

# The Parish of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

Waterloo, Ontario  
www.stedmund.ca

## UPDATE

The Anglican Catholic Church of Canada / The Traditional Anglican Communion

October 13, 2011 - **St. Edward, King and Confessor**

### *NOVEMBER SCHEDULE*

---

November 1	Tuesday	All Saints' Day
November 2	Wednesday	All Souls' Day
November 6	Sunday	The Twentieth Sunday after Trinity
November 13	Sunday	Remembrance Sunday
November 20	Sunday	Christ the King / The Sunday Next Before Advent
November 27	Sunday	The First Sunday in Advent
November 30	Wednesday	St. Andrew the Apostle

### *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) <b>THE GENESIS OF ANGLICANORUM COETIBUS</b> - this page, the third of four parts. | 4) <b>MONEY MATTERS - But not the way you think</b> - page 6.            |
| 2) <b>ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS - Sheep and Goats</b> - the second of two parts - page 3.   | 5) St. Jude - <b>SOMEBODY'S WATCHING US</b> - page 8.                    |
| 3) <b>WHAT IS THE ANGLICAN PATRIMONY?</b> - the second of two parts - page 4.        | 6) 'Reductions' - <b>FINDING THE HOLES IN PRO-CHOICE LOGIC</b> - page 9. |

### THE GENESIS OF ANGLICANORUM COETIBUS - 3 of 4

---

#### The Third Group, or "the Dog that Did not Bark" paragraph 13:

At this point, when I first began to prepare this presentation, I feared that I would have to make an attempt at adjudicating the relative importance of the Roman dealings of the TAC, on the one hand, and of FIF/UK, on the other. However, I can avoid this thankless, and potentially offensive, task by telling instead a third Anglo-Roman story, one which has gone almost completely unnoticed by the media, due most likely to its lack of success, or seeming lack of any concrete results, but which may have been more influential in hastening - hastening by Vatican standards, at least - the production of AC, as well as accounting for some of its features. I am referring to an approach to Rome by a number of Church of England diocesan bishops in early 2008, an approach which resulted in eighteen months of clandestine meetings and conversations, and which seemingly led some Roman authorities to believe that two or three Church of England bishops would accept the offer proffered to them (and others) in AC. Since this third story has received almost no publicity, and one may even wonder (in the light of what will follow) whether elements of the British media have deliberately avoided publicizing it, I have prepared two documents for distribution, documents to which I have given the respective titles of "Exhibit A" and "Exhibit B."

"Exhibit A" consists of two paragraphs from the address, "Five Hundred Years after St. John Fisher: Benedict's Ecumenical Initiatives to Anglicans" that Cardinal Levada delivered at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada on March 6, 2010. An official text of this address has never been made public, but an unofficial transcript can be found online.

It is portions of paragraphs 13 and 21 of that address that are of peculiar interest in the context of the subject of this paper. The paragraphs state:

A more general analysis of the work of ARCIC II goes beyond the scope of this talk, not to mention the time available. But there's one statement, "Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church", that addresses the question of homosexuality, which, in the past decade, has become another church-dividing issue in the Anglican Communion and potentially between the two Communion, and thus also touches our topic, **since it motivated the need seen by some Anglicans to request the possibility of corporate union with the Catholic Church, to which *Anglicanorum coetibus* is a response.**

paragraph 21:  
**As we met with Anglican consultants in the preparation of *Anglicanorum coetibus*, these bishops and theologians** themselves proposed the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* as the norm of faith for the corporate groups of Anglicans who might avail themselves this new instrument for full corporate union with the Catholic Church. Thus, I would also characterize the Catechism as an ecumenical initiative of Pope Benedict XVI and of his predecessor.

I have bolded the portions of each paragraph to which I wish to draw your attention.

In paragraph 13 Cardinal Levada tells us that it was "the question of homosexuality" that "motivated . . . some Anglicans" to request "corporate union" with the Catholic Church and that (as we are left to infer) it was the approach of these particular Anglicans that brought the process of producing AC to a position of high priority, while in paragraph 21 he tells us that in the process of preparing AC there were consultations between the CDF and Anglican "bishops and theologians."

Now this is curious information. What "constituency" would have been motivated by "the question of homosexuality?" Not the TAC, since this "question" was not, and never had been an issue for them, and had nothing whatsoever to do with their petition to the Holy See; and not FIF/UK either, since that "question" was not a factor in their origins (and indeed when FIF/UK declared some years after the organization's foundation their corporate adherence to the traditional and magisterial Catholic teaching on the subject of homosexual practice it met with some dislike from certain of its individual members and sympathizers) and not an issue on which they have been particularly energetic in their advocacy of Catholic Truth. And what "constituency" could have engaged in an ongoing "consultation" involving "bishops and theologians" during the genesis of AC between, say, October 2007 and October 2009? Again, not TAC, since the contacts between it and the CDF in that period, contacts which may have involved no more than two individuals from either side, were kept very low-key indeed; and not FIF/UK either, since more than one person in the best positions to be informed about these matters have told me that there were no consultations involving FIF/UK and the CDF in this period, beyond the meetings in April 2008 and January 2009, which in any case hardly merit the description of "consultations." At this point I wish to draw your attention to "Exhibit B."

"Exhibit B" is an article dated July 5, 2008 by the then Religious Affairs Correspondent of *The Sunday Telegraph*, Jonathan Wynne-Jones, and which appeared the following day; it can be found online.

According to this article "a group of conservative bishops" of the Church of England met with "members of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith" for "highly confidential discussions." Those interested in these matters should read this article carefully, as possibly it is more remarkable for what it does not say, and what it avoids saying, as for what it does say, which is remarkable enough. What does it not say? Well, for starters it does not give any date for the meeting, if indeed we are to infer from it that there was only one meeting - "have held secret talks," as the subtitle runs, seems deliberately ambiguous - and there is nothing in it to warrant the conclusion that the meeting (or meetings) occurred (or began) shortly before the July 5 date of the article. And we must remember that the article appeared just one day before the crucial General Synod vote on July 7 - the Synod's July 2008 session ran from Friday, July 4 to Tuesday, July 8 - that the woman bishops' legislation to be drafted would not contain adequate safeguards for the opponents of the purported ordination of women and would, in fact, do away with the most important safeguards that had been embodied in the "Act of Synod" of 1993. And what does it avoid saying? To quote from the article itself, "The names of the bishops are known to *The Sunday Telegraph*, but they have asked for anonymity because the talks are of such a sensitive and potentially explosive nature." We may well marvel at such rare journalistic discretion.

This paper was presented by **Dr. William Tighe** at the **2011 Anglican Use Conference**, which took place on July 7 - 9, at the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Arlington, Texas.

## ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS

---

### **Sheep and Goats - 2 of 2**

*An address given in the mid 80's in the RC church of Our Lady of Lourdes, Bulawayo, at a joint Quiet Day for RC and Anglican clergymen. The RC bishop gave the other address. PB Evensong was said.*

While we were yet sinners Christ died for us. The grace of God goes before, not only on one Good Friday long ago in the land of Judah, but also in our own lives. If we repent, it is only because God enables us to do so. If we commit ourselves, it is only because God leads us to do so. God not only gives us Christ as our Redeemer, God also gives us the faith by which to accept His Gift of Christ.

We meet, not only in Passion-tide, but also on the eve of the Annunciation (March 25, p.271 of the PB), one of the loveliest festivals in the Christian year. There are many reasons why we love the

mother who, precisely because she is the mother of Jesus, is our mother also.

1. We love her because of our concern for right responses. "Behold the handmaid of the Lord. Be it unto me according to thy word". (*Luke* 1,39) Her advice to the servants at the wedding, "Whatsoever He saith unto thee do it". (*John* 2,6) In her own life she anticipated to some extent the perfect obedience of her perfect Son Who prayed "Nevertheless not what I will but what Thou wilt". (*Mark* 14, 36) The 2<sup>nd</sup> century theologian, Irenaeus, tells us that if Christ is the Second or New Adam,

whose obedience cancels out the disobedience of the First Man (*Romans* 5), then Mary is the Second or New Eve whose obedience cancels out the disobedience of our First Mother.

2. We love her because of "the scandal of particularity". "This is none other but the house of God and this is the gate of heaven". (*Genesis* 28,17) The 9<sup>th</sup> century hymn puts it, "Thou wast the gate of heaven's high Lord, the door through which the Light hath poured". (EH 215) This is the ark and the throne of God in which He journeyed and from which He reigned, not tables of stone, but the Most High Himself. This is the burning bush, this is Mount Sinai where man meets with God and still lives. This is the ladder down which descended, not angels, but the Son of God himself. John Donne, the famous 16<sup>th</sup> century Dean of St. Paul's in London, addresses her like this, "This All which always is all everywhere yields Himself to lie in prison in thy womb," and again, "immensity cloistered in thy dear womb". Who does not think of Mary when he hears the prophet *Isaiah* say? "Verily thou art a God that hidest Thyself, O God of Israel". (45,15)

3. We love her because of the English word lady. It derives from two older Anglo Saxon words meaning to knead dough. A lady is one who kneads dough and provides her family with bread. Mary is twice a lady. She is lady to the Lord because she provided Jesus with bread to eat. She is our lady because she provided us with the "Bread of life". (*John* 6,50)

4. The Religious Left loves Mary because of the *Magnificat*. "He hath put down the mighty from their seat and hath exalted the humble and meek". (*Luke* 1,52) For them she is the fore-runner of Karl Marx.

There are many reasons why we love the mother who, precisely because she is the mother of Jesus, is our mother also. The 16<sup>th</sup> century German reformer, Martin Luther, and the 16<sup>th</sup> century St. John of the Cross, are at least agreed about her. Luther

says, "Mary is the mother of Jesus and the mother of us all. All that He has must be ours. It is God's overflowing goodness that man should be honoured with such treasure. Mary is his mother. Christ is his brother. And God is his Father." St. John of the Cross says, "Mine are the heavens and mine is the earth. The mother of God is mine. God himself is mine and all for me because Christ is mine and all for me".

There are many reasons why we love the mother. We love her because she is the living sign and symbol of, the living proof of, the loving witness to, the prevenience of God's grace. Wherever we hear her mentioned; wherever we see her depicted; wherever she is commemorated in East or West, the text from *Romans* comes to mind, "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us". (5,8)

She grows greater and greater with Child. She trudges down from Nazareth to Bethlehem. She dandles a Baby upon her lap. He rears a Boy. Nobody understands. Nobody believes. Nobody cares. There's no faith, no commitment, no response. But God is working His purpose out and her "childbearing is the beginning of our salvation". (old RC collect)

While we were yet sinners, the Annunciation. While we were yet sinners, the Visitation. While we were yet sinners, the Nativity. While we were yet sinners, Jesus at the age of 12 in the temple. While we were yet sinners, the wedding at Cana. While we were yet sinners, Mary at the cross. While we were yet sinners, Mary and the Twelve waiting for the Spirit. While we were yet sinners, Christ died and revived that He might be Lord both of the dead and the living. (*Romans* 14,9)

To Whom with His Father in the unity of their Spirit be praise for evermore. Amen.

+Robert Mercer CR

## WHAT IS THE ANGLICAN PATRIMONY? - 2 of 2

### ***A distinctive tradition of pastoral care.***

This grows out of the previously mentioned domestic approach to parochial life and is, at least in part, a function of the typically small size of our parishes. Spiritual direction, counseling, and confession are approached in a way that emphasizes that which is pastoral, practical, and empirical rather than juridical.

*The Book of Common Prayer* provides the structures

of the parochial system of pastoral care, providing in a distinctive way for initiation, catechesis, formation in morals and ascetics, nourishment in prayer and sacraments, clear teaching on the responsibilities of clergy and laity in the good order of the Church.

### ***An ascetical structure for a distinctive way of being Christian.***

*The Book of Common Prayer* defines the Anglican way of being Christian, with three essential

elements: the Sunday (and Holy Day) Eucharist, the Daily Office, with its Psalter, Scripture and set prayers, and the "private" prayer of quiet and meditation.

A characteristic theological method and temper which is, at its best, at once scriptural, traditional, and patristic.

While (with recent exceptions) the Anglican Way has insisted on a well-educated clergy, theology has been done largely within a pastoral context. The greatest of Anglican theologians were pastors (Hooker, Keble, Newman, Ramsey).

The classical Anglican theological method might be characterized as more Benedictine than Jesuit. It is focused on Scriptural foundations, as Scripture is presented by the Fathers and the living tradition of the Church. We expect this method to find its perfection in the authority of the Magisterium. Indeed, those of us who are accepting the generous offer expressed in *Anglicanorum coetibus* are doing so because we have been brought to the conclusion that it is only in communion with the Magisterium that it can be perfected.

The aspiration of this method is best summarized by the formula of Saint Augustine of Hippo, "In essentials, unity; in doubtful things, liberty; in all things, charity." Populated by believers chastened by the four and a half centuries of the "Anglican experiment," the Ordinariates can serve as a vehicle whereby it may be demonstrated that unity in essentials cannot be maintained on a basis of theoretical consensus, but must have in this world a personal focus who can speak authoritatively in the Name of the Personal Savior of man.

***A tradition of reverence in the practice, and especially in the language, of public prayer.***

For nearly five centuries, Anglican worship has been characterized by the use of reverential language for liturgical prayer. In this, it follows a well-established pattern dating back at least to the patristic era and likely to the beginning of worship, which is the use of a more classical form of the vernacular, in contrast to the contemporary form. (Contrary to popular assumptions, the language of the Prayer Book and the King James Bible is not, nor ever was intended to be, the daily vernacular of the street and the marketplace. The composers and translators of these great monuments of the English tongue were very concerned with writing in a "language understood of the people," but they never made the mistake of confusing that with the form of that language commonly spoken by the people. The gift

in all this for Latin Rite Catholics is that it will help foster the practical re-integration of a fundamental principle of human spiritual development, which is that we are first taught reverence by being taught to act and speak reverently. (The new English translation of the Roman Missal represents another major and parallel step in this enterprise of recovery.)

There is in this aspect of the Anglican heritage a strikingly harmonious resonance with the longstanding concern of Benedict XVI with the re-sacralization of ecclesiastical life, in which the re-sacralization of worship has an instrumental role. (This concern seems to be very closely connected in principle with his and his predecessor's urgent desire for the re-evangelization of Western society.)

***A musical tradition which is both broad-based and consistent with the ethos of the Anglican tradition of common worship, of which it is an integral component.***

The Anglican patrimony has as one of its notable elements a hymnody which, while spanning the ages from the late patristic to the contemporary, and styles from Gregorian monophony to modern polyphony, is directed toward the enhancement of worship and being the handmaid of the liturgy. Most Anglican congregations - including those in which a choir plays a major role in the offering of the liturgy - are notable for the quality and natural willingness of the concerted singing of the members.

Again, there is here a noteworthy resonance with the concerns of the Holy Father, which include the recovery of much of worth in the musical treasury of the Church that has been eclipsed in recent decades.

***A long experience with lay participation in church governance as regards temporalities.***

This is an element that is not unfamiliar to the other members of the Latin Rite after several decades of Parish Councils. However, because of its longer history among us, we may be able to assist our brethren in pointing out some of the pitfalls of the system as well as its positive potentialities. Its continuation in a form consistent with Canon Law is certainly anticipated, especially in Article X, §4 of *Anglicanorum coetibus*.

***Married Clergy.***

For the last 450 years Anglicans have had married as well as celibate clergy, as the Latin Rite does now, ordaining as a rule celibate men to the

priesthood, but married men to the permanent Diaconate. *Anglicanorum coetibus* recognizes the fact, and provides for it, while also affirming the discipline of the Latin Rite of which the Ordinariate will be a part.

### **Conclusion**

We wish to emphasize most clearly that we wish to offer the riches of the Anglican patrimony in a spirit of humility and gratitude both for the gift of the patrimony itself and for the gift of the means now made available by the Holy Father for the incorporation of this patrimony into the living treasury of Holy Church. We claim no inherent superiority for the Anglican Way, and are mindful that *Anglicanorum coetibus* provides not just a means of incorporation, but a means for correction, if necessary. We wish to retain only that which is

consistent with the fullness of the Catholic Faith.

By **The Rev. Samuel L. Edwards**

On the Eve of Corpus Christi / Commemoration of Saint Alban, Protomartyr of England  
June 27, 2011

*I wrote this paper at the suggestion of Fr David Ousley, who (along with fellow-contributor Cav. Michael LaRue) contributed significantly to its content. After receiving the approval of Bishops Campese, Falk, and Moyer, it was sent to Fr Scott Hurd (Cardinal Wuerl's assistant for the ordinariate process) in case His Eminence wishes to circulate it among the members of the USCCB. It makes no pretense to be the last word on the subject, but to help start a discussion that will benefit both us and our brethren and soon-to-be co-religionists.*

## **FROM HERE AND THERE**

---

1) "The Lord did not say: This is symbol of my body, and this is a symbol of my blood, but rather: **This is my body and my blood**. He teaches us not to look to the nature of what lies before us and is perceived by the senses, because the giving of thanks and the words spoken over it have changed it into flesh and blood." **Theodore of Mopsuestia**, Epistle to Magnus

2) While driving in Pennsylvania, a family caught up to an Amish carriage. The owner of the carriage obviously had a sense of humour, because attached to the back of the carriage was a hand-printed sign - 'Energy efficient vehicle: runs on oats and grass. Caution: do not step in exhaust.'

3) It is fitting that we should pay honour to **Mary the Mother of our Lord**, for her life and character, for that obedience that made her a sharer in the work of Redemption wrought by Christ, and for her exaltation over all other creatures and that she is the chief amongst the Saints and nearest to Our Lord in heaven. For all

this it is fitting that we should ask her prayers, and there is no more appropriate way than by the use of that prayer in the devotion we call the Angelus:

Hail, Mary full of grace,  
The Lord is with thee;  
Blessed art thou amongst women,  
And blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus.  
Holy Mary, Mother of God pray for us sinners,  
now and at the hour of our death. Amen.

From a booklet by **Frank F. Laming**, Provost of St. Mary's Cathedral, Glasgow

4) **A fact from the 1500s:**

Baths consisted of a big tub filled with hot water. The man of the house had the privilege of the nice clean water, then all the other sons and men, then the women and finally the children. Last of all the babies. By then the water was so dirty you could actually lose someone in it. Hence, the saying, 'Don't throw the baby out with the bath water!'

## **MONEY MATTERS**

---

***But not the way you think***

**St. Matthew, patron saint of bankers, pray for me.**

This is how I open and close each day. I am a banker and in the business of buying and selling money. There is a common misconception among



the faithful that having money is bad, and having a lot of money is *really* bad. Conversely, it is thought that not having money (or enough money) is somehow morally sanctifying. While this attitude is widespread, it misses the point: Money is not really about money at all. In fact, understanding the true nature of money - and, more broadly, wealth - and its role in our journey through the material world is key to more fully understanding God's plan for each of us.

### **What is money?**

At its core, money is a medium of exchange that facilitates the transfer of goods and services. Recall the example from Economics 101: I have a sweet tooth, so I trade my guitar for your bicycle so that I can get across town to trade the bicycle to the winemaker (who needs a non-motorized means of transportation). In exchange for the transportation help, the winemaker gives me a bottle of fine wine to exchange with the pastry chef (who is a connoisseur), which enables me to finally get the crême brûlée that I am craving. The inefficiency here is obvious. Clearly, I am better off selling my guitar and using the money to buy my sweet indulgences directly. At its essence, this is what money is: a lubricant to increase the velocity of exchange.

Money provides the means to meet our basic needs - food, shelter, clothing, and transportation - but only if others are willing to produce the things that we need. While it is popularly thought that money makes us independent, the opposite is actually true. Currency makes us *interdependent*, because it only functions if others accept its value and are willing to use it in exchange. Simply put, money is a sign of the interdependence of man.

### **How much money is enough?**

We can all agree that if a person does not have enough money for the basic needs of himself and those dependent upon him, he does not have enough money. Beyond the benchmark of meeting basic needs, the answer to the question of how much money is enough is a very personal and often difficult question to answer. These three steps will help you come to a conclusion:

Step One: Evaluate the genuine needs in your life. Genuine needs are those things in life that you must have to develop into the kind of person that God has called you to be. Education is an example of a genuine need. Although education is not a basic need for survival, we know that it is impossible for us to reach our potential as productive members of our society without it. In conducting an accounting of your own life, these

needs become clear.

Step Two: Beyond the meeting of our own basic and genuine needs, as business professionals, we must also contend with another set of needs often referred to as profession-related needs. These needs are those things that are required of us in order to fulfill our profession in life. An example of a profession-related need for a banker may be a professional wardrobe suitable for serious business meetings, or a set of golf clubs to facilitate client interaction and business dealings. Again, this type of accounting is very personal.

The challenge comes next. What about the money that is left? How are we to understand the excess above these core needs?

Step Three: We must consider the money needed for acquiring what can be termed as beneficial goods. These are goods that would improve us as persons but are *not critical* to our personal development. They are not essential and are truly discretionary. Here is where we often find the most challenging questions about how we use our money and how much money is enough. It is in this area that the exercise of the virtues is critical - particularly the virtues of temperance and prudence.

Ultimately, how much money is enough is a prayerful question between you and God.

### **How does God understand wealth?**

Most business-minded Catholics are aware of Christ's admonishment of the wealthy man in the Gospel of Matthew (Mt 19:24). Unfortunately, this is often where they begin and end their investigation of what our faith has to say about wealth.

In the story, Jesus instructed a young man, who inquired about how to obtain eternal life, to keep the commandments. When the young man pressed further by insisting that he already observed the commandments, Jesus countered that if he wishes to be perfect, he must "go, sell what you have and give to [the] poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me." The Gospel goes on to say that the young man was saddened by Jesus' response, because he had many possessions. Then addressing His disciples, Jesus said: "Amen, I say to you, it will be hard for one who is rich to enter the kingdom of heaven. Again I say to you, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for one who is rich to enter the kingdom of God."

The message is clear and challenging: Riches are a distraction and hard to share if one is too attached to them. This is both a warning and a reminder: Wealth comes with great responsibility and risk, and the person of means must always be spiritually vigilant.

But dangers aside, wealth is not inherently a bad thing. In *On the Love of the Poor*, St. Gregory Nazianzen encourages the wealthy to "give thanks to God that you are among those who can do favors and not among those who need to receive them; that you need not look up to the hands of others but others to yours. Do not be rich only in your wealth but also in your piety; not only in your gold but also in your virtue, or better still, only in the latter."

He wasn't alone. Origen, in his *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, outlined the various ways Christians can obtain God's forgiveness of transgressions. The third way (or path) calls for the giving of alms as a method of cleansing one's soul; the sixth path requires an abundance of charity, citing the Sermon on the Mount's passage, "Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy" (Mt 5:7).

We all have an obligation to exercise charity (love). For the wealthy, this love is to be manifested not only in the relief of temporal sufferings of the poor but also in helping create opportunities for the poor to escape their material poverty. Similarly, the poor have an obligation to always maintain the spirit of hope that God stamps into us all. This hope in the

midst of desperate circumstances serves as an example and inspiration to the wealthy to remember that all of us must rely upon God.

Christianity requires social solidarity. In his *Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, St. John Chrysostom allows no loopholes:

[I]f in world matters no man lives for himself, but artisan, soldier, farmer, and merchant, all of them contribute to the common good, and to their neighbors advantage, much more must we do this in spiritual things. For this is, in the true meaning of the term, to live. He, who lives for himself only and overlooks all others, is useless. He is not even a man and he does not belong to the human race.

As business people, we have a vocation to create wealth to use in service to our fellow man. By taking advantage of our God-given talents (and the resources those talents generate) in the marketplace, we facilitate the productive interdependence of all God's children. Furthermore, we serve God by helping create a world where the needs of our brothers and sisters are met not merely at a level of sufficiency, but with the hope for abundance rooted in the understanding that productivity is part of God's plan for all of us.

**Dawn Carpenter - *Crisis magazine* - June 10, 2010**

## SOMEBODY'S WATCHING US

---

When I was young, I was given St. Jude as my patron saint. Then years later, I found out that he is the patron saint of lost causes and hopeless cases . . . hmmm; did someone back then have a "prophetic moment"? No Saint could be more fitting for me; really. I was indeed the lost cause. I was never exactly a "rabid anti-Catholic" like many of those in the circles I used to frequent, but I did point out my disagreements with the Catholic Church more than once. Of late, I have often taken solace in Paul's assertion that he persecuted God's Church in "ignorance" for that was my experience also. Whenever I spoke against Catholicism it was (I know now, but did not know back then) all based on errant views of what Catholicism is.

So, when I was about seven years old and we were attending Mass less than annually, St. Jude was praying for me. When I was in my early teens and falling into various worldly habits, St. Jude was praying for me. When I arrived at my middle teens

and was being led into all kinds of heretical ideas, St. Jude was praying for me. When I was in my late teens and getting into some quite unholy behaviors (those were the years I gave my guardian angel an ulcer), St. Jude was praying for me. When I found my way into Protestant Churches and was imbibing various errors, St. Jude was praying for me. About this point in time, most people would have given up on me ever coming back to the Catholic Church. When I started reading the Church Fathers, St. Jude was (really) praying for me. When I started rejecting core Protestant doctrines, St. Jude was (really intensely) praying for me. Now that I am in process to come home to Mother Church, I know that "the prayers of a righteous man availeth much" and that St. Jude was indeed the right Saint to be given watch over me (whether anyone back then knew what they were doing or not). His statue now sits on my desk as a constant reminder of what he did and is still doing.



Some of my former colleagues in Protestant denominations would scoff at me and say that I was never "really and truly" saved, and that this proves it because I fell away. They would also tell me that no saint in Heaven has any idea what is going on down here on Earth. The perspective of the saints in Heaven is certainly not one of those things that you can quantify or examine under a microscope. Science is completely unfit for the task of examining spiritual reality; its limitations are even worse in this area than in others. Yet, that fateful day when I read that I was "compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses" who were watching me "run . . . the race that is set before" me (Heb 12:1), I asked myself: "Are these saints really witnesses to what I am doing?"

The list of saints in Hebrews 11 is a list of people whose deeds were seen (by God and men) to be faithful so they "obtained a good report" (Heb 11:39; which uses the verbal form of the same noun for "witness" in Heb 12:1). Then the author says next that we are surrounded by witnesses. His whole point is to say, "here are faithful men and women whose works were seen as righteous, and they are now watching you in your struggle to see whether your works will also be righteous." Things must be confirmed by two or three witnesses, yet we are surrounded by a multitude of witnesses. These "saints departed this life in [God's] faith and fear" are watching what we are doing. How are they able to see us? I do not know. We apparently do not need to know or we would have been told; we only need to accept that God says it happens.

They are not just watching us though. They are also hearing our prayers and praying for us. This is what we are told in the most extensive biblical description of Heaven after the Resurrection of Christ. In the book of Revelation, John says that the "beasts and elders" in Heaven receive our prayers and take part in offering them to God (Rev 5:8; cf. 8:3). St. Jude is one of those who was witnessing me and praying. He never gave up. Now when I ask him to pray for me and my family, I am confident that he is doing so.

On this week when we recognize the feast of Corpus Christi, it is quite fitting for us to think of those with whom we have communion in Heaven. It is important to remember that everything we are doing in entering the Ordinariates is for the sake of communion. The preservation of our Anglican heritage is not for our sake alone, but for the sake of the Kingdom of God. Why are we going through these struggles? It is for the sake of that most blessed of gifts; the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. It is for the glory of Christ and for the conversion of the lost that they too may partake of His very body and blood. This is what the "witnesses in Heaven" are praying for and it is what we should be praying for also.

Who is witnessing how we are behaving right now? The list of names is longer than I have room for here. As the Ordinariates are being established throughout the world, we need to be praying and have others praying for us. I know St. Jude would be joyful to have the Ordinariate succeed, but he is not exactly the expected patron saint for the Ordinariates. The Ordinariates are not a "lost cause" or a "hopeless case" regardless of what many nay-sayers have been hoping for (although St. Jude may very well be praying for them!). Whether it be Blessed John Henry Newman, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton, or Our Lady of the Atonement, they are members of that very same cloud of witnesses. They long to see the growth of the Anglican heritage within the Catholic Church, and it is their voices that are being lifted up onto the altar of God along with ours as a sweet incense. They are the "spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb 12:23) into whose presence we enter during every liturgy. Let us take heart in knowing that whatever challenges lie in our path, whatever delays may occur, and whatever confusion we may have, that there is an innumerable company of the "souls of the faithful departed" who continually behold the face of our Lord Jesus Christ and are petitioning Him for our good, both today and forever.

By **Father Chori Seraiah** - June 21, 2011

## **FINDING THE HOLES IN PRO-CHOICE LOGIC**

### ***'Reduction' procedures, where only one twin is terminated, are making even abortion's supporters uneasy***

What's worse than an abortion? Half an abortion.

It sounds like a bad joke. But it's real. According to Sunday's *New York Times Magazine*, demand is rising for "reduction" procedures in which a woman carrying twins keeps one and has the other aborted.

Since twin pregnancies are generally safe, these abortions are largely elective.

Across the pro-choice blogosphere, the article has provoked discomfort. RH Reality Check, a website dedicated to abortion rights, ran an item voicing

qualms with one woman's reduction decision. Jezebel, another pro-choice site, acknowledged the "complicated ethics" of reduction. Frances Kissling, a longtime reproductive rights leader, wrote a *Washington Post* essay asking whether women should forgo fertility treatment rather than risk a twin pregnancy they'd end up half-aborting.

In comments on these articles, pro-choice readers express similar misgivings, "Even as a woman who has terminated a pregnancy I totally understand the author's apprehension . . . Something about it just doesn't feel right," said one. A commenter at Jezebel writes that "if I were put in the position and decided to/needed to abort a single fetus, I could. But if I knew that I was keeping the baby and it turned out to be twins, I don't think I could have a reduction."

To pro-lifers and hardcore pro-choicers, this queasiness seems odd. After all, a reduction is an abortion. If anything, reduction should be less problematic than ordinary abortion, since one life is deliberately being spared. Why, then, does reduction unsettle so many pro-choicers?

For some, the issue seems to be a consumer mentality in assisted reproduction. For others, it's the deliberateness of getting pregnant, especially by IVF, without being prepared to accept the consequences. But the main problem with reduction is that it breaches a wall at the centre of pro-choice psychology. It exposes the equality between the offspring we raise and the offspring we abort.

Look up any abortion-related item in Jezebel and you'll see the developing human referred to as a fetus or pregnancy. But when the same entity appears in a non-abortion item, it gets an upgrade. A blood test could help "women who are concerned that they may be carrying a child with Down's Syndrome?" A TV character wonders whether she's "capable of carrying a child to term." Nuclear radiation in Japan "may put unborn children at risk."

This bifurcated mindset permeates pro-choice thinking. Embryos fertilized for procreation are embryos; embryos cloned for research are "activated eggs." A fetus you want is a baby; a fetus you don't want is a pregnancy. Under federal law,

any one who injures or kills a "child in utero" during a violent crime gets the same punishment as if he had injured or killed "the unborn child's mother," but no such penalty applies to "an abortion for which the consent of the pregnant woman . . . has been obtained."

Reduction destroys this distinction. It combines, in a single pregnancy, a wanted and an unwanted fetus. In the case of identical twins, even their genomes are indistinguishable. You can't pretend that one is precious and the other is just tissue. You're killing the same creature to which you're dedicating your life.

*Sophie's Choice* is a common theme in abortion decisions. To give your existing kids the attention and resources they'll need, you have to terminate your fetus. This rationale fits the pro-choice calculus that born children are worth more than unborn ones. But in the case of reduction, the child for whom you're reserving attention and resources is equally unborn. They are, and will always be, a living reminder of what you exterminated.

This is what tortures pro-choicers. "I just couldn't sleep at night knowing that I terminated my daughter's perfectly healthy twin brother," says a commenter in the *Times* story. A Jezebel reader worries about "all the poor surviving twins who will one day find out that their other is missing?"

Another Jezebel reader writes: "I'd have a much easier time aborting a single baby or both twins than doing a reduction. When you reduce, the remaining twin will remain a persistent reminder of the unborn child. I think that, more than anything would make killing that fetus feel like killing another human, even though it wasn't fully developed. It would feel that way because you would have a living copy of the person you killed."

That's the anguish of reduction: watching the fetus you spared become what its twin will never be. And knowing that the only difference between them was your will.

**William Saletan** in the *National Post* on August 18, 2011

**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)