no authority to tell you to wear blue shoes."

"But if I tell you this is what you must believe because this is what the Church teaches, then I hope you would obey me."

(I may not have the second quote exactly right, but that was the point he was making.)

I bring all this up because proper authority is so little understood these days. Authority has become a dirty word. Everyone seems to be out there wanting to do their own thing, be their own pope or bishop and determine for themselves what the Church teaches. And, sadly, they are reaping the



consequences for doing so.

The consequences I have witnessed include: lost peace; people's spiritual state allowing their becoming a conduit for the fiery darts of the enemy; confusion and a lack of spiritual growth - a sense of being stuck.

Interestingly, I had been taught to honor the spiritual authority of my pastors and the headship of my husband through the teachings of a charismatic pastor from New York, who taught a winter Bible school in my part of Ottawa. I later invited Penn Clark to come teach for two consecutive years at ladies' retreats put on by Kanata Baptist Church, my previous church home and still a place very dear to me.

One year, we invited the ladies from a local Anglican Church to join us and Penn taught on headship. Now this is an extremely controversial topic, especially in our seeker-friendly evangelical circles where equality is all the rage and wives are not expected to submit to their husbands. But he courageously presented this teaching, and set me up for eventually accepting such doctrines as Apostolic Succession. Penn has this teaching up on his website. Here is an extremely important point that I have proven in my life through practical experience:

When God's order is honored it acts like a spiritual umbrella, which protects us from the assaults from the enemy. Christ protects the husband, the husband protects the wife, and together they protect the children. Pastors protect the flock as they submit to Christ. If we reject this prescribed order we are no longer honoring what God has established and can lose our protection, break the flow of nurture, guidance and provision that God wants to give us. I have seen where it often stops people from growing spiritually.

People need to be aware that to reject our husband's place of authority, or our pastor's place of authority, is to reject Jesus' role as our Head.

Think about this. Of course, authority can and has been abused. We are not, as Bishop Mercer says, to don blue shoes or jump to meet any unreasonable request.

But is what Bishop Mercer and the other bishops leading us into unreasonable? What I am finding so beautiful is that the guidance of our bishops here in Canada is identical to that which I see from the Catholic bishops I have come to know and love through my work. It's an authority that comes from servant leadership, an invitation to follow rather than a heavy power play. And of course, for years, even long before Cardinal Ratzinger became Pope Benedict XVI, our bishops were Ratzingerians, rooting for him in the conclave because he himself is such a servant leader under the authority of the precious Deposit of Faith handed faithfully from generation to generation from those first eye-witness accounts of the Apostles.

I often pray for a teachable spirit and the grace of a contrite heart and the courage to obey when God reveals His will to me. I also pray to have a submissive, obedient nature and eyes to see and hear God speaking to me through those in authority over me. It is way too easy to see the human flaws, the cracks in the jars of clay, in our spiritual leaders. It's my prayer today that all of us will instead discern the treasure within and how God is speaking to us through our shepherds. And let us continually hold them up in prayer also since they have a huge responsibility. They will answer for our souls.

Some of us may have husbands who are not submitted to Christ, or pastors or bishops who we may judge to be not particularly great examples of holy obedience. But Penn stressed that God still will speak to us through this flawed "chain of command." He gave the example of a boss he once had, a woman at an advertising agency who wore thick red lipstick and constantly smoked cigarettes.

He did not like being under this woman's authority at all. But as he began grappling with a growing understanding of God's use of hierarchy, he said he began to hear God speaking to him from time to time through those lipsticked lips and the haze of smoke.

We must also pray for our bishops and encourage them in the awesome and daunting responsibility they have.

By **Deborah Gyapong** - July 19, 2010 - *The Anglo-Catholic* blog

---

## WHAT DOES 'DOING THE RIGHT THING' ENTAIL?

---

***"Righteousness, righteousness shall you pursue." Deut. 16:20***

The great Chassidic master Rebbe Simchah Bunim of P'shis'che observes that the repetition of the word "righteousness" means that one should pursue righteousness with righteousness.

We may not use unjust methods even in the interest of a just cause.

The end does not justify the means. In commerce, good and bad are determined by outcome. Profit is good, loss is bad. If someone undertakes a project in a helter-skelter manner and ends up with a windfall profit, he is a good businessman. If someone does a careful market analysis, uses every bit of caution in setting up his business and goes bankrupt, he is a bad businessman.

It is unfortunate that our preoccupation with commerce has resulted in our personal lives being influenced by commercial standards. We often evaluate ethical good and bad by results rather than by process.

Rabbi Chaim Shmulevitz, the late dean of the Mirrer Yeshiva of Jerusalem, cites the incident where Moses chastised the High Priest, Aaron, for burning a sacrificial offering against his instructions. Aaron argued that Moses may have erred in understanding the Divine commandment. Moses conceded that Aaron was right.

"You are right. God had indeed commanded as you said, but I had forgotten" (Leviticus 10:20, Zevachim 101b).

Rabbi Shmulevitz points out that Moses was faced with a dilemma. Inasmuch as he was the sole conduit of God's word, to admit that he had forgotten something and erred would have placed the authenticity of the entire Torah (Bible) in jeopardy unto eternity. "If Moses could err in this, where else might he have erred?" It would perhaps be better if he said to Aaron, "What I instructed you was right." Moses decided that he had only one responsibility: to tell the truth, whatever the consequences may be.

Preserving the authenticity of the Torah was God's problem, not his. His duty was to tell the truth.

There is an interesting question that arises from a unique halachah, Jewish law. The Talmud states that in a case of capital punishment, if all seventy-one judges of the Sanhedrin (Supreme Court) vote "guilty," the case is dismissed. The rationale is that the cross-examination of the eyewitness was so meticulous that a minor discrepancy in the testimony was usually found, and this was enough to invalidate the testimony.

Therefore, if the testimony coincided so perfectly that there was not even the slightest difference between the two so that not even one of the seventy-one judges could vote "not guilty," this was ample reason to believe that the witnesses had been carefully rehearsed and that the accusation and testimony was set-up.

The votes of the Sanhedrin were oral rather than by secret ballot. The question arises, suppose that seventy judges vote "guilty," and the seventy-first judge happens to feel that the defendant was not guilty. If he casts a "guilty" vote, then the rule that a unanimous guilty verdict results in acquittal will apply, and his opinion that the defendant is not guilty will be implemented. However, if he votes "not guilty," then there is no unanimous vote of "guilty," and the verdict will be that of the majority: guilty. Should this last judge, therefore, vote "guilty" in order to achieve the acquittal that he believes to be just?

The Ohr HaChaim says that the last judge must vote his opinion of "not guilty," even though that will result in the opposite of what he believes to be just. Why? Because a person is obligated to speak the truth as he sees it, rather than consider the result.

According to Torah ethics, the process must be righteous, because it is the process that lies in human hands. Results are up to God.

By **Rabbi Abraham J. Twerski**

**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)