

The Sodality of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

A Catholic Community of the Anglican Use, Diocese of Hamilton

www.stedmund.ca



September 14, 2012 - **The Exaltation of the Holy Cross**

OCTOBER SCHEDULE

October 7	Sunday	The Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity
October 14	Sunday	The Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity
October 21	Sunday	The Twentieth Sunday after Trinity
October 28	Sunday	The Twenty-first 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) Mark your calendars!

Sunday, October 21 at 5:00 p.m.

Father George Nowak, CR, Pastor of St. Mary of the Seven Sorrows, in Kitchener, has kindly invited us to celebrate our **Anglican Use Mass** in his church at 56 Duke Street. (You may recall that Father Nowak invited us to Vespers and Benediction, about 18 months ago, with a Reception following, to discuss *Anglicanorum coetibus* with Catholics from various Parishes in the area.)

Father William Foote, our Chaplain, (and Pastor of St. Patrick's in Cambridge) will be the celebrant.

Mr. Robert Tasse, the Music Director at St. Mary's will be the organist. The Cantor will be Mr. Andrew Malton, a parishioner of St. Louis' in Kitchener.

We will be advertising the Mass in the local papers.

This Mass will give us an opportunity of 'exposing'

other Catholics, Anglicans, Protestants, and others in the area, to the beauty of our Mass.

Please mark your calendars. We hope you are able attend. Please pass on the word!

A Reception in the Parish Hall will follow the Mass, with time for Questions and Answers about our Community and the Anglican Use Mass.

2) **THE MASS AS SACRIFICE** - 4 of 7 - this page.

3) **ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS - PETER AND PERSECUTION: PORTSMOUTH** - page 3.

4) **THE PROBLEMS OF FREE WILL, EVIL, AND HELL** - 2 of 2 - page 4.

5) **PLAYING IN THE BIG LEAGUES NOW** - page 6.

6) **FROM HERE AND THERE** - page 7.

THE MASS AS SACRIFICE - 4 of 7

"A Pure Sacrifice"

So what did the Jewish people think they were doing when they offered sacrifice? Sacrifice was required for the forgiveness of sin. In the words of Psalm 32: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." The idea was taken up by the Letter to the Hebrews: "Under the Law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood, there is no forgiveness of sins." Of course, Hebrews continues, "It is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins."

The people of the Old Testament weren't naive. They knew sacrifice wasn't magic. They knew that "God demanded an *interior* sacrifice as well." Psalm 51 puts it like this: "For in sacrifice You take no delight / Burnt offering from me You would refuse / My sacrifice a contrite spirit / A humble, contrite heart You will not spurn." And the prophet Hosea says: "For I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God, rather than burnt offerings."

"The passage in which Abraham is about to sacrifice his son Isaac can validly be read: 'God will provide Himself the Lamb, for a burnt offering'"

"The blood of animals could neither 'atone' for sin nor bring God and men together. It could only be

a sign of hope, anticipating a greater obedience that would be truly redemptive." Israel hopes for a Messiah, a new Prophet, a new Passover and a new Covenant. The Old Testament is orientated to the future. Malachi foretold that God would send His Messenger to purify His people "till they present right offerings to the Lord. Then the offering [the sacrifice] of Judah and Jerusalem will be acceptable to Him." By tradition the Messiah would come on Passover night.

"Christ, our Passover Lamb, has been Sacrificed"

Christ's earthly ministry approaches its climax as He enters Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover. He sends Peter and John to prepare for the Passover meal. They had to get a lamb. That didn't mean going to Sainsbury's or the local butcher: Their lamb had to be sacrificed in the Temple before it could be eaten at the Passover supper.

The biggest difference to the Jewish religion between the time of Jesus and today is the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. The Temple was a wonder of the ancient world, vast, ornate and rich. Its destruction was one of the most controversial and compelling of Jesus' prophecies. "The days will come when there shall be left not one

stone upon another that will not be thrown down." That happened within a generation as the Romans destroyed Jerusalem and razed the Temple in 70 AD.

That's my real grudge against *Seder* meals. They don't do what they claim. They don't accurately portray the Passover meal as it was at the time of Jesus, because the Jewish religion has fundamentally changed. There's no more Temple sacrifice. There hasn't been for almost 2,000 years. The Jewish faith is now based on the synagogue and the rabbi. The Passover meal has been ripped from its sacrificial context. "Judaism at the time of Jesus was much more like Catholicism (priests leading worship based on sacrifice), whereas rabbinic Judaism after the Temple's destruction was more like Protestantism (Scripture teachers leading worship without blood sacrifice)."

The fact that Temple sacrifice came to an end for ever in the first century AD does not mean that God is through with sacrifice and priests. It doesn't mean we've graduated to Bible study and fellowship meals. Remember what Jesus said: "Think not that I have come to abolish the Law and the Prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them. Temple sacrifice is no longer needed because it has been fulfilled by Christ, Who "offered for all time a

single sacrifice for sins". The rabbis at the time taught that once the Messiah came "all sacrifices will cease except the *toda* sacrifice [the thanksgiving sacrifice, what the Greeks translated as "eucharist"]. This will never cease." The sacrifice of Christ remains.

But back to the Last Supper: No one who went to Jerusalem for the Passover at the time of Christ would have had any doubts. This was about sacrifice. The Jewish historian Josephus tells us that 250,000 lambs were sacrificed in the Temple for the two and a half million pilgrims. As the lambs' throats were slit and their blood drained, they were fixed on two wooden staves at right angles to be skinned, gutted and cleaned. Interesting: the lambs were crucified.

St Luke makes clear the context of the Last Supper: "Then came the day of Unleavened Bread, on which the Passover lamb had to be sacrificed." As the Passover lambs are being sacrificed in the Temple, *the* Lamb of God is preparing for His sacrifice.

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

PETER AND PERSECUTION: PORTSMOUTH

Now it's Turkey, populated mostly by Turks and Kurds. In NT times it was a collection of Roman colonies and provinces populated by a variety of ethnicities, descendants of the former Sumerian, Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian empires. Lots of Greeks had settled there. Greek was the common language. Some Celts had settled there also, the Galatians of Galatia, who gave St Paul much grief. We have his letter, "O stupid Galatians" (3,1). These provinces and colonies did not necessarily all have the same form of government. St Peter writes a circular, a pastoral letter, to the Christians of these various provinces. "Peter to the chosen in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia" (1,1). Like all the other NT writers Peter writes in Greek.

Peter writes in the early 60's AD, some 30 years after the crucifixion. He writes from Rome which in early Christian code he calls Babylon (5,13). We don't know if Peter wrote in his own hand or if he dictated to a secretary. We know that, perhaps because of eye trouble, St Paul dictated to secretaries. For example, *Romans* 16,22: "I Tertius who write the letter greet you". Paul would then sign

the letters himself. For example, *II Thessalonians* 3,17: "The greeting of me Paul with my own hand."

We don't know if Peter's secretary made copies of the letter, or if Peter expected the people in Pontus to forward their copy, when they had done with it, to the people of Galatia. Paul did this sort of thing on at least one occasion. For example, *Colossians* 4,16: "When this letter has been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of Laodicea, and do you read the letter which I sent to Laodicea".

St Peter knows that persecution of the church is about to begin. So he writes his circular to warn Christians beforehand. 4,12: "Beloved, think it not strange, the fiery trial which comes upon you". He reminds them that Christ, though innocent, also suffered. They should follow Christ's example. 4,21: "You should follow His steps Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth". St Peter advises his readers how to behave during the coming persecution.

The guiding principle is this, set out at the start of

the epistle for today. "Let your conduct be honourable among the pagans. Whereas they speak against you, falsely, as evil doers, they may by your good works which they see, glorify God in the day of persecution." Christians are to be model citizens of the empire. "Obey the laws of man for the Lord's sake. Whether the emperor here in Rome or your own local governor set over you by the emperor. For the will of God is that by well doing you put to silence the ignorance of foolish men". True, Christ has freed Christians from the corruptions of pagan society, but this does not mean that Christians are freed from the necessities of good citizenship. "You are free men but don't misinterpret that freedom."

Peter goes on in verses which are not included in today's epistle. Servants are to be good servants even if their masters are harsh and unjust. And in a society in which there is much promiscuity and infidelity, husbands and wives are to love each other. Both at home and in wider civil society, Christians should be distinctive by their virtues.

What St Peter wrote in his circular to Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, and so on, on the eve of persecution, is still relevant to all Christians of the United Kingdom, where society at large seems increasingly hostile to the beliefs and practises of Christians.

St Peter's expectations were all too correct. Persecution did begin and was to last some 300 years. It is not surprising therefore that persecution featured in the liturgy. The long consecration prayer which we use in this parish (also used in the [soon to be] Ordinariate in Canada) comes to us, like St Peter's letter, from the city of Rome. This prayer dates back to about 350, only 25 years or so after persecution had ceased. The prayer was brought to England by St Augustine when Pope Gregory sent him to convert our ancestors in 597, and when he founded his mission at Canterbury.

The prayer recalls the death and resurrection and ascension of Christ, as all consecration prayers should. But it also recalls some of those who died

for Christ's sake, some of them in Rome. Peter and Paul who wrote letters from Rome, who were executed in Rome, whose burial sites were known and remembered, over which mighty churches were later built. The prayer goes on to remember *Linus*, who followed St Peter as Bishop of Rome. A Linus is mentioned in St Paul's *second letter to Timothy*

(3,21). The prayer goes on to mention *Cletus*, next in line. And *Clement*, third in line. We know his date. 95 AD. We have two of his letters, the *epistles of Clement to the Corinthians*. The Christians of that Greek city remained as quarrelsome and fractious as they were in the days when St Paul was writing his two letters to them, urging them to love each other. And Clement mentioned in St Paul's letter to the *Philippians* (4,3) which Paul sent from Rome.

Rome was the capital of a great empire. Christians were martyred throughout that empire. *Anastasia* is mentioned in the consecration prayer, whose bones were eventually interred in what is now the capital of Turkey. *Ignatius* came from Turkey, brought all the way to Rome to be executed. We know his dates, 35 to 107. We have some of his *letters, to the Ephesians, Romans, Philadelphians*. The prayer mentions our own *St Agatha* who died in Sicily, and whose fame travelled up Italy until it reached the capital.

Yes, the consecration prayer is long. Our minds wander, which is why the prayer is printed out in full in this leaflet. Our minds also wander during Bible readings, which is why epistles and gospels are printed out in full in the Prayer Book. Far away places, Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia. Far away times, 35 AD, 60 AD, 95 AD. Long lists of names, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Anastasia, Agatha, Ignatius.

Boring? No, today's epistle and today's consecration warn us that Christ is not for sissies.

To Whom, in all lands and in all ages, risen from the dead, be adoration for evermore.

Msgr Robert Mercer CR

THE PROBLEMS OF FREE WILL, EVIL, AND HELL - 2 of 2

Today, I want to talk about probably the three most important interrelated problems facing Christianity: the problem of free will, the problem of evil, and the problem of Hell. These are not only the issues which drive people away from Christianity, but they're issues which have divided even Christians, with some Christians denying that free will even

exists, while others deny the reality of Hell.

III. The Answer in Genesis

This is the answer which seems to be given by Scripture. God says in This is the answer which seems to be given by Scripture. God says in

Genesis 1:26, "Let Us make man in **Our image**, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground." The "image of God" isn't a physical description, but a spiritual one.

What distinguishes us from animals is our ability to make moral choices. For example, it's meaningless to say that an animal is "evil," since even the deadliest of animals simply obey blind instinct. But because man has free will, we can refer to him as "good" or as "evil." It's only because of free will that we can have a meaningful relationship with God. But conversely, it's only because of free will that Hell exists.

In Genesis 2:16-17, God says to Adam, "You are free to eat from any tree in the garden; but you must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat of it you will surely die." The serpent says to Eve (Gen. 3:4-5), "You will not surely die. For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil." It turns out that God was telling the truth, while the serpent was telling a half-truth (Gen. 3:6-7):

When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye, and also desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it. **Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realized they were naked**; so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves.

So **it was true** that their eyes were opened. They came to know good and evil. But in coming to know good from evil, they came to know shame. Suddenly, Adam and Eve become morally responsible for their actions, because now *they know better*. They've lost their ignorant innocence. All of us go through this in our own lives, as we mature from small children.

But the rest of what the serpent said was false. Unsurprisingly, God was telling the truth: acquiring knowledge of good and evil requires death. Not simply the death of innocence, but the risk of eternal death - Hell. Tiger Sharks kill one another in the womb. But they're not at risk of Hell for this fratricide, because they're not morally responsible agents. In contrast, when Cain kills Abel (Genesis 4:1-16), he **is** morally responsible.

That brings us, more or less, to the present day. We

have free will, which is good. And we have the knowledge of good and evil, which helps us make informed moral choices. But because we have knowledge of good and evil, we're accountable for our actions. That includes the risk of Hell.

IV. Why Create the Damned, Then?

The best challenge I've heard to Christianity is this one: why did God create the damned at all? After all, God:

- wants all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth. (1 Timothy 2:4)
- knows perfectly well who will choose and who will reject Him. (Romans 8:29; John 21:27)
- knows that for the damned, it would be better not to have been born. (Mark 14:21)

God desires the best for everyone, including those who end up in Hell. If that weren't the case, we could imagine a higher good than God. And He knows the terrible fate of the damned. Yet in His Goodness, He's not going to stop the free will of damned, just as the military doesn't stop free elections, even when it becomes clear we're going to make a terrible choice we'll have to live with four years.

Having said all that, couldn't God simply *not create the damned*?

If God foreknows that Adam, Betty, and Charles will accept the grace of salvation, but that David, Ellen, and Francis will reject it, ending up in eternal anguish, why create David, Ellen, and Francis at all? Why not create a world with only Adam, Betty, and Charles in it?

I struggled with this issue for a long time, but having listened to some brighter minds than mine talk about it (like William Lane Craig), I'm satisfied that there's a good answer. God foreknows that in a world with Adam, Betty, Charles, David, Ellen, and Francis, the first three will go to Heaven and the last three to Hell. But that **doesn't** mean that things would look the same in a world with just Adam, Betty, and Charles.

Perhaps it was the bad example of Francis which turned Betty away from a life of sin; or perhaps Charles came to know Christ through caring for his father, David. After all, there are plenty of priests and preachers whose *own* souls are in danger, yet these same people often lead others to Christ.

None of us go through life in isolation: were

surrounded, and influenced, by countless numbers of those around us, sinners and Saints alike. To imagine that we could change one variable - much less a million variables - without impacting the final outcome seems naïve.

Finally, consider the fate of Judas. It's of Judas that Jesus says, "It would be better for him if he had not been born" (Mark 14:21). Yet Judas is the one who betrays Christ, and his betrayal results in Christ's Death on the Cross, which results in our Redemption. Every Saint in history profited directly from Judas' betrayal. That doesn't make that betrayal alright (obviously - it wasn't as if Judas was

being public-minded), but it does give us a hint into why God would permit someone like Judas to exist. There's no question that Jesus loves Judas, that He would have taken Him back in an instant if Judas had converted. Yet God, knowing Judas' stubbornness and sinfulness, was able to draw profit from that, too. He's *always* able to draw good out of evil (Romans 5:20). Here, He drew the supreme good, the Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Christ, out of the supreme betrayal.

From the [catholicdefense.blogspot](http://catholicdefense.blogspot.com) - *Shamelss Popery* - August 5, 2011

PLAYING IN THE BIG LEAGUES NOW

So, I've made it. I'm in the big league, I'm a player. It's like being awarded the Order of Canada, but important. I've got a major death threat. I've had a few in the past, but this one is serious. Here it is: "Islam doesn't allow honour killings, but yeah, people like Pamela Gellar and Coren, oh yeah, totally allowed, aren't there any Muslims in the U.S. and Canada who can kill these pigs? Any Muslim? Please for the sake of Allah, can someone plz kill these pigs." And then, "Guns can be bought in sports shops in the U.S. and Canada, people get mugged and even killed in the cities, can't any Muslim kill these pigs? Ayan Hirsi, Pamela Gellar and Coren?"

So, there it is. A member of the religion of peace calls for me and some much braver and bolder people to be killed. Why? Because I allow Islam to speak for itself, expose itself, explain itself. The police have been informed, the FBI alerted, but I'm not losing any sleep about it. Frankly, I've been threatened by better people than this. But it speaks of far more than its mere words. It's self-evident, and almost redundant, that venomous and vile things are said about Christians, and in particular Roman Catholics, on a daily basis. In the past months alone, arsonists set fires at two Canadian Catholic churches and a convent was vandalized. These criminal acts were given hardly any publicity at all.

Which is not to say that I think nonviolent criticism, and even abuse, should be silenced. All I ask for is a level playing field, where we are given room to defend ourselves. As for anti-Muslim comments, they are similarly repugnant; but an informed criticism of Islam is something entirely different, and this is seldom heard or even allowed in mainstream media.

I write and say things about the history and teaching of Islam because I appear on *Sun News*, a station that refuses to be intimidated. But I am part of a small group, and I could not speak and write this way in any Muslim country and probably couldn't say much or most of it even in Europe. In France, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Norway, Belgium and many other countries I'd probably be physically attacked and likely have my career terminated.

But it's not about me, but about free speech. Free speech not as some woolly philosophical concept but as one of the bricks in the wall that provide the defence of our values and dignity against the barbarism that is beyond it. We have long taken it for granted because it seemed so obvious. We refrain from abuse and insult because we're civilized; we speak truth, even if it offends, also because we're civilized.

But today we've reversed the equation. We insult and abuse and think it adult and sophisticated, but flee from bold, authentic speech because we're frightened of being accused of political incorrectness, racism, homophobia or Islamophobia.

Let's speak briefly about the separation of church and state. We don't have it officially in Canada, but most of us assume that the relationship between the secular and the religious is a tenuous one, one that we know has to be handled with mutual respect. Neither state nor church should dominate. But this is a Christian or a Jewish idea, even a Hindu or Buddhist idea, not an Islamic one. It is intrinsic to genuine Islam that there is no, and can be no, separation; the state is Islamic, just as every aspect of one's life is Islamic. In some ways this is admirable, but it does suggest that Western, Christian based pluralism and democracy is incompatible with Islam.

You may hear gentle, compromising talk from some Muslim leaders about this, but look to those countries with an Islamic majority, or even a substantial Muslim minority, and see that Islamic actions speak louder than liberal words. As the left folds and atheism surrenders, the Roman Catholic Church is left as the sole institution that can provide a wise, firm and compassionate opposition to Islamic

aspirations. Death threats against me are mere symptoms. The cause is much deeper, and the remedy Christian, papal and with roots deep in Christendom, Rome and the Church.

By **Michael Coren** - *The Catholic Register* - July 29 - August 5, 2012 edition

FROM HERE AND THERE

1) 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.
Dennis McInerney

2) The obedient are not held captive by Holy Mother Church; it is the disobedient who are held captive by the world! **Diane M. Korzeniewski**

3) Catholic Women who changed the world

Edel Quinn

Edel Quinn was an impeccably dressed young woman with arresting blue eyes. She hailed from Cork, attended a finishing school in Cheshire and worked as a secretary. At 20, she joined the Legion of Mary. Feeling the stirrings of a vocation, she declined a proposal of marriage from a successful businessman, Pierre Landrin.

But Edel's plan to become a Poor Clare was ended by a serious case of TB. But Frank Duff, the Legion's founder, saw that despite poor health Edel had great potential and appointed her the Legion envoy to Africa. In 1936 she began a new life in Africa. She worked alone in a state of exhaustion, but founded hundreds of Legion branches, multiple councils and enthused thousands of Africans with love for Our Lady. Her work extended as far as Mauritius.

She died in 1944, when she was only 36, having spent eight years in Africa.

Miraculous occurrences are associated with Edel Quinn. A Dublin friend of hers was a young mother in dire straits. One day, the young mother was crossing O'Connell Bridge, so depressed that she was about to drown herself in the Liffey. Suddenly she saw Edel Quinn ahead. She hurried towards her, forgetting suicide, but could not find Edel. Two days later, the young mother read that, shortly before she spotted her in Dublin, Edel had passed away in Nairobi.

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

4) Nuncio celebrates ordinariate Mass amid new wave of converts

The Apostolic Nuncio to Great Britain has celebrated the first Chrism Mass of the Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham.

Archbishop Antonio Mennini celebrated the Mass on Monday at the church of St. James, Spanish Place, in London with 60 former Anglican clergy, including five former Anglican bishops, concelebrating. Hundreds of laity from groups across Britain were in attendance.

Archbishop Mennini celebrated the Mass at the request of the Ordinary of the Personal Ordinariate, Msgr Keith Newton.

Msgr Newton, who received the Renewal of Priestly Promises and preached at the Mass, said: "The jurisdiction given to me, unlike that of Catholic diocesan bishops, is vicarious on behalf of the Roman Pontiff.

"It is therefore particularly appropriate that our Chrism Mass should be celebrated by the Holy Father's representative to Great Britain particularly as at this time we celebrate the 30th anniversary of full diplomatic relations between the British Government and the Holy See."

Speaking of the priesthood, Msgr Newton said: "No man possesses the priesthood just as no one possesses baptism or marriage. They are something shared. You cannot be married on your own and cannot live the baptised life apart from other Christians.

"No, the priesthood possesses us. It is a life. It is a particular way of living the Christian life. But it is not for ourselves but for Christ and his holy people. It is a life of sacrifice.

"Although much is written about priesthood, it is far too complex to be reduced to simple statements which we can easily understand because it is nothing less than a particular sharing in the eternal priesthood of Christ.

"That sharing is expressed visibly today as we gather round the altar to celebrate this Mass."

In Holy Week over 200 former members of the Church of England and the Traditional Anglican Communion are expected to be received into full communion.

The Catholic Herald - April 16, 2012

5) The newest Ordinariate

After a long gestation, the Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of the Southern Cross was born on 15 June 2012. The skilled, encouraging and patient midwife has been Bishop Peter Elliott, the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference Episcopal Delegate for the Ordinariate.

Australian Ordinariate Born

Bishop Peter Elliott is an Auxiliary Bishop of Melbourne. Bishop Geoffrey Jarrett, the Bishop of Lismore, and he have been two of the members of the Bishops Commission for the Personal Ordinariate. Both are former Anglicans and both were present at St Mary's Cathedral in Perth when Archbishop Timothy Costelloe ordained Harry Entwistle, formerly Bishop of the Western Region of the Traditional Anglican Communion, to the priesthood in the Catholic Church on 15 June.

After the Ordination Mass, Bishop Elliott proclaimed Benedict XVI's erection of the Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of the Southern Cross, under the patronage of Saint Augustine of Canterbury. Father Harry Entwistle was announced as Ordinary. Several hours earlier 40 of the laity of his congregation were admitted to the Catholic Church. They received their first communion with him at the Ordination Mass. My wife and I came over from Melbourne for the Mass. It was a joyful occasion, replete with hymns from Anglican patrimony. Since then Father Harry has admitted another 20 of the laity in Perth.

A spread out Ordinariate

Father Harry has a big patch. To give some idea of the distances involved, the distance from Perth in the south west across the continent to Melbourne in the south east is roughly equivalent to the distance

from London to Athens, and from Perth to Rockhampton in the north east (where there will also be an Ordinariate congregation), it is roughly equivalent to the distance from London to Damascus. Other Ordinariate congregations will be spread over Australia.

Melbourne Meeting

Melbourne is very likely to be the next Ordinariate 'cab off the rank'. At an Ordinariate Information Day on 14 July in Melbourne, Father Harry spoke of those entering the Ordinariate taking on the Catholic culture of being much more community orientated, and bringing with them the treasures of our Anglican heritage, including our English Spiritual Tradition (which we need to rediscover), which claims continuity with the desert fathers and mothers, with the Celtic Church, Saint Augustine of Canterbury, Saints Benedict, Anselm, Bernard, Aelred, the English mystics of the 14th century, such as the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, Margery Kempe, Henry Rolle, Walter Hilton, Julian of Norwich and later, the Reformers, the Caroline Divines of the 17th century and the Tractarians, in particular Blessed John Henry Newman. He also encouraged the tradition of the expectation of the laity to join the clergy in reciting or hearing daily matins and evensong.

Father Harry said, "The Ordinariate will grow and become financially self-supporting if we keep our eyes on the Lord, if we are faithful in prayer, scripture reading, study, reception of the sacraments, are evangelistic and live the Christian life wherever we are and whatever we do."

By **John Parkes** in the August 2012 issue of ***The Portal***

6) The Ordinariate is not an Anglican Preservation Society, living in some imagined golden age. It is a non-geographical diocese within the Western Catholic Church, committed to proclaim the gospel and be evangelistic. We will have our liturgy that reflects our English tradition, but it is not an end in itself. It reflects what we believe and pray, and its language will be of our tradition. **Msgr Harry Entwistle**

7) In his recent book *The Mystery of the Mustard Seed: Foundations for the Thought of Benedict XVI*, Cardinal Koch, the President of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, argues that the Holy Father believes that renewal of the Church begins with small movements and that great things begin with small steps.

All we (in the Ordinariate) can pray for is that we might make a small contribution to that renewal.

Msgr Kieth Newton (Ordinary, The Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham)

8) What is 'hate speech'? It's speech the authorities hate. No doubt, it is often worth hating, but it is also, by definition, speech that falls short of being unlawful. Hate-speech legislation can only ban free speech. Prohibited speech is already banned. Crime is hemmed in by strictures against slander, official secrets, perjury, fraud, incitement to riot and so on. When laws go beyond suppressing crimes, they suppress opinion and creed. There's nothing else for them to suppress. And a society that suppresses opinion and creed isn't liberal. **George Jonas** in the *National Post*, August 22, 1012

9) Joint Message to the Nations of Poland and Russia

Today our nations are faced with yet new challenges. Fundamental moral principles based on the Ten Commandments are questioned under the pretence of retaining the principle of secularism or the protection of freedom. We are faced with the promotion of abortion, euthanasia and same-sex relations, persistently shown as a form of marriage; a consumerist lifestyle is endorsed, traditional values rejected, while religious symbols are removed from public space. Quite often we encounter signs of hostility towards Christ, His Gospel and Cross; attempts are made to exclude the Church from public life. A misinterpreted secularism assumes a form of fundamentalism and in reality is a form of atheism.

www.chiesa.espressonline.it - from a *joint declaration* signed on August 17, 2012, in Warsaw, by **Cyril, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia**, Head of the Russian Orthodox Church, and **Józef Michalik, Archbishop Metropolitan of Przemysl**, President of the Polish Episcopal Conference [Catholic].

10) Ever wonder about the origin of Hocus Pocus (hocus-pocus)?

To-day the term is a supposed magical charm uttered by magicians, a general term for trickery or magic. Like, abracadabra, and shazam.

In all probability, hocus-pocus is nothing other than a corruption of *hoc est corpus [meum]*, the words of institution in the Latin Mass - this is [my] Body!

11) By Dom Gerard, Prior

"Recently an agnostic, faced with our foundering civilisation in thrall to liberalism ("to every man his own religion", and so "to every man his own morality" - you can see just how far that can go!) and to materialism (a two-dimensional universe without after-life or a beyond) remarked: "You monks, you are the most useful members of society". We retorted: "How can you say that if you believe neither in God, prayer, nor heaven?" He replied: "Because we are witnessing a haemorrhage of values, a continuing evolution where everything is questioned, a real collective suicide. Now amidst the general rout, you monks are witnesses to the permanence of values. **And make no mistake the day you cease to be uncompromising you will interest us no longer** [Emphasis is mine - GSF]".

Dear friends, shall we search together this evening for the secret of an institution [this *Monastery of Sainte-Madeleine-a-Bedoin*] which even agnostics regard as an immovable rock in the midst of this rush to the abyss?"

From a lecture - November 24, 1977

12) Wilberforce

I'm reminded of the work of William Wilberforce in England. You may recall that in debate after debate after debate, and in election after election after election, Wilberforce was soundly and roundly defeated when he sought the abolition of slavery in the British Commonwealth. But if ever there was an exercise in perseverance, it was by Wilberforce. Wilberforce refused to give up. He simply would not walk away from being the conscience of the English nation. And he publicly testified that slavery was wrong and he promised to oppose it as long as he had breath in his body. And finally in the providence of God, Parliament woke up and abolished this unethical practice that was a plague on the English speaking world.

From *Principles for Voting* by **R.C. Sproul**:

<http://www.ligonier.org/blog/principles-for-voting-text/>
Thanks to **Steve Cavanaugh** at *The Cavalier's Commonplace Book*

13) 4 husbands

The local news station was interviewing an 80-year-old lady because she had just gotten married for the fourth time. The interviewer asked her questions about her life, about what it felt like to be marrying again at 80, and then about her new husband's occupation. "He's a funeral director," she answered.

"Interesting," the newsman thought.

disabled."

He then asked her if she wouldn't mind telling him a little about her first three husbands and what they did for a living. She paused for a few moments, needing time to reflect on all those years. After a short time, a smile came to her face and she answered proudly, explaining that she had first married a banker when she was in her 20's, then a circus ringmaster when in her 40's, and a preacher when in her 60's, and now - in her 80's - a funeral director. The interviewer looked at her, quite astonished, and asked why she had married four men with such diverse careers.

(wait for it) . . .

She smiled and explained, "I married one for the money, two for the show, three to get ready, and four to go."

Thanks to **Jeff Speek**

14) Worried

A serious article in the *Journal of Medical Ethics* calls for the introduction of infanticide for social and medical reasons. Titled "After-birth abortion: why should the baby live?" it contains these words:

"After-birth abortion (killing a newborn) should be permissible in all cases where abortion is, including cases where the newborn is not

The authors, Alberto Giubilini of the University of Milan and Francesca Minerva of Melbourne University, suggest "foetuses and newborns do not have the same moral status as actual persons".

Lord Alton, co-chairman of the All Party Parliamentary Pro-Life Group, was quoted by *The Catholic Herald* saying that infanticide was the "chilling and unassailable" logical step for a society that permits killing a baby one day before birth. He continued: "That the *Journal of Medical Ethics* should give space to such a proposition illustrates not a slippery slope, but the quagmire into which medical ethics and our wider society have been sucked."

[One is reminded of the words in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* - You shall not kill the embryo by abortion and shall not cause the newborn to perish.

God, the Lord of life, has entrusted to men the noble mission of safeguarding life, and men must carry it out in a manner worthy of themselves. Life must be protected with the utmost care from the moment of conception: abortion and infanticide are abominable crimes. Paragraph 2271.]

From an article by **Will Burton** in the September 2012 issue of ***The Portal***

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)