

The Parish of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

Waterloo, Ontario
www.stedmund.ca



The Anglican Catholic Church of Canada / The Traditional Anglican Communion

UPDATE

September 9, 2008 - **St. Gorgonius**

October Schedule

October 1	Wednesday	St. Michael and All Angels
October 5	Sunday	The Twentieth Sunday after Trinity
October 12	Sunday	Harvest Thanksgiving
October 18	Saturday	St. Luke the Evangelist
October 19	Sunday	The Twenty-second Sunday after Trinity
October 23	Thursday	St. James, St. Jude and St. Simeon
October 26	Sunday	The Twenty-third Sunday after Trinity
October 28	Tuesday	St. Simon and St. Jude, Apostles

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) **Parish mission giving** - we almost double tithe to our missions work - including, but not limited to, our southern African churches (through The Parish of St. Peter and St. Paul, Vancouver), and local Waterloo Region organizations who provide: shelter for abused/battered women and their children; housing for single prenatal and postnatal women; emergency shelter and support for street children and youth in crisis; etc.

We are making an effort to follow our Lord's second commandment to "love thy neighbour as thyself", an obvious duty for all of us.

2) An extract from Cardinal Kasper's address to Lambeth, with introductory comments by Bishop Robert Mercer - *The Anglican Church and the See of Rome* - this page.

3) *Robert's Ramblings - Past and Future* - page 3.

4) Bishop George Langberg's address at the Conference of the Fellowship of Concerned Churchmen - *Christian Unity - It's not a matter of choice* - page 5.

5) *Catholics who support abortion should not receive Communion* - page 8.

6) Chuck Norris - *An Affair to Remember* - page 9.

The Anglican Church and the See of Rome

Introductory comments

An extract from the address given by Cardinal Kasper to the recent Lambeth Conference held in Canterbury. The whole address is much too long for reprinting in UPDATE. This cardinal is in charge of the Vatican's Secretariat for Unity. It was to this department that Archbishop Falk, Bishop Crawley and Fr Hepworth went some 18 years ago with the concurrence of our international College of Bishops. Our current request for corporate rapprochement with the Bishop of Rome is now being handled by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) headed by Cardinal Levada. CDF has consultants all round the world. It was to this department that Archbishop Hepworth and Bishops Wilkinson and Mercer went in October 2007 on behalf of the entire College of Bishops of the Traditional Anglican Communion. It is not unreasonable to assume that detailed dialogue is yet to take place between CDF and our representatives before any final decision is made by the Pope in consultation with his cardinals. Who our representatives might be is likely to depend on issues under discussion, whether doctrinal, historical, legal, liturgical, missionary, and so on. Not all are equally knowledgeable about all matters. Facility in different languages may also be

required: neither Rome nor TAC is exclusively Anglophone.

Official and formal dialogue between Rome and the entire "mainline" Anglican Communion has been going on for 40 years in talks known as the Anglican Roman Catholic International Consultation (ARCIC). We are not attempting anything novel, merely continuing established Anglican practice. Many agreed statements have been published and have been readily accessible. If you are unaware of these facts, one wonders if you have been hiding your head in the sand these past four decades.

Unsubstantiated gossip alleges that the late Dr Henry Chadwick (Anglican), historian and patristic scholar of Oxford and Cambridge Universities, had a hand in drafting parts of The Catechism of the Catholic Church.

+Robert Mercer CR

Lengthy extract follows

Regarding the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate, the Catholic Church's teaching has been clearly set forward from the very beginning of our dialogue, not only internally, but also in correspondence between Pope Paul VI and Pope John Paul II with successive Archbishops of Canterbury. In his Apostolic Letter "*Ordinatio sacerdotalis*" from May 22, 1994, Pope John Paul II referred to the letter of Paul VI to Archbishop Coggan from November 30, 1975, and stated the Catholic position as follows: "Priestly ordination . . . in the Catholic Church from the beginning has always been reserved to men alone", and that "this tradition has also been faithfully maintained by the Oriental Churches." He concluded: "I declare that the Church has no authority whatsoever to confer priestly ordination on women and that this judgment is to be definitively held by all the Church's faithful." This formulation clearly shows that this is not only a disciplinary position but an expression of our faithfulness to Jesus Christ. The Catholic Church finds herself bound by the will of Jesus Christ and does not feel free to establish a new tradition alien to the tradition of the Church of all ages.

As I stated when addressing the Church of England's House of Bishops in 2006, for us this decision to ordain women implies a turning away from the common position of all churches of the first millennium, that is, not only the Catholic Church but also the Oriental Orthodox and the Orthodox churches. We would see the Anglican Communion as moving a considerable distance closer to the side of the Protestant churches of the 16th century, and to a position they adopted only during the second half of the 20th century.

Since it is currently the situation that 28 Anglican provinces ordain women to the priesthood, and while only 4 provinces have ordained women to the

episcopate, an additional 13 provinces have passed legislation authorising women bishops, the Catholic Church must now take account of the reality that the ordination of women to the priesthood and the episcopate is not only a matter of isolated provinces, but that this is increasingly the stance of the Communion. It will continue to have bishops, as set forth in the Lambeth Quadrilateral (1888); but as with bishops within some Protestant churches, the older churches of East and West will recognise therein much less of what they understand to be the character and ministry of the bishop in the sense understood by the early church and continuing through the ages.

I have already addressed the ecclesiological problem when bishops do not recognize other's episcopal ordination within the one and same church, now I must be clear about the new situation which has been created in our ecumenical relations. While our dialogue has led to significant agreement on the understanding of ministry, the ordination of women to the episcopate effectively and definitively blocks a possible recognition of Anglican Orders by the Catholic Church.

It is our hope that a theological dialogue between the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church will continue, but this development effects directly the goal and alters the level of what we pursue in dialogue. The 1966 Common Declaration signed by Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey called for a dialogue that would "lead to that unity in truth, for which Christ prayed", and spoke of "a restoration of complete communion of faith and sacramental life". *It now seems that full visible communion as the aim of our dialogue has receded further, and that our dialogue will have less ultimate goals and therefore will be altered in its character.* While such a dialogue could still lead to good results, it would not be sustained by the dynamism which arises from the realistic possibility of the unity Christ asks of us, or the shared partaking of the one Lord's table, for which we so earnestly long.

Anyone who has ever seen the great and wonderful Anglican cathedrals and churches the world over, who has visited the old and famous Colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, who has attended marvellous Evensongs and heard the beauty and eloquence of Anglican prayers, who has read the fine scholarship of Anglican historians and theologians, who is attentive to the significant and long-standing contributions of Anglicans to the ecumenical movement, *knows well that the Anglican tradition holds many treasures.* These are, in the words of *Lumen Gentium*, among those gifts which, "belonging to the Church of Christ, are forces impelling toward catholic unity."

Our keen awareness of *the greatness and remarkable depth of Christian culture of your tradition* heightens our concern for you amidst current problems and crises, but also gives us confidence that with God's help, you will find a way out of these difficulties, and that in a

new and fresh manner we will be strengthened in our common pilgrimage toward the unity Jesus Christ wills for us and prayed for. I would reiterate what I wrote in my letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in December, 2004: In a spirit of ecumenical partnership and friendship, we are ready to support you in whatever ways are appropriate and requested.

In that vein, I would like to return to Archbishop Williams' puzzling question what kind of Anglicanism I want. It occurs to me that at critical moments in the history of the Church of England and subsequently of the Anglican Communion, you have been able to retrieve *the strength of the Church of the Fathers* when that tradition was in jeopardy. The Caroline divines are an instance of that, and above all, I think of the Oxford Movement. Perhaps in our own day it would be possible too, to think of a new Oxford Movement, a retrieval of riches which lay within your own household. This would be a re-reception, a fresh recourse to the Apostolic Tradition in a new situation. It would not mean a renouncing of your deep attentiveness to human challenges and struggles, your desire for human dignity and justice, your concern with the active role of all women and men in the Church. Rather, it would bring these concerns and the questions that arise from them more directly within the framework shaped by the Gospel and ancient common tradition in which our dialogue is grounded.

+Walter Kasper

Robert's Ramblings

Past and Future

It is a privilege that towards the end of my life I am able to join the worshipping community of St Agatha's, not least because of its association with the early years of my home parish in Zimbabwe, and with the early years of the Community of the Resurrection. I write these words at Mirfield on July 14, 2008, the commemoration of John Keble's assize sermon, when many around the Anglican communion are giving thanks on the 125th anniversary of the Oxford Movement. In his short life of Pusey, published in London in 1933, Canon Prestige wrote, "Keble had no need either of buttons crawling up his legs or of superfluous laces in his hat to give him dignity. The highest honour that he could desire was to know that Pusey loved him".

Bishops of the Church of England can be notorious for their infidelity to catholic faith and practice. One of them required Father Dolling to desist from extempore prayer in public, and censured him for having invited the Reverend Stewart Headlam of the Guild of St Matthew to lecture on Christian socialism. A Bishop of Portsmouth so insisted that Father Dolling cease his liturgical practices regarding the dead that the latter felt compelled to resign. As Pusey had written to Keble in

February 1842, "It is everybody's duty to maintain catholic truth even if unhappily opposed by a bishop".

Far away in what is now Zimbabwe Bishop Billy Gaul of Mashonaland, something of a pioneering hero himself, whose crozier I have often used, confirmed to Dolling's biographer, Father Charles Osborne:

"I gladly offered dear Dolling the work in Bulawayo when the church at home seemed afraid of him. It burnt into my soul to think of the shame of the mother church not to keep such gifts as his in her service. Is the Establishment too select for such? But Dolling felt he could not at his time of life grapple with the problem of colonial work". Osborne's book was published in London in 1903.

Osborne said, "Paul Bull of the Community of the Resurrection was allowed by the head of that Community (then Canon Gore of Westminster Abbey, now Bishop of Worcester) to take temporary charge of St Agatha's". *The Chronicle*, kind of ship's log maintained at Mirfield, reports briefly that on January 11, 1896, "Paul went to Landport to take charge of St Agatha's in the interval between the departure of Father Dolling and the incoming of his successor". Dolling had quit Portsmouth on January 10. It is no surprise that Osborne should claim, "Father Bull gained the affection and confidence of the people". He and Dolling were both large, warm hearted and ebullient men committed to popular preaching of an evangelical sort, and to Christian socialism.

The Chronicle further records that at study groups for clergy held in Gore's residence at Westminster Abbey, papers were read about some of the issues which had got Dolling into trouble. On January 13, 1896, Gore spoke about prayers for the departed. In February a Herbert Hall spoke about the state of the departed. In April the same Herbert Hall spoke about the invocation of saints. Gore's house was then a priory of the Community of the Resurrection.

On the completion of his locum Father Bull sent Father Dolling an account of "my six weeks charge". He wrote from the vicarage at Radley, then also a priory of the Community. He praised the parishioners for "their combination of independence and discipline, men of strong and very decided character who worked together in perfect harmony. They know the difference between liberty and licence. I found the parish practically self working" (Osborne). The tradition has continued: I could myself praise the present congregation in similar terms.

The new priest was the Reverend George Herbert Tremenheere, formerly assistant curate of Holy Redeemer Clerkenwell. Among the many things for which Charles Gore is remembered is the fact that in 1892 he founded the Community of the Resurrection. He was a Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, when

Tremenheere was an undergraduate there. He was Vice Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College when Tremenheere was an ordinand there. He was founding Principal of Pusey House when Tremenheere resided there for some months. Tremenheere belonged to the Society of the Resurrection, a devotional guild and study group for clergy, from which evolved the Community of the Resurrection. One of Gore's closest and oldest friends from school days was Father Edward Eyre, vicar of Clerkenwell. It is reasonable to suppose that Gore was influential in Father Tremenheere's appointments both to Clerkenwell and to Portsmouth. In the latter he was in charge of St Agatha's from 1896 until 1911.

At Gore's invitation, who was then Bishop of Oxford, Tremenheere moved to two posts in that diocese. The two men corresponded until Gore's death in 1932. Father Tremenheere travelled to London for the Bishop's funeral but found the church's vestry so full of young clergy that he couldn't get in to robe. There is at Mirfield a small bundle of post cards and notes which Gore wrote to Tremenheere which the latter treasured until his own death in 1936. His lengthy appreciation of Gore was printed in full in the monthly journal *Theology*, issue of January 1953.

The fourth Superior of the Community of the Resurrection was Father Keble Talbot. Gore was his godfather. Like Tremenheere he had been a boy at Winchester, the school responsible for founding St Agatha's in the first place. He had been so moved by Father Dolling's preaching that he put all his pocket money in the collection plate. His own father, Edward, was another of Gore's closest and oldest friends and a Bishop of Winchester.

Father Godfrey Pawson CR edited a memoir *Keble Talbot: His Community and Friends*, which was published in London in 1954. Pawson wrote: "Keble had at least three reminiscences of Father Dolling. One was of a visit to a theatre. They had been given a box. Dolling grew tired of the play, took off his boots and exhibited his feet in (I think) white socks. On the ledge of the box, all excepting Dolling, being a good deal embarrassed. He mentioned that he recently came upon a letter written to him on the occasion of his own first confession, which was made, I think, to Father Stanton" (of St Alban's, Holborn).

Interest in Father Dolling continues. In his collection of biographical studies *In the House of my Friends* (London 2003) Canon Eric James devoted a chapter to Dolling. And I like to think that work done by my Community in the black slums of Johannesburg, led by such as Father Raymond Raynes and Father Trevor Huddleston, was heir to work done in Portsmouth; that Nicholas Mosley's *Life of Raymond Raynes* (London 1961) and Trevor Huddleston's *Naught for Your Comfort* (London 1956) are heirs to Father Dolling's own *Ten Years in a Portsmouth Slum* (London 1896).

At St Agatha's I therefore feel that I have entered upon my inheritance. But there is also a future to look forward to in ecumenical hope. Pusey wrote to Archdeacon Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop-elect of Oxford, in November 1845: "I can not but think that Rome and we are not irreconcilably at variance, but that, in the great impending contest with unbelief, we shall be on the same side, and in God's time, and in His way" (Liddon's monumental life of Pusey, four volumes, London 1897).

+Robert Mercer CR

The retired, Third Bishop of The Anglican Catholic Church of Canada

From here and there

1) "What do you [Anglicans] expect from the Church of Rome which, in the words of Ignatius of Antioch, is to preside over the Church in love?" (**Cardinal Kasper** to the recent Lambeth conference. St. Ignatius was Bishop of Antioch in Asia Minor but was martyred in Rome in about 107 AD. He was a friend of St Polycarp of Smyrna who as a boy had known St John the Apostle. Ignatius is famous for seven Epistles to different churches, which sound like a mixture of St John and St Paul. He is equally revered as an authority by Anglicans, Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholics. +RM CR)

2) As for [John Doe's] claim that there is no science, just "moralizing" in conscientiously objecting to a patient's demand to kill an unborn child, or themselves (assisted suicide), science indeed does support the pro-life position. As an example, I'd like [Mr. Doe] to explain the "science" that supports the current position in Canadian law that has no problem killing an unborn child in the womb in the last trimester, yet throws the full support of the Charter of Rights behind a child born three months earlier in development, as a 24-week preemie. By **Dr. Paul Randalli**, in a letter to the editor, *The National Post*, August 19, 2008

3) Builders bungle train tunnel

Bungling engineers have been left red-faced after building a railway tunnel that's too small for trains to actually fit through.

The costly mistake was only discovered when inspectors measured the finished tunnel in the Polish capital, Warsaw, and realised the roof was so low that no trains would get under it.

Rail bosses claim the mix-up happened because workers who were laying new tracks didn't talk to the team that was building the tunnel.

"During work on the tunnel, tracks were laid down on

newly-raised ground which meant the distance between the tracks and roof of the tunnel became shorter," said Polish Railways spokesman Marta Szklarek.

The cock-up is the latest in a series of public transport construction fiascoes in Poland.

A tunnel built recently to divert lorry traffic in Warsaw turned out to be too low for lorries.

Last year, the Polish road authority produced plans for two sections of a major motorway that would have missed each other by five miles - each coming to a dead end in the middle of the countryside. From www.ananova.com

4) From a church leaflet/bulletin - The sermon this morning: Jesus walks on water. The sermon tonight: Searching for Jesus.

5) If you're not a liberal by the time you're eighteen, you have no heart. And if you're not a conservative by the time you're thirty-five, you have no brain. Attributed to **Winston Churchill**

6) Why doesn't 'Buick' rhyme with 'quick'?

7) Adam and Eve

God formed man and gave him an immortal soul, created to His own image.

From Adam the first man, and from Eve, whom God gave to Adam as a companion, has sprung the whole human race.

God has created us to know Him, to love Him, and to serve Him in this world and to be happy with Him forever in heaven.

God not only gave our first parent an immortal soul; He elevated them to a supernatural life of grace; He called them to enjoy His eternal happiness. In this first state of original justice, He exempted them from the ravages of sickness, ignorance, concupiscence and death.

From a booklet *Our Faith* published by **The Anglican Church in Southern Africa (Traditional Rite)**

8) Dear Lord: Keep your arm around my shoulder and Your hand over my mouth. Amen.

9) Believe it or not

Mrs. Grazinski, of Oklahoma City, purchased a brand new 32-foot Winnebago motor home. On her first trip home (from an OU football game), having driven on to the freeway, set the cruise control at 70 mph and calmly left the driver's seat to go into the back and make herself a sandwich. Not surprisingly, the RV left the freeway, crashed and overturned. Mrs. Grazinski sued

Winnebago for not advising her in the owner's manual that she couldn't actually do this. The jury awarded her \$1,750,000, plus a new motor home. The company actually changed their manuals on the basis of this suit, just in case there were any other complete morons around.

Christian Unity - It's not a matter of choice

The overall perspective from which we see and interpret the world and our place in it is called a "worldview." Our worldview operates mostly at the subconscious level, but it provides the framework for our conscious thinking. We often hear, for example, talk of Anglicans "converting" to Catholicism. That verb implies that Anglican and Catholic are different churches, possibly even different religions, but on a deeper level, it reveals a commonly held worldview which assumes that there can be multiple Christian churches.

Most of us have come to think of the Church more or less as we think of corporations and brand names, and a move from one denomination to another is seen as comparable to switching from Ford to General Motors or from Coca-Cola to Pepsi. Such a perspective is at odds with the sacramental nature of the Church. The Church may indeed look at first like other man-made organizations, but its external and institutional component is the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace - the mystical presence of the Body of Christ in the physical world. The Church is a sacramental entity designed and instituted by Christ himself, with unity as an essential attribute.

One can abandon the Ford Motor Company and continue to own automobiles or abandon Coca-Cola and continue to enjoy soft drinks, but it is impossible to keep oneself separate from the larger Body of Christ and at the same time be part of it. Paul's comparison of the church to the human body fits perfectly with Jesus' prayer for the unity of Christians. Just as an ear, arm, or leg, if it could detach itself from the body and continue to live, would no longer be the body of which it had been a part, a piece of the church which has broken away and which remains separate from the main body, regardless of its reason for doing so, is neither that body nor a separated but equal substitute for it. The Body of Christ, by definition, must be One Body. It can neither be replicated nor dismembered.

Shopping around

Misled and misinformed by those without Christ's vision of a unified Church, we have come to accept a multitude of Christian churches as healthy and normal. We have more or less absorbed the notion that each of us is free to decide what to accept as true about God, his moral teachings, and his plan for us, that we can ignore any part of God's revealed will with which we

are uncomfortable, and that the key is to find a church where the teaching and style of worship are pleasing and comfortable to us. Thus we have the strange but familiar phenomenon of people shopping for a church in much the same way as they might shop for a car or a new pair of shoes.

This differs radically from the Scriptural picture of the Church. Christ designated the Apostles as the Church's first leaders and established a system for their succession. He instituted the Eucharist as the bond which would unite Christians. The notion of Christians not "in communion" with each other would have been unfathomable to the Apostles and nonsense to our Lord. Jesus likewise gave his followers the Great Commission to carry his message of salvation to the world as the task of a unified Church, never intending it to become a competition between its broken fragments.

A Divided Christianity

There simply is no room for a divided Christianity in Jesus' prayer in John 17 that his followers be one, as completely and intimately as He and the Father are one. A patchwork quilt of disjointed denominations does not even approach Christ's standard of oneness. The idea that Christians should separate themselves from one another over liturgical preferences or because of different perspectives on non-essentials is preposterous, unless one's worldview is completely out of sync with the Mind of Christ.

Teaching and Tradition

The Christian, Anglican or otherwise, who rejects the pursuit of unity in favor of preserving the particular subset of teaching and tradition he finds personally attractive and comfortable is a modern parallel to the character Julius, described by William Law in the first chapter of *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. Law's Julius believed it was fine for a Christian to "live as the generality of the world does" and "gratify his tempers and passions as most people do," while our modern Julius sees no problem in embracing the contemporary view of the church as a cafeteria of belief and practice from which he is free to make his selections. In either case, as Law wrote, "If Julius was to read all the New Testament from the beginning to the end, he would find his course of life condemned in every page of it."

Persecution

Christianity in our day is under open attack. Christians are persecuted, and often killed, by fanatics whose agenda is the extermination of all who disagree with them. Secular humanism more quietly and insidiously eats away at Christian faith and morals at every level of modern society. Much of what passes for entertainment is an open sewer of immorality. If we wonder why Christianity seems to be losing ground to the godless

culture around it, we need look no further than John 17. The unity for which Jesus prayed was linked to an outcome: ". . . that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me." The divisions we have produced and perpetuated in the Body of Christ have blocked Jesus' recognition and acceptance by much of the world, and have kept God's will for His people from being fulfilled.

Fizzle and fade

Over the last 30 years, Anglicans have demonstrated time and again that they are much better at demolition than at building. Here in the USA, the rapid disintegration which followed the promising start made in St Louis in 1977 is only part of the story. Every 3-5 years, another group of Episcopalians seems to undergo a sort of "Rip Van Winkle experience," waking up from a 20-year nap and realizing that their church has self-destructed while they were asleep. These people either believe that they are the first to recognize what has happened, or they decide for one reason or another that their earlier-awakened cousins are not to be taken seriously. In either case, a new "great white hope" for unity among discerning Anglicans like themselves is announced and launched, each with more fanfare than its predecessor, only to fizzle and fade before the pattern repeats itself a few years later. The end result of each of these cycles is usually just another addition to Anglicanism's well-known "alphabet soup" and another argument about who the "real Anglicans" are.

Anglican Unity

Maybe the problem is that we have all been thinking way too small. If, in the light of John 17, we were trying to rebuild The Church, reconciling and uniting all of Christ's followers, we would be forced to deal with the issues which define a follower of Christ, rather than the minor issues and major egos which keep various groups of Anglicans separate from one another. Even differences between Anglicans, Catholics, and Protestants melt away when we begin talking about what makes one a "follower of Christ," rather than what defines a "true Anglican," a "real Catholic," or a "good Protestant" - all terms unknown to Jesus, we should remember. The inherent flaw in our multiple "Anglican unity" efforts may just be that we are putting our energy into trying to repair one dysfunctional piece of the Church, rather than the shattered Church itself.

Conservative Anglicans, by even the broadest definition, comprise considerably less than 1% of the world's Christians. If you were trying to repair an article of pottery which had been broken, would you begin by looking for small fragments to glue together? Of course not. The only logical way to rebuild the broken vessel would be to start with the largest intact piece and re-attach to it, one by one, the pieces which had broken off.

Process of reconstruction

In its action last October, seeking "full, corporate, sacramental union" with the See of Rome, the College of Bishops of the Traditional Anglican Communion sought to begin that process of reconstruction in the broken Body of Christ. The knowledge that their appeal was "cordially received" by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith at the Vatican, and that a substantive response to it is being prepared, should fill every Christian with hope that the process to reclaim an undivided Christian Church is underway.

There are many, both Anglicans and Roman Catholics, who are praying for us. A Poor Clare sister here in the USA recently let us know that she is dedicating her prayer life to our cause, and she has requested a list of our clergy and parishes so that she can also pray for each of them individually. A group of Carmelite nuns in Canada is doing likewise.

Despite such positive responses, there has also been some negative reaction to the news of our petition, and even some nervousness among those who support it in principle. It would be folly to expect otherwise - both Abraham and Moses certainly had their critics. Resistance to change and fear of the unknown, along with an underlying assumption that a fragmented Christian church is normal and reasonable, combine to make the status quo seem attractive, even if it is at odds with Holy Scripture.

Restoring unity

Because we know about Jesus' prayer for unity, it was obviously a public prayer, directed to the Father but intended for our instruction as well. Neither the TAC's petition nor the concurrent Roman-Orthodox dialogue is an attempt to establish an alliance or working arrangement between disparate churches. In each case, the motivation is the fulfillment of our Lord's unambiguous will for a unified Church. The ultimate goal is to restore the unity destroyed by earlier schisms, preserving and respecting the unique contributions to the faith developed by each of the parties during their periods of separation, and adding these contributions to the richness of the restored Body of Christ. It will take time and effort to realize that goal, and there will be missteps and mid-course corrections along the way, but the goal itself must not change, because it is clearly the will of our Lord.

If we are to realize Jesus' vision for his Church, the Anglican component will obviously be much bigger than the TAC. Chemists routinely mix two or more ingredients to form some new and useful compound, and it is not unusual for a catalyst to be required to start the reaction necessary to produce the desired end product. It may be helpful to think of the TAC and its petition as catalysts in the unity process, rather than as main ingredients.

This is a new, more robust ecumenism, unlike earlier efforts - one which recognizes full communion as the sign and product of unity, but is not afraid to explore its role as an agent of unity as well. The end game is not some special status for the TAC, but an open door through which all faithful Anglicans can come home as Anglicans who, in the words of the Athanasian Creed, "keep the catholic faith whole and undefiled." It is not a quick process because, as one Vatican official told us, "You have forced us to consider questions we haven't thought about in 500 years."

Real unity

Our fallen human nature makes it very difficult to let go of our personal opinions, preferences, and even ambitions. When we find ourselves apprehensive about concrete steps toward real Christian unity because of our private concerns about what such unity may mean for us personally, we need to re-read Jesus' prayer for his followers in John 17, and then ask God to "preserve us from faithless fears and worldly anxieties" (BCP 1928, p. 596). Making the following prayers for the Church, from pp. 37-38 of the same Book of Common Prayer, part of our daily devotions will also help us align ourselves more closely with the will of our Lord:

Pray daily For the Church

O gracious Father, we humbly beseech thee for thy holy Catholic Church; that thou wouldest be pleased to fill it with all truth, in all peace. Where it is corrupt, purify it; where it is in error, direct it; where in any thing it is amiss, reform it. Where it is right, establish it; where it is in want, provide for it; where it is divided, reunite it; for the sake of him who died and rose again, and ever liveth to make intercession for us, Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

For the Unity of God's People

O God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord: that as there is but one Body and one Spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may be all of one heart and of one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Anyone who reads John 17 and offers those prayers with a heart and mind truly open to the Holy Spirit will understand that maintaining the current divisions in the Body of Christ is in direct opposition to Christ's clear and incontrovertible will for His Church. Simply put, that is sin, and it is not an option.

Let go - Let God

We all say the words "Thy will be done" daily in the Lord's Prayer. James (1:22) writes, "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only." Those words from the Lord's Prayer ring hollow unless we actively pursue, or at least support, the quest to undo the mistakes of our forefathers and restore the Church to the unity mandated by Jesus. Opposition to such unity is nothing less than telling our Lord that He cannot have the church He wants, because we insist on having the church we want.

There is only one Christian response to such feelings - the words spoken by our Lord when Peter put his personal wishes ahead of God's plan: "Get behind me, Satan! You are an offence to me, for you are not mindful of the things of God, but the things of men." (Matt. 16:23, NKJV)

This is an historic time in the life of the Church, not a time to sit on the sidelines, and not a time to let our own personal preferences or hang-ups keep us out of the game entirely. If Christ's clearly-stated will for his Church clashes with our individual inclinations, the problem is ours, and we need to fix it.

As God calls us forth from our comfortable little enclaves and we move like Abraham into uncharted territory, we need to "let go and let God" rebuild His Church, ready and willing for Him to use us as He sees fit, whether that be as architects and engineers, or simply as a batch of cement.

An address given by **The Right Reverend George Langberg** at the *Conference of the Fellowship of Concerned Churchmen* - June, 2008

Let's face it - English is a crazy language

There is no egg in eggplant, nor ham in hamburger; neither apple nor pine in pineapple. English muffins weren't invented in England; nor French fries in France.

Sweetmeats are candies; while sweetbreads, which aren't sweet, are meat.

We take English for granted. But, if we explore its paradoxes, we find that quicksand can work slowly, boxing rings are square; and a guinea pig is neither from Guinea, nor is it a pig.

And, why is it that writers write - but, fingers don't fing; grocers don't groce, and hammers don't ham?

If the plural of tooth is teeth, why isn't the plural of booth, beeth?

One goose, 2 geese. So - one moose, 2 meese? One index, 2 indices? Doesn't it seem crazy that you can

make amends, but not one amend?

If you have a bunch of odds and ends, and get rid of all but one of them, what do you call it?

If teachers taught, why don't preachers praught? If a vegetarian eats vegetables, what does a humanitarian eat?

Sometimes, I think all the English speakers should be committed to an asylum for the verbally insane.

In what language do people recite at a play, and play at a recital?

Ship by truck and send cargo by ship? Have noses that run, and feet that smell?

How can a slim chance and a fat chance be the same; while a wise man and a wise guy are opposites?

You have to marvel at the unique lunacy of a language in which your house can burn up, as it burns down; in which you fill in a form by filling it out; and in which, an alarm goes off by going on.

English was invented by people, not computers, and it reflects the creativity of the human race, which, of course, is not a race at all.

From the newsletter of **Fr. Ralph Beaumont** in the Lake District, UK. Thanks to +RM CR

Catholics who support abortion should not receive Communion

Rome, August 19, 2008 - The prefect of the Apostolic Signature, Archbishop Raymond Burke, said this week that Catholics, especially politicians, who publicly defend abortion should not receive Communion, and that ministers of Communion should be responsibly charitable in denying it to them if they ask for it, "until they have reformed their lives."

In an interview with the magazine, *Radici Christiane*, Archbishop Burke pointed out that there is often a lack of reverence at Mass when receiving Communion. "Receiving the Body and Blood of Christ unworthily is a sacrilege," he warned, "If it is done deliberately in mortal sin it is a sacrilege."

To illustrate his point, he referred to "public officials who, with knowledge and consent, uphold actions that are against the Divine and Eternal moral law. For example, if they support abortion, which entails the taking of innocent and defenseless human lives. A person who commits sin in this way should be publicly admonished in such a way as to not receive Communion until he or she has reformed his life," the

archbishop said.

"If a person who has been admonished persists in public mortal sin and attempts to receive Communion, the minister of the Eucharist has the obligation to deny it to him. Why? Above all, for the salvation of that person, preventing him from committing a sacrilege," he added.

"We must avoid giving people the impression that one can be in a state of mortal sin and receive the Eucharist," the archbishop continued. "Secondly, there could be another form of scandal, consisting of leading people to think that the public act that this person is doing, which until now everyone believed was a serious sin, is really not that serious - if the Church allows him or her to receive Communion."

"If we have a public figure who is openly and deliberately upholding abortion rights and receiving the Eucharist, what will the average person think? He or she could come to believe that up to a certain point it is okay to do away with an innocent life in the mother's womb," he warned.

Archbishop Burke also noted that when a bishop or a Church leader prevents an abortion supporter from receiving Communion, "it is not with the intention of interfering in public life but rather in the spiritual state of the politician or public official who, if Catholic, should follow the divine law in the public sphere as well."

"Therefore, it is simply ridiculous and wrong to try to silence a pastor, accusing him of interfering in politics so that he cannot do good to the soul of a member of his flock," he stated.

It is "simply wrong" to think that the faith must be reduced to the private sphere and eliminated from public life, Archbishop Burke said, encouraging Catholics "to bear witness to our faith not only in private in our homes but also in our public lives with others in order to bear strong witness to Christ."

From www.catholicnewsagency.com

An Affair to Remember

Now that John Edwards [former Democratic presidential candidate] has admitted to his affair with 42-year-old Rielle Hunter, the big test looms again before the American public: Do we care? Do we think it matters? Do we believe that there should be any code of conduct or moral standard for those in public office, even if it is the highest one in the land?

Justifications for political improprieties abound. There are historical ones: "Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John F. Kennedy, Bill Clinton, etc. had moral failures, so what's the big deal?" There are also

personal ones: "We shouldn't judge. No one is perfect. Who are we to point fingers?"

Don't misunderstand me. I believe in personal redemption. I myself have experienced it, as I wrote about in the chapter "A sin that became a blessing" in my autobiography, "Against All Odds," in which I discuss an adulterous one-night stand in the early '60s that resulted in my wonderful daughter Dina. That is why I hope, as he says, John Edwards truly has asked God and his wife for forgiveness, and I pray for their restoration and the long road that results from it.

But then again, John Edwards continues to minimize his culpability by playing linguistic and moral dodge ball. He lied to his closest colleagues and the public for nearly two years about the affair. And even in his confession last week, he doesn't call it a "lie," a "sin," an "affair" or "adultery." Rather, he repeatedly calls it merely a "mistake" or a "serious error in judgment." Is that all it is?

I believe leadership should be above reproach. I believe those who govern should lead also in civility and decency and that their character should be congruent with their call to office. Like parents to children, a nation's politicians' integrity and character should supersede its citizens. But as long as we the people tolerate leadership immorality and elect corrupt politicians, we cannot expect the heart and character of our nation to improve.

It fascinates me that American naturalization law incorporates "good moral character" as a prerequisite for citizenship but no such legal standard is expected of those who govern our citizens. In a post-Clinton era, government trusts seem to be the rule more than the exception. Immorality is not only tolerated but also expected among public servants now. Have we at last severed or totally compartmentalized their personal and political lives so that never the twain should meet?

Enduring public humiliation is not the only price a political leader should pay for improprieties; I think they should be disciplined and suspended, if not deposed from public service. The consequence of corruption also should be increased restrictions, if not a banning from certain areas of future public service. If one cannot properly handle his private affairs, can we truly expect him to handle political ones? If politicians can't rightly steward the duties and offices granted to them, then they should be removed and kept from the public trust. As Christians, we should be abundant in forgiveness; but as Americans too, we should be diligent in protecting political trusts from those who do or might abuse them.

To help restore national civility and decency is just one of many reasons I wrote my new book, "Black Belt Patriotism," which will be released September 7 . . .

With the Edwards affair and political integrity again hot in the news, here is just a taste of what I say in the section "The basis for morality and civility":

"Whatever happened to decency, respect, and fair play? Remember when a handshake was the only contract that was needed in negotiations? Whatever happened to the days when fourteen-year-olds (like the young George Washington) set themselves to learn and write out freehand by their own volition the 110 Rules of Civility & Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation (a book written by Jesuits for the instruction of young gentlemen)?

"Good morals precede good laws, which is why government isn't much help. Unless the people and their legislators are grounded in morality, the best of laws will be broken and the worst of laws will be made, legalizing immorality. We can't look to government to improve decency, civility, and morality. For that we need to look to another source.

"John Adams put it well when he said: 'We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion. Avarice, ambition, revenge, or gallantry, would break the strongest cords of our Constitution as a whale goes through a net. Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.' . . .

"Our Founders had a better answer than government or even education. God is the answer. God is the moral compass of America. Or He should be, if we ever want to restore morality in our homes and civility to our land. Our Founders believed morals flowed from one's accountability to God, and that, without God, immoral anarchy would result."

By **Chuck Norris** - August 12, 2008 on *Human Events.com*

Gary S. Freeman
102 Frederick Banting Place
Waterloo, Ontario N2T 1C4

519-886-3635 (Home)
800-265-2178 or 519-747-3324 (Office)
519-747-5323 (Fax)
gfreeman@pwi-insurance.ca